




# Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2008-09

National Inmate Survey, 2008-09



Allen J. Beck, PhD, and Paige M. Harrison,  
*BJS Statisticians*

Marcus Berzofsky, Rachel Caspar,  
and Christopher Krebs, PhD,  
*RTI International*

August 2010, NCJ 231169

**Bureau of Justice Statistics**  
James P. Lynch  
Director

**BJS Website:**  
[www.bjs.usdoj.gov](http://www.bjs.usdoj.gov)

[askbjs@usdoj.gov](mailto:askbjs@usdoj.gov)

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistics agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. James P. Lynch is director.

This compendium was written by Allen J. Beck, PhD, and Paige M. Harrison, BJS Statisticians, and Marcus Berzofsky, Rachel Caspar, and Christopher Krebs, PhD, RTI International.

Paige M. Harrison, under the supervision of Allen J. Beck, was the project manager for the NIS-2. RTI, International staff, under a cooperative agreement and in collaboration with BJS, designed the survey, developed the questionnaires, and monitored the data collection and processing, including Rachel Caspar, Principal Investigator/ Instrumentation Task Leader; Christopher Krebs, Co-principal Investigator; Ellen Stutts, Co-principal Investigator and Data Collection Task Leader; Susan Brumbaugh, Logistics Task Leader; Jamia Bachrach, Human Subjects Task Leader; David Forvendel, Research Computing Task Leader; Ralph Folsom, Senior Statistician; and Marcus Berzofsky, Statistics Task Leader.

Jill Duncan edited the report, Barbara Quinn designed and produced the report, and Jayne Robinson prepared the report for final printing under the supervision of Doris J. James.

August 2010, NCJ 231169

## Contents

Highlights . . . . .	5	<b>Inmate-on-Inmate Victimization</b> . . . . .	21
<b>National Inmate Survey-2</b> . . . . .	6	<b>Staff Sexual Misconduct</b> . . . . .	23
<b>Incidents of Sexual Victimization</b> . . . . .	6	<b>Appendix 1.</b> Survey items related to inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	25
<b>Facility Level Rates</b> . . . . .	7	<b>Appendix 2.</b> Survey items related to staff sexual misconduct, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	26
<b>Demographic Characteristics</b> . . . . .	12	<b>Appendix 3.</b> Follow-up questions for inmates reporting no sexual activity, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	26
<b>Sexual History and Orientation</b> . . . . .	14	<b>Methodology</b> . . . . .	27
<b>Criminal Justice Status</b> . . . . .	16		
<b>Predicted Victimization Rates</b> . . . . .	18		

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1.</b> Inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	7	<b>Table 11.</b> Multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization, by criminal justice status and history, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	17
<b>Table 2.</b> Facilities with high rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	8	<b>Table 12.</b> Final multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization in prisons and jails, by type of incident, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	18
<b>Table 3.</b> Facilities with high rates of staff sexual misconduct, by type of facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	9	<b>Table 13.</b> Estimated and predicted rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in high-rate prisons and jails, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	20
<b>Table 4.</b> Facilities with low rates of any type of sexual victimization, by type of facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	10	<b>Table 14.</b> Estimated and predicted rates of staff sexual misconduct in high-rate prisons and jails, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	20
<b>Table 5.</b> Rates of sexual victimization in special correctional facilities, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	11	<b>Table 15.</b> Experiences of victims of inmate-on-inmate victims of sexual victimization, by type of facility and sex, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	21
<b>Table 6.</b> Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident and demographic inmate characteristic, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	12	<b>Table 16.</b> Circumstances surrounding inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and sex, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	22
<b>Table 7.</b> Multivariate logistic regression models of sexual victimization, by inmate demographic characteristic, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	13	<b>Table 17.</b> Circumstances surrounding incidents of staff sexual misconduct, by type of facility and sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	23
<b>Table 8.</b> Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident and sexual history, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	14	<b>Table 18.</b> Sex of perpetrator of staff sexual misconduct, by facility type and sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	24
<b>Table 9.</b> Multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization, by sexual history, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	15	<b>Table 19.</b> Sexual touching between inmates and staff during and not during strip searches and pat downs, by sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	24
<b>Table 10.</b> Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident and criminal justice status, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	16		

## List of Appendix Tables

<b>Appendix Table 1.</b> Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	34	<b>Appendix Table 7.</b> Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	75
<b>Appendix Table 2.</b> Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	41	<b>Appendix Table 8.</b> Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	83
<b>Appendix Table 3.</b> Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	47	<b>Appendix Table 9.</b> Characteristics of special correctional facilities and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	91
<b>Appendix Table 4.</b> Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	53	<b>Appendix Table 10.</b> Wald F statistics for inmate risk characteristics in the final multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization in prisons and jails, by type of incident, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	92
<b>Appendix Table 5.</b> Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	59		
<b>Appendix Table 6.</b> Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 . . . . .	67		

## Highlights

### Prevalence of sexual victimization

- An estimated 4.4% of prison inmates and 3.1% of jail inmates reported experiencing one or more incidents of sexual victimization by another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months. Nationwide, these percentages suggest that approximately 88,500 adults held in prisons and jails at the time of the survey had been sexually victimized.
- About 2.1% of prison inmates and 1.5% of jail inmates reported an incident involving another inmate. An estimated 1.0% of prison inmates and 0.8% of jail inmates said they had nonconsensual sex with another inmate (the most serious type of acts), including unwilling manual stimulation and oral, anal, or vaginal penetration.
- About 2.8% of prison inmates and 2.0% of jail inmates reported having had sex or sexual contact with staff. At least half of the inmates who experienced staff sexual misconduct (1.8% in prison and 1.1% in jail) said that they willingly had sex or sexual contact with staff.

### Facility rankings

- Eight male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 6 jails were identified as “high rate” facilities based on the prevalence of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization; 4 male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 5 jails were identified as “high rate” based on the prevalence of staff sexual misconduct. Each of these facilities had a lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval that was at least 55% higher than the average rate among comparable facilities.
- Seven male prisons, 4 female prisons, and 9 jails were identified as “low rate” facilities based on a small percentages of inmates reporting any sexual victimization by another inmate or staff and a low upper bound for the 95%-confidence interval around the rate. Among the 167 prisons and 286 jails in the survey, 6 prisons and 28 jails had no reported incidents of sexual victimization.
- Except for a 6.0% rate of sexual victimization in the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks (Leavenworth, KS), rates in the 5 surveyed facilities operated by ICE, 3 operated by the U.S. Military, and 2 facilities in Indian country were lower than average rates in state and federal prisons (4.4%) and jails (3.1%).

### Variations in victimization rates

- Rates of reported sexual victimization varied among inmates:
  - Female inmates in prison (4.7%) or jail (3.1%) were more than twice as likely as male inmates in prison (1.9%) or jail (1.3%) to report experiencing inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization.

- Sexual activity with facility staff was reported by 2.9% of male prisoners and 2.1% of male jail inmates, compared to 2.1% of female prisoners and 1.5% of female jail inmates.
- Rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in prisons and jails were significantly higher among inmates who were white or multi-racial compared to blacks, inmates with a college degree or more (compared to those who had not completed high school), a sexual orientation other than heterosexual compared to heterosexual, and who had experienced a sexual victimization before coming to the facility compared to those who had not.
- After controlling for multiple inmate characteristics, rates of reported staff sexual misconduct were lower among white inmates (compared to black inmates), lower among inmates ages 25 or older (compared to inmates ages 20 to 24), higher among inmates with a college degree (compared to those who had not completed high school), and higher among inmates who had experienced sexual victimization before coming to the facility (compared to those who had not).

### Circumstances surrounding victimization

- Among inmates who reported inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, 13% of male prison inmates and 19% of male jail inmates said they were victimized within the first 24 hours after admission, compared to 4% of female inmates in prison and jail.
- Inmate-on-inmate victimization in prisons and jails was most commonly reported to have occurred between 6 pm and midnight: more than 40% of victims reported this time period.
- Most victims of staff sexual misconduct were males; most perpetrators were females. Among male victims of staff sexual misconduct, 69% of those in prison and 64% of those in jails reported sexual activity with female staff. An additional 16% of prison inmates and 18% of jail inmates reported sexual activity with both female and male staff.
- Among inmates who reported staff sexual misconduct, nearly 16% of male victims in prison and 30% of male victims in jail said they were victimized by staff within the first 24 hours, compared to 5% of female victims in prison and 4% of female victims in jail.

# Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2008-09

## National Inmate Survey-2

Between October 2008 and December 2009, BJS completed the second National Inmate Survey (NIS-2) in 167 state and federal prisons, 286 jails, and 10 special confinement facilities operated by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the U.S. Military, and correctional authorities in Indian country. The survey, conducted by RTI International (Research Triangle Park, NC), was administered to 81,566 inmates ages 18 or older, including 32,029 inmates in state and federal prisons, 48,066 in jails, 957 in ICE facilities, 399 in military facilities, and 115 in Indian country jails.

The NIS-2 is part of the National Prison Rape Statistics Program, which collects administrative records of reported sexual violence, and allegations of sexual victimization directly from victims, through surveys of adult inmates in prisons and jails and surveys of youth held in juvenile correctional facilities. Administrative records have been collected annually since 2004. Reports by victims of sexual victimization have been collected since 2007.

The NIS-2 survey consisted of an audio computer-assisted self-interview

(ACASI) in which inmates, using a touch-screen, interacted with a computer-assisted questionnaire and followed audio instructions delivered via headphones. Some inmates (726) completed a short paper form. Most of these inmates were housed in administrative or disciplinary segregation or were considered too violent to be interviewed.

The NIS-2 collects only allegations of sexual victimization. Because participation in the survey is anonymous and reports are confidential, the survey does not permit any follow-up investigation or substantiation of reported incidents through review. Some allegations in the NIS-2 may be untrue. At the same time, some inmates may remain silent about sexual victimization experienced in the facility, despite efforts of survey staff to assure inmates that their responses would be kept confidential. Although the effects may be offsetting, the relative extent of under reporting and false reporting in the NIS-2 is unknown.

## Incidents of Sexual Victimization

**4.4% of prison inmates and 3.1% of jail inmates reported one or more incidents of sexual victimization**

Among the 76,459 inmates participating in the NIS-2 sexual victimization survey, 2,861 reported experiencing one or more incidents of sexual victimization in the past 12 months, or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months. Because the NIS-2 is a sample survey, weights were applied for sampled facilities and inmates within facilities to produce national-level and facility-level estimates. The estimated number of prison and jail inmates experiencing sexual victimization totaled 88,500 (or

4.4% of all prison inmates and 3.1% of jail inmates, nationwide) (table 1).

Among all state and federal inmates, 2.1% (or an estimated 30,100 prisoners) reported an incident involving another inmate, and 2.8% (41,200) reported an incident involving facility staff. Some prisoners (0.5%) reported sexual victimization by both another inmate and facility staff.

About 1.5% of jail inmates (11,600) reported an incident with another inmate, and 2.0% (15,800) reported an incident with staff. Approximately 0.4% of jail inmates (3,400) reported being sexually victimized by both other inmates and staff.

The NIS-2 screened for specific sexual activities in which inmates may have been involved during the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months. Inmates were then asked if they were forced or pressured to engage in these activities by another inmate or staff. (See appendices 1 through 3 for specific survey questions.) Reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization were classified as either nonconsensual sexual acts or abusive sexual contacts.

Approximately 1.0% of prisoners and 0.8% of jail inmates said they were forced or pressured to have nonconsensual sex with another inmate, including manual stimulation and oral, anal, or vaginal penetration. An additional 1.0% of prison inmates and 0.7% of jail inmates said they had experienced one or more abusive sexual contacts only, or unwanted touching of specific body parts in a sexual way by another inmate. (See page 7 for definition of terms.)

An estimated 1.7% of prison inmates and 1.5% of jail inmates

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-79) (PREA) requires the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to carry out a comprehensive statistical review and analysis of the incidents and effects of prison rape for each calendar year. This report fulfills the requirements under Sec. 4(c)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act to provide a list of prisons and jails according to the prevalence of sexual victimization.

reported that they had sex or sexual contact unwillingly with staff as a result of physical force, pressure, or offers of special favors or privileges. An estimated 1.8% of all prison inmates and 1.1% of jail inmates reported they willingly had sex or sexual contact with staff. Regardless of whether an inmate reported being willing or unwilling, any sexual contact between inmates and staff is illegal; however, the difference may be informative when addressing issues of staff training, prevention, and investigation.

### Facility Level Rates

#### NIS-2 provides a basis for identifying high rate and low rate facilities

As required under the Prison Rape Elimination Act, the NIS-2 provides facility-level estimates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and staff sexual misconduct. Since these estimates are based on a sample of inmates rather than a complete enumeration, they are subject to sampling error. (See *Methodology* for description of sampling procedures.)

The precision of each of the facility-level estimates can be calculated based on the estimated standard error. Typically, a 95%-confidence interval around each survey estimate is calculated by multiplying the standard error by 1.96 and then adding and subtracting the result from the sample estimate to create an upper and lower bound. This interval expresses the range of values that could result among 95% of the different samples that could be drawn.

For small samples and estimates close to 0%, as is the case with facility-level estimates of sexual victimization by type of incident, the use of the standard error to construct the 95%-con-

fidence interval may not be reliable. An alternative method developed by Wilson has been shown to perform better than the traditional method.<sup>1</sup> This method provides asymmetrical confidence intervals for facilities in

which the lower bound is constrained to be no less than 0%. It also provides confidence intervals for facilities in which the survey estimates are 0% (but other similarly conducted samples could yield non-zero estimates).

**TABLE 1**  
**Inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of facility and incident, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Type of incident	Number of victims <sup>a</sup>		Percent of inmates		Standard errors <sup>b</sup>	
	Prisons	Jails	Prisons	Jails	Prisons	Jails
<b>Total</b>	64,500	24,000	4.4%	3.1%	0.3%	0.1%
<b>Inmate-on-inmate</b>	30,100	11,600	2.1%	1.5%	0.2%	0.1%
Nonconsensual sexual acts	15,100	6,000	1.0	0.8	0.1	0.1
Abusive sexual contacts only	15,000	5,600	1.0	0.7	0.1	0.1
<b>Staff sexual misconduct</b>	41,200	15,800	2.8%	2.0%	0.2%	0.1%
Unwilling activity	25,400	11,400	1.7%	1.5%	0.2%	0.1%
Excluding touching	19,000	8,200	1.3	1.1	0.1	0.1
Touching only	5,800	3,100	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.0
Willing activity	25,500	8,500	1.8%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Excluding touching	21,700	7,200	1.5	0.9	0.1	0.1
Touching only	3,800	1,300	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0

Note: Detail may not sum to total because inmates may report more than one type of victimization. They may also report victimization by both other inmates and staff.

<sup>a</sup>Estimates of the number of victims nationwide are based on weighted data and rounded to the nearest 100.

<sup>b</sup>Standard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around each estimate. See *Methodology* for calculations.

### Definition of terms

**Sexual victimization**—all types of sexual activity, e.g., oral, anal, or vaginal penetration; hand jobs; touching of the inmate’s buttocks, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way; abusive sexual contacts; and both willing and unwilling sexual activity with staff.

**Nonconsensual sexual acts**—unwanted contacts with another inmate or any contacts with staff that involved oral, anal, vaginal penetration, hand jobs, and other sexual acts.

**Abusive sexual contacts only**—unwanted contacts with another inmate or any contacts with staff that involved touching of the inmate’s buttocks, thigh, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way.

**Unwilling activity**—incidents of unwanted sexual contacts with another inmate or staff.

**Willing activity**—incidents of willing sexual contacts with staff. These contacts are characterized by the reporting inmates as willing; however, all sexual contacts between inmates and staff are legally nonconsensual.

**Staff sexual misconduct**—includes all incidents of willing and unwilling sexual contact with facility staff and all incidents of sexual activity that involved oral, anal, vaginal penetration, hand jobs, blow jobs, and other sexual acts with facility staff.

<sup>1</sup>Brown, L.D., Cai, T., and DasGupta, A. (2001). Interval Estimation for a Binomial Proportion. *Statistical Science*, 16(2), pp. 101-138.

Wilson, E.B. (1927). Probable Inference, the Law of Succession, and Statistical Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 22, pp. 209-212.

Although the NIS-2 provides facility-level estimates and measures of precision, it cannot provide an exact ranking for all facilities as required under PREA. Rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and staff sexual misconduct differ across facilities, but the observed differences are not always statistically significant. To address PREA requirements, facilities have been categorized as having high rates or low rates based on criteria applied to the lower and upper bounds of the 95%-confidence interval for each facility.

The criterion that the lower bound of the confidence interval be at least 55% higher than the average rate for comparable facilities was used to identify high rate male prisons, female prisons, and jails. The criterion that the upper bound of the confidence interval be lower than 65% of the average rate for comparable facilities was used to identify low rate facilities.

To better identify variations among correctional facilities in rates of sexual victimization, prisons and jails are compared separately by type of sexual victimization. Though informative, an analysis of a single, overall prevalence rate of sexual victimization for each sampled facility would confound differing risk factors, circumstances, and underlying causes of victimization. For the same reasons, prisons are compared separately by the sex of inmates housed.

The NIS-2 sample was designed to ensure a sufficient number of female-only prison facilities (35 facilities participated) and a sufficient number of female respondents (6,279 completed the survey) to allow for valid comparisons among female prisons. Only 2 of the 286 participating jails in NIS-2 housed only females; as a result, rates of sexual victimization in jails could not be compared separately by sex of inmate housed.

### Eight male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 6 jails were identified as having high rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization

Among the 167 prisons and 286 jails surveyed in NIS-2, 8 male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 6 jails were designated as high rate facilities based on reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization (table 2). Each of these facilities had a rate of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization that was at least twice the national rate of 1.9% for male prisons, 4.8% for female prisons, and 1.5% for jails. Each had a 95%-confidence interval with a lower

bound that was at least 55% higher than the average rate among comparable facilities.

Selection of slightly lower criteria would have had only a minor impact on the list of facilities with high rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization. Lowering the criteria of the lower bound to at least 50% higher than the average comparable rate would not have increased the number of high rate facilities (16); lowering the criteria to 35% would have increased the number to 22 (including 10 male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 10 jails).

**TABLE 2**  
**Facilities with high rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of respondents <sup>b</sup>	Response rate	Percent <sup>c</sup>	Any inmate-on-inmate incident <sup>a</sup>	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>All prisons</b>	29,954	71%	2.1%	1.7%	2.5%
<b>Male prisons</b>	23,675	70%	1.9%	1.5%	2.3%
Hughes Unit (TX)	159	57	8.6	5.2	14.0
Allred Unit (TX)	161	55	7.6	4.4	12.9
Pontiac Corr. Ctr. (IL)	96	32	6.9	3.0	15.0
Plainfield Corr. Fac. (IN)	181	69	6.1	3.3	11.0
Michael Unit (TX)	158	60	6.1	3.3	11.0
Maine State Prison - Warren (ME)	143	59	5.9	3.1	11.0
California Med. Fac. (CA)	258	60	5.8	3.7	9.1
Pleasant Valley State Prison (CA)	181	62	5.5	3.0	9.9
<b>Female prisons</b>	6,279	78%	4.8%	4.0%	5.9%
Taycheedah Corr. Inst. (WI) <sup>d</sup>	171	75	11.9	8.2	16.9
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. (VA) <sup>d</sup>	199	79	11.4	7.7	16.5
<b>All jails</b>	45,126	68%	1.5%	1.4%	1.7%
Orleans Parish - South White Street Jail (LA) <sup>d</sup>	138	83	7.5	5.5	10.2
Madison Co. Det. Fac. (AL)	293	71	5.5	3.7	7.9
Miami-Dade Co. - Pre-trial Det. Ctr. (FL)	158	50	5.1	2.9	9.1
Houston Co. Jail (AL)	216	89	4.0	2.3	6.7
Jefferson Co. Jail (MO)	127	81	4.0	2.5	6.2
Madison Co. Det. Ctr. (IN)	158	78	3.9	2.5	6.1

Note: High rate facilities are those in which the lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval is larger than 1.55 times the average among prisons, by sex of inmates housed, and 1.55 times the average among all jail facilities.

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Number of inmates who responded to the sexual victimization survey.

<sup>c</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on selected characteristics, including age, sex, race, time since admission, and sentence length.

<sup>d</sup>Facility houses only female inmates.

Among male prisons, Hughes Unit (Texas) recorded an inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization rate of 8.6%, and Allred Unit (Texas) recorded a rate of 7.6%. Among female prisons, Taycheedah Correctional Institution (Wisconsin) had a rate of 11.9%, and Fluvanna Correctional Center (Virginia) had a rate of 11.4%.

Orleans Parish - South White Street Jail (Louisiana), a female-only facility, recorded an inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization rate of 7.5%, which was 5 times the average rate among jails nationwide. Madison County Detention Facility (Alabama) reported a rate of 5.5%.

**Four male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 5 jails were identified as having high rates of staff sexual misconduct**

Eleven facilities were identified as high rate facilities based on reports

of staff sexual misconduct—4 male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 5 jails (table 3). Each had a confidence interval with a lower bound that was at least 55% higher than the national rate of male prisons (2.9%), female prisons (2.2%), and jails (2.0%).

Selection of slightly lower criteria would have had only a minor impact on the list of facilities with high rates of staff sexual misconduct. Lowering the criteria of the lower bound to at least 50% higher than the average comparable rate would have increased the number of high rate facilities from 11 to 14 (including 5 male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 7 jails); lowering the criteria to 35% would have increased the number to 20 (including 6 male prisons, 2 female prisons, and 12 jails).

In 3 state prisons, at least 8% of

surveyed inmates reported incidents of staff sexual misconduct, including 8.2% of males in Crossroads Correctional Facility (Missouri), 8.1% of males in Attica Correctional Facility (New York), and 11.5% of females in Bayview Correctional Facility (New York). Two jails, Caroline County Jail (Maryland) with 10.0% and Eastern Shore Regional Jail (Virginia) with 9.9%, had rates of reported staff sexual misconduct that exceeded 8%.

The reported use or threat of physical force to engage in sexual activity with staff was generally low among all prison and jail inmates (1.0%); however, at least 5% of the inmates in 2 state prisons and 2 jails said that they had been physically forced or threatened with force. Caroline County Jail (Maryland), with 10%,

**TABLE 3**  
**Facilities with high rates of staff sexual misconduct, by type of facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of respondents <sup>c</sup>	Response rate	Any staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>			Level of coercion <sup>b</sup>		
			Percent <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval		Physically forced <sup>e</sup>	Pressured <sup>f</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>g</sup>
				Lower bound	Upper bound			
<b>All prisons</b>	29,954	71%	2.8%	2.5%	3.2%	1.0%	1.6%	1.8%
<b>Male prisons</b>	23,675	70%	2.9%	2.5%	3.3%	1.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Crossroads Corr. Fac. (MO)	207	77	8.2	5.3	12.6	3.8	5.2	4.1
Attica Corr. Fac. (NY)	170	61	8.1	4.8	13.3	6.4	6.0	2.8
Elmira Corr. Fac. (NY)	167	63	7.7	4.5	12.7	2.5	7.1	1.3
Ferguson Unit (TX)	236	82	7.6	4.7	11.9	1.1	3.1	5.8
<b>Female prisons</b>	6,279	78%	2.2%	1.6%	2.9%	0.8%	1.8%	0.6%
Bayview Corr. Fac. (NY)	96	73	11.5	8.3	15.6	6.5	10.8	0.6
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. (VA)	199	79	6.0	3.7	9.5	1.5	4.3	2.4
<b>All jails</b>	45,126	68%	2.0%	1.9%	2.2%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%
Caroline Co. Jail (MD)	32	46	10.0	3.2	27.4	10.0	7.9	7.9
Eastern Shore Regional Jail (VA)	27	49	9.9	4.3	21.5	2.6	2.6	9.9
Clallam Co. Corr. Fac. (WA)	75	71	6.1	3.4	10.6	5.2	5.0	2.0
Orleans Co. Jail (NY)	55	82	5.6	3.5	8.9	0.0	0.0	5.6
Cook Co. Jail - Division 6 (IL)	268	86	5.5	3.6	8.3	2.0	1.7	3.8

Note: High rate facilities are those in which the lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval is larger than 1.55 times the average among prisons, by sex of inmates housed, and 1.55 times the average among all jail facilities.

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.  
<sup>b</sup>Detail may not sum total because an inmate may report more than one incident or level of coercion.  
<sup>c</sup>Number of inmates who responded to the sexual victimization survey.  
<sup>d</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on selected characteristics, including age, sex, race, time since admission, and sentence length.  
<sup>e</sup>Physical force or threat of physical force.  
<sup>f</sup>Includes incidents in which the perpetrator, without using force, pressured the inmate or made the inmate feel they had to participate.  
<sup>g</sup>Includes incidents in which staff offered favors or privileges in exchange for sex or sexual contact and incidents in which the inmate reported they willingly had sex or sexual contact with staff.



had the highest percentage of inmates reporting physical force or threat force by staff, followed by Bayview Correctional Facility (New York) and Attica Correctional Facility (New York), with 6.5% and 6.4%, respectively.

An estimated 1.6% of prison inmates and 1.3% of jail inmates also reported being coerced by facility staff without any use or threat of force, including being pressured or made to feel they had to have sex or sexual contact. In 6 of the 11 facilities with high rates of staff sexual misconduct, at least 5% of the inmates reported such pressure by staff. Among state prisoners, the highest rates were reported by female inmates (10.8%) in the Bayview Correctional Facility (New York) and by male inmates (7.1%) in the Elmira Correctional Facility (New York). Among jail inmates, the highest rates were reported by inmates in the Caroline County Jail (7.9%).

**Seven male prisons, 4 female prisons, and 9 jails were identified as “low rate” for sexual victimization overall**

Six prisons and 28 jails had no reported incidents of sexual victimization of any kind. (See appendix tables 1 and 5.) However, estimates of the number of inmates who experienced a sexual victimization in each of these facilities are also subject to sampling error and could vary if a different group of inmates had been interviewed. Although the lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval in each of these facilities is 0%, the upper bound varies depending on the number of completed interviews in each facility.

Combining reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and staff sexual misconduct, 7 male prisons and 4 female prisons were designated as low rate facilities. These designations were based on their low rate of sexual victimization overall and the upper bound of their 95%-confidence interval that was less than 65% of the average rate among male and female prisons (table 4). Four of these

facilities had no reported incidents of sexual victimization; 7 had at least one inmate who reported a sexual victimization.

C. Moore Transfer Facility (Texas), with a reported sexual victimization rate of 0.4%, had a confidence interval with the lowest upper bound (1.9%) among male prisons. Halbert

Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Facility (Texas), with reported sexual rate of 0.9%, had a confidence interval with the lowest upper bound (2.5%) among female prisons.

Nine jails were designated as low rate facilities based on the upper bound of the 95%-confidence interval that was less than 65% of the average for jails nation-

**TABLE 4**  
Facilities with low rates of any type of sexual victimization, by type of facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of respondents <sup>b</sup>	Response rate	Percent <sup>c</sup>	Inmates reporting any sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>All prisons</b>	29,954	71%	4.4%	3.9%	5.0%
<b>Male prisons</b>	23,675	70%	4.3%	3.8%	4.9%
C. Moore Transfer Fac. (TX)	184	72	0.4	0.1	1.9
Elkton Fed. Corr. Inst. (BOP)	176	64	0.0	0.0	2.1
Morgantown Fed. Corr. Inst. (BOP)	159	65	0.0	0.0	2.4
Centinela State Prison (CA)	143	52	0.0	0.0	2.6
Maximum Security Fac. (RI)	115	55	0.6	0.1	2.7
Northern Nevada Corr. Ctr. (NV)	206	82	0.8	0.2	2.9
Corr. Reception Ctr. (OH)	242	84	1.1	0.4	3.1
<b>Female prisons</b>	6,279	78%	6.0%	5.0%	7.3%
Halbert Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Fac. (TX)	229	97	0.9	0.3	2.5
Bridgeport Pre-Parole Fac. (TX) <sup>d</sup>	128	88	0.0	0.0	2.9
Swannanoa Corr. Ctr. for Women (NC)	56	81	1.3	0.5	3.4
Lincoln Corr. Ctr. (IL)	190	77	1.4	0.5	3.9
<b>All jails</b>	45,126	68%	3.1%	2.9%	3.3%
Hinds Co. Penal Farm (MS)	164	80	0.5	0.2	1.6
Lake Co. - Adult Max. Security Det. Ctr. (OH)	120	70	0.5	0.1	1.6
Tulsa Co. - David L. Moss Criminal Justice Ctr. (OK)	216	59	0.4	0.1	1.8
Lake Co. - Hill Road Corr. Fac. (CA)	111	57	0.5	0.2	1.9
Nassau Co. Det. Fac. (FL)	168	87	0.7	0.2	1.9
Bristol Co. - New Bedford Fac. (MA)	124	75	0.7	0.2	1.9
Lenawee Co. Jail (MI)	141	76	0.9	0.4	2.0
Carson City Jail (NV)	136	77	0.8	0.3	2.0
Coweta Co. Prison (GA)	184	91	0.0	0.0	2.0

Note: Low rate facilities are those in which the upper bound of the 95%-confidence interval is lower than 0.65 times the average among prisons, by sex of inmates housed, and 0.65 times the average among all jail facilities.

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Number of inmates who responded to the sexual victimization survey.

<sup>c</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on selected characteristics, including age, sex, race, time since admission, and sentence length.

<sup>d</sup>Privately operated facility.

wide. Hinds County Penal Farm (Mississippi) and Lake County - Adult Maximum Security Detention Center (Ohio), both with a 0.5% overall sexual victimization rate, had confidence intervals with the lowest upper bounds (1.6%).

**Low rates of sexual victimization were reported in military, Indian country, and ICE facilities**

The NIS-2 also surveyed 10 special confinement facilities including 5 ICE facilities, 3 military facilities, and 2 Indian country jails. (See *Methodology*

for sample description.) Except for a 6.0% overall rate of sexual victimization in the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks (Leavenworth, KS), rates in these facilities were lower than the average rates in state and federal prisons (4.4%) and jails (3.1%). (Not shown. See appendix table 9.)

Reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization were highest in the El Paso Processing Center (Texas), operated by ICE; however, its rate of 2.1% equaled the average rate among prisoners nationwide (table 5). The

U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, which is operated by the U.S. Army and holds the most serious offenders under military jurisdiction, had a rate of staff sexual misconduct (5.6%) that was double the average of prisons nationwide (2.8%). Gila River Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (Arizona), the largest jail in Indian country, had no reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and one report of staff sexual misconduct (1%).

**TABLE 5**  
Rates of sexual victimization in special correctional facilities, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Facility name	Number of completed interviews	Any inmate-on-inmate incident			Any staff sexual misconduct		
		Percent <sup>a</sup>	95%-confidence interval		Percent <sup>a</sup>	95%-confidence interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) facilities</b>							
Eloy Det. Ctr. (AZ) <sup>b,c</sup>	241	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.7%	0.2%	2.4%
Stewart Det. Ctr. (GA) <sup>c</sup>	138	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.9	0.2	4.5
Elizabeth Contract Det. Fac. (NJ) <sup>b,c</sup>	100	0.8	0.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	3.7
El Paso Processing Ctr. (TX) <sup>b</sup>	250	2.1	1.1	4.0	0.2	0.1	1.0
South Texas Det. Complex (TX) <sup>b</sup>	164	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3
<b>Military facilities</b>							
Marine Corps Base Brig, Camp Pendleton (CA)	105	0.5%	0.2%	1.6%	0.5%	0.2%	1.6%
Naval Consolidated Brig, Miramar (CA) <sup>b</sup>	125	1.4	0.5	3.5	1.5	0.6	3.9
U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Leavenworth (KS)	149	0.4	0.1	1.7	5.6	3.3	9.5
<b>Tribal jails</b>							
Gila River DOC and Rehab. (AZ) <sup>b</sup>	97	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	1.0%	0.4%	2.6%
Navajo Nation - Window Rock (AZ)	10	0.0	0.0	27.8	0.0	0.0	27.8

<sup>a</sup>Weighted percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Facility houses both males and females; both were sampled at this facility.

<sup>c</sup>Privately operated facility.

## Demographic Characteristics

Rates of reported sexual victimization varied across demographic categories of prison and jail inmates

- Rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization among prison inmates were higher among females (4.7%) than males (1.9%), higher among whites (3.0%) or multi-racial (4.4%) than among blacks (1.3%), higher among inmates with a college degree (3.4%) than among inmates who had not completed high school (2.0%), and lower among currently married inmates (1.3%) than among inmates who never married or who were widowed, divorced, or separated (2.2%) (table 6).
- Similar patterns of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization were reported by jail inmates. Females (3.1%), whites (1.5%), and inmates with a college degree reported higher rates of victimization (2.9%) than males (1.3%), blacks (1.2%), and inmates who had not completed high school (1.3%).
- Rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization were unrelated to age among state and federal prisoners, but were lower among jail inmates in older age categories (ages 35 to 44, 45 to 54, and 55 or older) than among inmates ages 20 to 24.
- Patterns of staff sexual misconduct were different—with reports of staff sexual misconduct being higher among males in prisons (2.9%) and jails (2.1%) than among females in prisons (2.1%) and jails (1.5%), and higher among black inmates in prisons (3.2%) and jails (2.4%) than among white inmates in prisons (2.3%) and jails (1.5%).
- In both prisons and jails, rates of reported staff sexual misconduct were lower among inmates in the oldest age categories (ages 45 to 54 and ages 55 or older) compared to inmates ages 20 to 24.

**TABLE 6**

**Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident and inmate demographic characteristic, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Demographic characteristic	Prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>			Jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
	Number of inmates <sup>b</sup>	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Number of inmates <sup>b</sup>	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Sex</b>						
Male*	1,357,100	1.9%	2.9%	678,100	1.3%	2.1%
Female	100,600	4.7**	2.1**	99,100	3.1**	1.5**
<b>Race/Hispanic origin</b>						
White <sup>c</sup>	456,800	3.0%**	2.3%**	271,900	1.5%**	1.5%**
Black <sup>c*</sup>	565,400	1.3	3.2	279,000	1.2	2.4
Hispanic	304,400	1.4	2.4**	158,500	1.5	1.9
Other <sup>c,d</sup>	43,600	2.7	2.9	17,300	1.9	2.4
Two or more races <sup>d</sup>	72,100	4.4**	4.3	43,000	3.1**	3.5**
<b>Age</b>						
18-19	27,800	1.6%	3.9%	51,400	2.1%	2.7%
20-24*	182,800	2.1	3.5	162,500	1.9	2.9
25-34	482,500	2.2	3.4	255,400	1.5	2.3**
35-44	406,400	2.3	2.7	173,200	1.2**	1.4**
45-54	259,000	1.8	2.1**	105,800	1.2**	1.1**
55 or older	98,400	1.5	0.9**	28,700	0.9**	0.7**
<b>Education</b>						
Less than high school*	867,200	2.0%	2.9%	422,500	1.3%	1.9%
High school graduate	275,600	1.9	2.2**	179,600	1.5	2.0
Some college <sup>e</sup>	220,800	2.2	2.7	126,600	1.6	2.1
College degree or more	88,800	3.4**	3.8	45,500	2.9**	3.4**
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married*	249,900	1.3%	2.0%	138,000	1.2%	2.2%
Widowed, divorced, or separated	398,700	2.2**	2.1	184,000	1.6	1.6**
Never married	781,300	2.2**	3.3**	445,800	1.6	2.1
<b>Weight<sup>f</sup></b>						
1st quartile*	350,200	2.4%	3.0%	265,500	1.8%	1.9%
2nd quartile	360,400	2.1	2.6	191,600	1.3**	1.9
3rd quartile	324,500	1.9	2.6	140,000	1.1**	2.0
4th quartile	390,900	1.7**	2.6	163,600	1.5	2.2

\*Comparison group.

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

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Estimated number of inmates at midyear 2008 in prisons and jails represented by NIS-2, excluding inmates under age 18. Estimates have been rounded to the nearest 100.

<sup>c</sup>Excludes persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

<sup>d</sup>Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders.

<sup>e</sup>Includes persons with an associate degree.

<sup>f</sup>Weight quartiles are defined by sex. Men: 1st quartile—60 to 168 lbs., 2nd quartile—169 to 186 lbs., 3rd quartile—187 to 209 lbs., 4th quartile—210 to 700 lbs. Women: 1st quartile—65 to 144 lbs., 2nd quartile—145 to 166 lbs., 3rd quartile—167 to 194 lbs., 4th quartile—195 to 450 lbs.

These variations in rates of sexual victimization among demographic groups are statistically independent and largely unexplained by covariation with other demographic characteristics. Multivariate logistic regression was used to determine which demographic characteristics are statistically significant for predicting a sexual victimization, while simultaneously controlling for the effects of other inmate demographic characteristics. (See *Methodology* for discussion of logistic regression.)

Results are displayed in terms of their conditional predicted probability, which represents the probability that an inmate with a particular characteristic has experienced a given sexual victimization outcome conditional on the inmate having the mean value for all other predictors in the model (table 7). For example, based on models with demographic characteristics only, a female prison inmate has a 3.8% chance of being sexually victimized by another inmate, while a male inmate has a 1.6% chance (given that the inmates are at the mean of the joint distribution of race or Hispanic origin, education level, and marital status).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>These estimates represent the expected risk of victimization for an inmate, conditional on the inmate belonging to a particular group (defined by each characteristic in the final model) and having the mean value on all of the other characteristics in the model. For characteristics that are categorical (which is the case for every variable in the NIS-2 logistic regression models), the mean value is a weighted value of the joint distribution of all other characteristics in the respective model.

See Research Triangle Institute (2008). *SUDAAN Language Manual Release 10.0*. Research Triangle Park, NC, Section 4.8.3, pp. 209-211

**TABLE 7**  
Multivariate logistic regression models of sexual victimization, by inmate demographic characteristic, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Demographic characteristic	Predicted percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		Predicted percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>	
	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Sex</b>				
Male*	1.6%	2.5%	1.2%	1.8%
Female	3.8**	1.8**	2.8**	1.2**
<b>Race/Hispanic origin</b>				
White <sup>b</sup>	2.8**	2.1%	1.3%	1.4%**
Black <sup>b*</sup>	1.2	2.7	1.1	2.1
Hispanic	1.3	2.1	1.4	1.7**
Other <sup>b,c</sup>	2.4**	2.6	1.5	2.2
Two or more races <sup>b</sup>	4.0**	4.0**	2.7**	3.1**
<b>Age</b>				
18-19	--	3.4%	2.0%	2.7%
20-24*	--	3.0	1.8	2.9
25-34	--	3.0	1.3**	2.1
35-44	--	2.5	1.0**	1.3**
45-54	--	1.9**	1.0**	1.0**
55 or older	--	0.8**	0.7**	0.5**
<b>Education</b>				
Less than high school*	1.7%	2.5%	1.1%	1.6%
High school graduate	1.6	1.7**	1.4	1.7
Some college <sup>d</sup>	1.8	2.5	1.4	2.0**
College degree or more	2.8**	4.5**	2.8**	4.0**
<b>Marital status</b>				
Married*	1.1%	1.8%	--	--
Widowed, divorced, or separated	1.6	2.2	--	--
Never married	2.1**	2.8**	--	--
<b>Weight<sup>e</sup></b>				
1st quartile*	--	--	1.5%	--
2nd quartile	--	--	1.1**	--
3rd quartile	--	--	1.0**	--
4th quartile	--	--	1.4	--

--Characteristic deleted from model when Wald statistic was not significant at the 95%-confidence level.

\*Comparison group.

\*\*Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95%-confidence level. (See *Methodology* for tests of significance.)

<sup>a</sup>Conditional predicted percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Excludes persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

<sup>c</sup>Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders.

<sup>d</sup>Includes persons with an associate degree.

<sup>e</sup>Weight quartiles are defined by sex. Men: 1st quartile—60 to 168 lbs., 2nd quartile—169 to 186 lbs., 3rd quartile—187 to 209 lbs., 4th quartile—210 to 700 lbs. Women: 1st quartile—65 to 144 lbs., 2nd quartile—145 to 166 lbs., 3rd quartile—167 to 194 lbs., 4th quartile—195 to 450 lbs.

Based on four separate models, each representing the type of sexual victimization in prison and jail, variations by sex, race, Hispanic origin, and education remain statistically significant. Except for reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in prison, older inmates (ages 45 and older in prison and ages 35 and older in jails) still have lower rates of sexual victimization, after controlling for the effects of the other demographic characteristics. Among prison inmates, never married inmates remain somewhat more likely than married inmates to report sexual victimization; however, among jail inmates, there are no differences by marital status.

## Sexual History and Orientation

### Large differences in sexual victimization were found among inmates based on their sexual orientation and past sexual experiences

Inmates with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual reported significantly higher rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and staff sexual misconduct:

- Among heterosexual state and federal prisoners, an estimated 1.3% reported being sexually victimized by another inmate, and 2.5% reported being victimized by staff (table 8). In contrast, among prison inmates with a sexual orientation

other than heterosexual (including bisexual, homosexual, gay or lesbian, or other), 11.2% reported being sexually victimized by another inmate, and 6.6% reported being sexually victimized by staff.

- Similar differences were reported among jail inmates, with heterosexual inmates reporting lower rates of inmate-on-inmate victimization (1.1%) and staff sexual misconduct (1.9%) than non-heterosexual inmates (7.2% and 3.5%, respectively).
- Inmates who had experienced sexual victimization before coming to the facility were also more likely than inmates with no sexual

**TABLE 8**  
Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident, inmate sexual history, and orientation, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Sexual orientation and history	Prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>			Jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
	Number of inmates <sup>b</sup>	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Number of inmates <sup>b</sup>	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Sexual orientation</b>						
Heterosexual*	1,316,000	1.3%	2.5%	706,000	1.1%	1.9%
Bi-sexual, homosexual, or other	114,300	11.2**	6.6**	52,900	7.2**	3.5**
<b>Number of sexual partners</b>						
0-1*	229,800	1.4%	2.4%	121,600	1.2%	1.3%
2-4	181,500	2.3**	2.1	108,800	1.6	1.6
5-10	248,500	2.5**	2.0	141,700	1.5	1.5
11-20	227,600	1.8	2.5	125,200	1.1	1.6
21 or more	509,200	2.2**	3.6**	247,000	1.8**	3.1**
<b>Prior sexual victimization</b>						
Yes	177,000	11.0%**	8.7%**	100,100	7.4%**	6.1%**
No*	1,280,400	0.8	2.0	676,900	0.6	1.4

\*Comparison group.

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

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Estimated number of inmates at midyear 2008 in prisons and jails represented by NIS-2, excluding inmates under age 18. Estimates have been rounded to the nearest 100.

victimization history to report incidents of sexual victimization involving other inmates and staff. Among inmates who had experienced sexual victimization before coming to the facility, 11.0% of prisoners and 7.4% of jail inmates reported having been sexually assaulted by another inmate at the current facility. An estimated 8.7% of prisoners and 6.1% of jail inmates who had experienced sexual victimization before coming to the facility reported sexual activity with staff.

- Prison and jail inmates with 21 or more sexual partners prior to coming to the current facility

reported higher rates of staff sexual misconduct than inmates with 1 or no prior sexual partners.

Variations in rates of sexual victimization among groups of inmates based on their sexual orientation and past sexual experiences overlapped somewhat. After simultaneously controlling for the effects of these characteristics, the regression models reveal that variations in inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization remain associated with sexual orientation and prior sexual victimization, but are not associated with the number of past sexual partners (table 9). Except for reports of staff sexual misconduct in jails, an inmate's sexual orientation remained an impor-

tant predictor of victimization. In all models, inmates who had experienced sexual victimization before coming to the facility were more likely than inmates with no sexual victimization history to report incidents of sexual victimization.

**TABLE 9**  
**Multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization, by inmate sexual history and orientation, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Sexual orientation and history	Predicted percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		Predicted percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>	
	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Sexual orientation<sup>b</sup></b>				
Heterosexual*	0.9%	2.2%	0.8%	--
Bi-sexual, homosexual, or other	4.0**	3.6**	2.4**	--
<b>Number of sexual partners</b>				
0-1*	--	2.6%	--	1.3%
2-4	--	1.7	--	1.5
5-10	--	1.6	--	1.2
11-20	--	2.1	--	1.4
21 or more	--	3.0	--	2.6**
<b>Prior sexual victimization</b>				
Yes	7.3%**	7.4%**	5.7%**	5.5%**
No*	0.8	1.9	0.6	1.4

--Characteristic deleted from model when Wald statistic was not significant at the 95%-confidence level.

\*Comparison group.

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

<sup>a</sup>Conditional predicted percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Inmates were asked to report if they considered themselves to be heterosexual or straight, bisexual, homosexual, gay, or lesbian, or other.

## Criminal Justice Status

### Inmates held for a violent sexual offense reported higher rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization than inmates held for other offenses

An estimated 4.6% of violent sex offenders in prison and 3.9% of violent sex offenders in jail reported being sexually victimized by another inmate in the last 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months (table 10). These rates were higher than those reported by inmates held for other offenses. Among state and federal prisoners, rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization were—

- higher among prison inmates serving a long sentence (2.9% with a sentence of 20 or more years and 3.8% with a sentence to life or death) than among inmates serving a sentence of 1 to 5 years (1.5%).
- higher among prison inmates who had served 5 years or more in prison prior to coming to the current facility (2.6%) than among inmates who had not served any prior time (1.6%).
- higher among prison inmates who had been at their current facility for 5 years or more (3.3%) than among inmates who had been admitted in the last month (1.4%).

Among jail inmates, rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization—

- were higher among first time offenders (2.0%) than among those who had been arrested 2 to 3 times in the past (1.3%) or 4 to 10 times in the past (1.4%).
- increased with the length of time served in the current facility, rising from 0.9% among inmates who had been at the facility for less than a month to 1.7% among inmates in jail for 1 to 5 months, to 2.0% among inmates in jail for 6 to 11 months, and to 2.3% among those in jail for 1 to 5 years.

**TABLE 10**

**Prevalence of sexual victimization, by type of incident and inmate criminal justice status and history, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Criminal justice status and history	Prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>			Jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
	Number of prison inmates <sup>b</sup>	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Number of jail inmates <sup>b</sup>	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Most serious offense</b>						
Violent sexual offense*	198,000	4.6%	2.8%	36,500	3.9%	2.8%
Other violent offense	435,500	2.2**	4.0**	121,600	1.8**	3.0
Property	260,700	2.5**	3.0	169,000	1.9**	2.3
Drug	344,300	0.6**	1.4**	179,700	1.0**	1.8
Other	157,300	1.6**	2.3	209,000	1.2**	1.5**
<b>Sentence length</b>						
Less than 1 year	76,500	1.6%	0.9%**	--	--	--
1-5 years*	405,400	1.5	1.9	--	--	--
5-10 years	326,200	1.9**	2.8**	--	--	--
10-20 years	285,300	1.6	2.3	--	--	--
20 years or more	196,400	2.9**	4.1**	--	--	--
Life/death	130,900	3.8**	4.6**	--	--	--
<b>Time in a correctional facility prior to current facility</b>						
0 months*	292,600	1.6%	2.1%	220,000	1.7%	1.5%
1-5 months	169,200	2.0	2.2	156,700	1.7	1.6
6-11 months	135,600	2.1	1.4	76,200	1.5	1.9
1-5 years	425,800	1.8	2.6	187,600	1.2**	2.3**
5 years or more	405,700	2.6**	3.8**	126,800	1.4	2.9**
<b>Number of times arrested</b>						
1 time*	192,100	2.1%	2.1%	82,000	2.0%	2.0%
2-3 times	424,200	2.1	2.7**	215,900	1.3**	1.7
4-10 times	525,800	1.9	2.8**	291,500	1.4**	1.8
11 or more times	281,800	2.1	2.8	174,600	1.6	2.8**
<b>Time since admission</b>						
Less than 1 month*	105,000	1.4%	1.6%	264,200	0.9%	1.5%
1-5 months	418,400	1.6	2.6	354,700	1.7**	2.0**
6-11 months	259,500	2.1	2.7**	97,100	2.0**	3.0**
1-5 years	512,600	2.2	2.8**	58,000	2.3**	3.3**
5 years or more	161,500	3.3**	2.8**	2,600	5.4	3.5

--Not calculated.

\*Comparison group.

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

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Estimated number of inmates at midyear 2008 in prisons and jails represented by NIS-2, excluding inmates under age 18. Estimates have been rounded to the nearest 100.

**Rates of staff sexual misconduct also varied among inmates based on their criminal justice status and history**

- Among state and federal prisoners, inmates with a long sentence, inmates who had served 5 years or more in prison prior to coming to the current facility, and inmates who had served 5 years or more at the current facility were more likely to report experiencing staff sexual misconduct than inmates with a sentence of 1 to 5 years, inmates who had not served any prior time, and inmates who had been admitted in the last month.
- Among jail inmates, the rates of reported staff misconduct increased with time served in the current facility and were higher among inmates who had previously served time in a correctional facility for 1 year or more.

Based on controls for the criminal justice status variables and past history variables, the regression models reveal that rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization remain higher for violent sex offenders in prison and jail. A violent sex offender has a 4.4% chance of experiencing sexual victimization by another inmate in prison and 3.1% chance of being sexually victimized by another inmate in jail. Inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization rates for inmates held for other offenses are significantly lower (table 11).

In each of the regression models for jails, rates of sexual victimization remain associated with an inmate's time since admission and prior time served in a correctional facility. Jail inmates who had served longer (i.e., 6 months to 5 years in the current facility and 6 months or more in other facilities) had statistically significant higher rates of staff sexual misconduct than jail inmates who had served less time (i.e., less than one month in the current facility and no time in other facilities in the past).

**TABLE 11.** Multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization, by inmate criminal justice status and history, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Inmate characteristic	Predicted percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		Predicted percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>	
	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Most serious offense</b>				
Violent sexual offense*	4.4%	2.5%	3.1%	2.4%
Other violent offense	1.8**	3.1	1.5**	2.4
Property	2.5**	2.9	1.7**	2.2
Drug	0.6**	1.4**	0.9**	1.7
Other	1.5**	2.5	1.1**	1.5**
<b>Sentence length<sup>b</sup></b>				
Less than 1 year	1.7	1.1**	--	--
1-5 years*	1.4	2.0	--	--
5-10 years	1.7	2.6	--	--
10-20 years	1.2	2.1	--	--
20 years or more	2.0	3.5**	--	--
Life/death	2.8**	3.6**	--	--
<b>Time in a correctional facility prior to current facility</b>				
0 months*	1.3%	2.0%	1.5%	1.4%
1-5 months	1.5	2.1	1.8	1.8
6-11 months	1.8**	1.4	1.3	1.9**
1-5 years	1.6	2.5	1.0**	2.2**
5 years or more	2.0**	3.2**	1.1	2.5**
<b>Number of times arrested</b>				
1 time*	--	--	1.5%	2.3%
2-3 times	--	--	1.0**	1.8
4-10 times	--	--	1.3	1.6**
11 or more times	--	--	1.6	2.3
<b>Time since admission</b>				
Less than 1 month*	--	--	0.8%	1.5%
1-5 months	--	--	1.6**	1.9
6-11 months	--	--	1.8**	2.4**
1-5 years	--	--	2.0**	2.7**
5 years or more	--	--	4.9**	3.2

--Characteristic deleted from model when Wald statistic was not significant at the 95%-confidence level.

\*Comparison group.

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

<sup>a</sup>Conditional predicted percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Sentence length is the total maximum sentence to prison for all sentences for which an inmate was currently serving. Sentence length for jail inmates is not included in the models.



## Predicted Victimization Rates

Sexual victimization among high rate facilities only partially explained by variations in risk among inmates held

The variations in rates of sexual victimization among inmates grouped by demographic characteristics, sexual orientation and history, and criminal justice status and history provide a basis for predicting the probability of victimization for each inmate. The final multivariate logistic regression models summarize the net contribution of each characteristic to the predicted probability of victimization, by type of victimization in prison and jail (table 12).

Because the effects of each characteristic overlap, the estimated conditional probabilities are smaller than those in previous regression models. However, the net effects of sexual orientation and prior sexual victimization remain the largest among all characteristics in predicting inmate-on-inmate victimization in prison and jail. An inmate's race (black), age (ages 20 through 24), and education (college degree or more) are found to increase the probability of experiencing staff sexual misconduct, controlling for other factors.

Taking into account the effects of sexual history and orientation and criminal justice status and history, female inmates have lower rates of sexual victimization than male inmates in both prison and jail and for both types of victimization.

Predicted rates of sexual victimization at the facility level have been calculated by combining all of the inmate-level characteristics into a final logistic regression model for each type of sexual victimization. Based on the predicted conditional probabilities of victimization of each inmate (derived from the multivariate logistic regression models) and the distribution of inmates in each facility, predicted

**TABLE 12**  
Final multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization in prisons and jails, by type of incident, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Inmate characteristic	Predicted percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		Predicted percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>	
	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>				
<b>Sex</b>				
Male*	0.9%	1.9%	0.7%	1.4%
Female	0.7**	0.6**	0.5**	0.5**
<b>Race/Hispanic origin</b>				
White <sup>b</sup>	1.1%	1.4%**	--	0.9%**
Black <sup>b*</sup>	0.8	2.2	--	1.6
Hispanic	0.8	1.6**	--	1.3
Other <sup>b,c</sup>	1.2	1.7	--	1.5
Two or more races <sup>b</sup>	1.4**	2.3	--	1.7
<b>Age</b>				
18-19	--	4.7%	1.2%	2.7%
20-24*	--	3.4	1.0	2.5
25-34	--	2.3**	0.7**	1.5**
35-44	--	1.6**	0.5**	0.8**
45-54	--	1.2**	0.5**	0.6**
55 or older	--	0.4**	0.3**	0.4**
<b>Education</b>				
Less than high school*	--	1.8%	0.6%	1.1%
High school graduate	--	1.5	0.8	1.3**
Some college <sup>d</sup>	--	1.8	0.7	1.4
College degree or more	--	2.9**	1.4**	3.0**
<b>Marital status</b>				
Married*	0.7%	--	--	--
Widowed, divorced, or separated	0.8	--	--	--
Never married	1.0**	--	--	--
<b>Weight<sup>e</sup></b>				
1st quartile*	--	--	0.9%	--
2nd quartile	--	--	0.6**	--
3rd quartile	--	--	0.6**	--
4th quartile	--	--	0.7	--
<b>Sexual orientation/history characteristics</b>				
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				
Heterosexual*	0.8%	1.7%	0.6%	--
Bi-sexual, homosexual, or other	3.4**	3.1**	2.3**	--
<b>Number of sexual partners</b>				
0-1*	--	2.1%	--	1.2%
2-4	--	1.5	--	1.3
5-10	--	1.3	--	1.0
11-20	--	1.5	--	1.0
21 or more	--	2.2	--	1.7**
<b>Prior sexual victimization</b>				
Yes	5.8%**	6.8%**	5.1%**	5.7%**
No*	0.7	1.4	0.5	1.0

**TABLE 12 (continued)**  
**Final multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization in prisons and jails,**  
**by type of incident, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Inmate characteristic	Predicted percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		Predicted percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>	
	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Criminal justice status/history characteristics</b>				
<b>Most serious offense</b>				
Violent sexual offense*	1.5%	1.5%	0.9%	--
Other violent offense	1.0**	2.0	0.7	--
Property	1.4	2.3**	0.8	--
Drug	0.4**	1.2	0.5**	--
Other	1.0	2.1	0.7	--
<b>Sentence length<sup>f</sup></b>				
Less than 1 year	0.9%	0.7%	--	--
1-5 years*	0.8	1.4	--	--
5-10 years	1.0	1.8	--	--
10-20 years	0.7	1.6	--	--
20 years or more	1.2	2.9**	--	--
Life/death	1.3	3.0**	--	--
<b>Time in a correctional facility prior to current facility</b>				
0 months*	--	1.7%	--	0.9%
1-5 months	--	1.6	--	1.1
6-11 months	--	1.0**	--	1.2
1-5 years	--	1.7	--	1.5**
5 years or more	--	2.3	--	1.9**
<b>Number of times arrested</b>				
1 time*	--	--	1.0%	1.5%
2-3 times	--	--	0.6**	1.2
4-10 times	--	--	0.6**	1.1
11 or more times	--	--	0.8	1.7
<b>Time since admission</b>				
Less than 1 month*	--	--	0.4%	1.0%
1-5 months	--	--	0.8**	1.3**
6-11 months	--	--	1.0**	1.7**
1-5 years	--	--	1.2**	1.9**
5 years or more	--	--	3.4**	2.6

Note: See appendix table 10 for Wald statistics and tests of significance for each inmate characteristic.

--Characteristic deleted from model when Wald statistic was not significant at the 95%-confidence level.

\*Comparison group.

\*\*Difference with comparison group is significant at 95%-confidence level. (See *Methodology* for tests of significance.)

<sup>a</sup>Conditional predicted percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Excludes persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

<sup>c</sup>Includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders.

<sup>d</sup>Includes persons with an associate degree.

<sup>e</sup>Weight quartiles are defined by sex. Men: 1st quartile - 60 to 168 lbs.; 2nd quartile - 169 to 186 lbs.; 3rd quartile - 187 to 209 lbs.; 4th quartile - 210 to 700 lbs. Women: 1st quartile - 65 to 144 lbs.; 2nd quartile - 145 to 166 lbs.; 3rd quartile - 167 to 194 lbs.; 4th quartile: 195 to 450 lbs.

<sup>f</sup>Sentence length is the total maximum sentence to prison for all sentences for which an inmate was currently serving. Sentence length for jail inmates is not included in the models.

rates of sexual victimization have been calculated for each of the high rate facilities.

These predicted rates take into account the underlying inmate risk factors and the variations in the distribution of inmates within each of the facilities. At the facility level, the difference between the predicted rate and observed rate represents the percent not accounted for by variations in inmate characteristics. (See *Methodology* for facility-level calculations.)

### Logistic regression models

Multivariate logistic regression estimation is a modeling technique used to determine what characteristics are statistically significant for predicting a dichotomous outcome (e.g., victimized or not victimized) while controlling for all the other characteristics in the model. NIS-2 used this technique to determine what inmate-level characteristics were significant predictors of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and staff sexual misconduct.

In each of the logistic regression models, the conditional predicted probability represents the probability that an inmate with a particular characteristic has experienced sexual victimization (by type) conditional on the inmate having the mean value for all other predictors in the model. For example, based on demographic characteristics only, a female prison inmate has a 3.8% chance of being victimized by another inmate given that she was at the mean of the joint distribution of race or Hispanic origin, education level, and marital status. (See table 7 and note 2 on page 13.) (See *Methodology* for full discussion on logistic regression models.)

Among high rate male prisons, the observed rate of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization was 6.7%, while the predicted rate was 3.6% (table 13). Among high rate female prisons, the observed rate was 11.6%, while the predicted rate was 8.0%. Among high rate jails, the observed rate was 4.9%, while the predicted rate was 1.9%.

Similar patterns are found for rates of staff sexual misconduct among the high rate facilities. In the 4 high rate male prisons, the observed rate of staff sexual misconduct was 7.8%, while

the predicted rate was 4.1% (table 14). In the 2 high rate female prisons, the observed rate was 8.1%, while the predicted rate was 2.6%. In the 5 high rate jails, the observed rate was 7.4%, while the predicted rate was 2.6%.

These data suggest that rates among the 16 facilities with high rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and the 11 facilities with high rates of staff sexual misconduct are only partially explained by variation in inmate demographic characteristics, sexual orientation and past sexual experience,

and criminal justice status and history.

Differences between the observed and predicted rates were statistically significant at the 95% level of confidence in only 3 of the 16 facilities with high rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and in 1 of the 11 facilities with high rates of staff sexual misconduct. However, the tests for statistical significance within each facility were limited by the small number of surveyed inmates for whom the predicted and observed rates of victimization differed. When the

**TABLE 13**  
Estimated and predicted rates of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in high-rate prisons and jails, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization		
	Estimated <sup>a</sup>	Predicted <sup>b</sup>	Difference
<b>High rate prisons</b>			
<b>Male prisons</b>	6.7%	3.6%	3.1%**
Hughes Unit (TX)	8.6	5.1	3.5
Allred Unit (TX)	7.6	3.8	3.8
Pontiac Corr. Ctr. (IL)	6.9	2.6	4.4
Plainfield Corr. Fac. (IN)	6.1	3.3	2.8
Michael Unit (TX)	6.1	5.7	0.4
Maine State Prison - Warren (ME)	5.9	4.8	1.1
California Med. Fac. (CA)	5.8	2.7	3.1**
Pleasant Valley State Prison (CA)	5.5	2.1	3.4**
<b>Female prisons</b>	11.6%	8.0%	3.6%**
Taycheedah Corr. Inst. (WI) <sup>c</sup>	11.9	8.8	3.1
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. (VA) <sup>c</sup>	11.4	7.3	4.1
<b>High rate jails</b>			
Orleans Parish - South White Street Jail (LA) <sup>c</sup>	7.5	3.3	4.3
Madison Co. Det. Fac. (AL)	5.5	1.8	3.7**
Miami-Dade Co. - Pre-trial Det. Ctr. (FL)	5.1	1.9	3.2
Houston Co. Jail (AL)	4.0	1.9	2.1
Jefferson Co. Jail (MO)	4.0	1.0	3.0
Madison Co. Det. Ctr. (IN)	3.9	1.6	2.4

Note: High rate facilities are those in which the lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval is larger than 1.55 times the average among prisons, by sex of inmates housed, and 1.55 times the average among all jail facilities.

\*\*Significant at the 95% confidence level.

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Conditional predicted percent of inmates (based on the final multivariate logistic models in table 12) reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>c</sup>Facility houses only female inmates.

**TABLE 14**  
Estimated and predicted rates of staff sexual misconduct in high-rate prisons and jails, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting staff sexual misconduct		
	Estimated <sup>a</sup>	Predicted <sup>b</sup>	Difference
<b>High rate prisons</b>			
<b>Male prisons</b>	7.8%	4.1%	3.7%**
Crossroads Corr. Fac. (MO)	8.2	4.8	3.4
Attica Corr. Fac. (NY)	8.1	4.1	4.0
Elmira Corr. Fac. (NY)	7.7	3.9	3.8
Ferguson Unit (TX)	7.6	3.9	3.7
<b>Female prisons</b>	8.1%	2.6%	5.5%**
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. (VA) <sup>c</sup>	6.0	2.9	3.1
Bayview Corr. Fac. (NY) <sup>c</sup>	11.5	2.1	9.4**
<b>High rate jails</b>			
	7.4%	2.6%	4.8%**
Caroline Co. Jail (MD)	10.0	3.1	6.9
Eastern Shore Regional Jail (VA)	9.9	3.1	6.8
Clallam Co. Corr. Fac. (WA)	6.1	1.9	4.1
Orleans Co. Jail (NY)	5.6	1.9	3.7
Cook Co. Jail - Division 6 (IL)	5.5	2.8	2.7

Note: High rate facilities are those in which the lower bound of the 95%-confidence interval is larger than 1.55 times the average among prisons, by sex of inmates housed, and 1.55 times the average among all jail facilities.

\*\*Significant at the 95%-confidence level.

<sup>a</sup>Percent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Conditional predicted percent of inmates (based on the final multivariate logistic models in table 12) reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>c</sup>Facility houses only female inmates.

number of inmates in all high rate male prisons, female prisons, and jails were combined, the differences were found to be statistically significant. With the exception of 2 facilities—the Michael Unit (in Texas) and Maine State Prison - Warren—the differences between the observed and predicted rates were large relative to the average rates of sexual victimization among male prisons, female prisons, and jails nationwide.

### Inmate-on-Inmate Victimization

#### Reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization differed among males and females by type of facility

Among inmates who reported inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in state and federal prisons—

- Males (16%) were more likely than females (6%) to have been victimized 11 or more times in the last 12 months, or since admission if less than 12 months (table 15).

- Males were more likely than females to report having been bribed or blackmailed to take part in the sexual activity (42% compared to 26%), offered protection (39% compared to 19%), or threatened with harm or a weapon (48% compared to 30%).
- Males were more likely than females to report more than one perpetrator (25% compared to 11%), that the perpetrator was of Hispanic or Latino origin (24% compared to 16%), and that one or more incidents were initiated by a gang (20% compared to 4%).

Among victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence in jails—

- Females were more likely than males to have been victimized only once (56% compared to 36%) and less likely to have been victimized 11 or more times (9% compared to 20%).
- Males were more likely than females to report all forms of pressure or force (except for being persuaded or talked into it).
- Males were more likely than females to report more than one perpetrator (43% compared to 16%), that the perpetrator was of Hispanic or Latino origin (37% compared to 17%), and that one or more incidents were initiated by a gang (36% compared to 6%).

**TABLE 15**  
Experiences of victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Experiences	Victims in prison		Victims in jail	
	Male*	Female	Male*	Female
Number of victims	25,312	4,774	8,611	3,023
Number of incidents <sup>a</sup>				
1	35.2%	41.6%	35.8%	55.8%**
2	18.1	27.1	15.4	16.0
3 to 5	16.7	15.9	10.5	13.1
6 to 10	13.8	10.0	18.0	5.8**
11 or more	16.2	5.5**	20.3	9.4**
Type of pressure or force <sup>b</sup>				
Persuaded/talked into it	46.7%	53.8%	43.3%	38.1%
Bribed/blackmailed	41.7	25.7**	47.9	19.1**
Given drugs	18.5	9.5**	25.5	4.4**
Offered protection	38.6	18.9**	39.9	18.3**
Offered to settle debt	13.7	4.0**	19.3	6.2**
Threatened with harm/weapon	48.1	29.5**	57.5	16.2**
Physically held down/restrained	24.3	23.3	40.5	19.7**
Physically harmed/injured	18.1	13.0	31.9	8.8**
Victimized by more than one perpetrator				
Yes	24.7%	10.8%**	42.5%	16.0%**
Hispanic/Latino origin of perpetrator(s)				
Yes	23.8%	15.9%**	37.1%	17.0%**
Race of perpetrator(s) <sup>b</sup>				
White	38.9%	36.5%	46.2%	35.0%
Black	64.6	60.4	59.2	60.6
American Indian/Native Alaskan	7.4	7.5	17.0	5.6**
Other	6.3	5.7	20.0	3.9**
Was any incident initiated by a gang?				
Yes	19.9%	4.2%**	36.0%	6.3%**

\*Comparison group.

\*\*Significant at the 95%-confidence level, when compared to male victims.

<sup>a</sup>Includes the number of sexual acts (i.e., hand job, oral/vaginal/anal sex) reported by inmate in the last 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Detail sums to more than 100% because some inmates reported more than one incident or reported more than one type of pressure or force during an incident.

**Inmate-on-inmate victimization occurred most often in the victim's cell between 6 pm and midnight**

- Among inmates who reported inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, males were much more likely than females to experience sexual victimization by another inmate within the first 24 hours after admission. Among inmates reporting victimization by another inmate, 13% of male prison inmates and 19% of male jail inmates said they were victimized within the first 24 hours, compared to 4% of female inmates in prison and jail (table 16).
- In both prisons and jails inmate-on-inmate victimization was most commonly reported to have occurred between 6 pm and midnight. More than 40% of male and female victims reported this time period.
- In both prisons and jails inmate-on-inmate victimization was most commonly reported to have occurred in the victim's cell or sleeping area. Among victims in prison, more than half of the male and female victims reported an incident in their cell. Among victims in jail, 63% of male victims and 43% of female victims reported at least one incident occurred in their cell or sleeping area.
- Among inmates who reported inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in jail, 37% of males reported being injured, compared to 8% of females. In prison, males and females were almost equally as likely to report being injured (21% and 17%, respectively) during the sexual victimization.

- Male and female inmates who experienced inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization in prisons and jails most commonly reported sustaining bruises, scratches, cuts, and other minor injuries. Among

victims in prison, anal or vaginal tearing was reported by nearly 10% of males and 6% of females. Among victims in jails, anal or vaginal tearing was reported by 21% of males and 3% of females.

**TABLE 16**  
**Circumstances surrounding inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, by type of facility and sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Circumstance	Victims in prison		Victims in jail	
	Male*	Female	Male*	Female
<b>Number of victims</b>	25,312	4,774	8,611	3,023
<b>When first happened<sup>a</sup></b>				
Within 24 hours of admission	13.1%	4.1%**	19.2%	4.3%**
1 to 3 days	12.3	6.4**	18.4	16.9
4 to 30 days	25.3	23.8	33.5	39.9
More than 30 days	49.4	65.7**	28.9	39.0
<b>Time of day<sup>b</sup></b>				
6 am to noon	29.7%	17.0%**	30.6%	12.0%**
Noon to 6 pm	34.7	32.3	37.6	28.4
6 pm to midnight	47.4	52.0	44.9	42.4
Midnight to 6 am	28.4	32.1	40.9	20.0**
<b>Where occurred<sup>b</sup></b>				
In victim's cell/sleeping area	51.1%	53.4%	62.8%	43.2%**
In other inmate's cell/room	33.2	26.8	41.8	31.4
Elsewhere in the facility				
Closet/locked office	13.4%	14.4%	19.8%	2.3%**
Workshop/kitchen	19.2	17.1	14.6	1.9**
Shower/bathroom	29.5	33.9	27.4	13.3**
Classroom/library	11.2	3.2**	11.5	3.2**
Yard/recreation area	21.8	24.2	15.7	9.6
On the stairs	11.0	5.3**	13.6	2.9**
Off facility grounds <sup>c</sup>	4.8	3.7	13.3	3.3**
<b>Ever injured<sup>b</sup></b>				
Yes	20.7%	17.2%	37.2%	8.2%**
Knife/stab wound	4.6	1.0**	9.5	1.4**
Broken nose	3.9	1.4	12.9	0.4**
Anal/vaginal tearing	9.7	6.3	21.2	2.8**
Chipped teeth	5.7	2.6	19.7	2.1**
Internal injuries	7.1	2.2**	16.0	1.3**
Knocked unconscious	8.6	3.2**	21.2	0.7**
Bruises, scratches, cuts	14.1	15.2	30.7	7.5**
<b>Ever report an incident</b>				
Yes	23.6%	18.4%	31.3%	15.4%**

\*Comparison group.

\*\*Significant at the 95%-confidence level, when compared to male victims.

<sup>a</sup>Inmate report of when the first victimization at the facility occurred.

<sup>b</sup>Detail sums to more than 100% because some inmates reported more than one victimization.

<sup>c</sup>Includes in a bus, van, or car and at a courthouse, temporary holding facility, or medical facility.

## Staff Sexual Misconduct

Most victims of staff sexual misconduct in prisons and jails reported at least one incident that involved pressure, force, or threat of force

- Among victims in prison, male victims of staff sexual misconduct (64%) were more likely than female victims (30%) to report incidents that involved no pressure or force (table 17). A similar pattern was reported by victims in jail, with an estimated 56% of male victims and 31% of female victims reporting one or more incidents that involved no pressure or force by staff.
- Nearly 82% of the female victims in prison said they were pressured by staff to engage in sexual activity, compared to 55% of male victims in prison.
- In both prisons and jails, male victims were more likely than female victims to report that the first incident of staff sexual misconduct occurred within the first 24 hours following admission to the facility. Nearly 16% of male victims in prison and 30% of the male victims in jail said they were victimized within the first 24 hours, compared to 5% of the female victims in prison and 4% of female victims in jail.
- In prisons, both male and female victims reported that the staff sexual misconduct was most likely to have occurred in a closet or locked office, the victim's cell or sleeping area, or the shower or bathroom area.
- In jails, 45% of male victims and 24% of female victims identified a closet or locked office as the most common area in which the staff sexual misconduct occurred.
- Among victims of staff sexual misconduct in jail, 17% of male victims and 8% of female victims reported they had been injured during the incident.

- Among victims of staff sexual misconduct in prison, 9% of males and 19% of females said they had

been injured by staff; however, the difference was not statistically significant.

**TABLE 17**  
Circumstances surrounding incidents of staff sexual misconduct, by type of facility and sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Circumstance	Victims in prison		Victims in jails	
	Male*	Female	Male*	Female
<b>Number of victims</b>	39,121	2,123	14,334	1,485
<b>Number of incidents<sup>a</sup></b>				
1	24.9%	32.1%	23.9%	38.9%**
2	20.5	19.2	21.9	26.2
3 to 5	17.4	19.3	13.3	19.0
6 to 10	16.7	15.5	14.2	10.1
11 or more	20.5	13.9	26.7	5.8**
<b>Type of coercion or force<sup>b</sup></b>				
Without pressure or force	64.1%	29.8%**	56.3%	31.0%**
Pressured	54.8	81.9**	61.7	70.1
Force/threat of force	35.4	38.8	51.4	47.4
<b>When first happened<sup>c</sup></b>				
Within 24 hours of admission	15.8%	5.0%**	30.4%	4.2%**
1 to 3 days	11.3	13.8	14.6	19.9
4 to 30 days	25.7	12.6**	27.8	42.4
More than 30 days	47.2	68.5**	27.2	33.4
<b>Time of day<sup>b</sup></b>				
6 am to noon	34.3%	31.1%	31.1%	32.9%
Noon to 6 pm	32.5	32.9	27.8	18.9
6 pm to midnight	34.8	29.5	34.6	16.5**
Midnight to 6 am	36.8	29.1	52.2	35.3**
<b>Where occurred<sup>b</sup></b>				
In victim's cell/sleeping area	36.2%	32.4%	39.1%	21.1%**
Elsewhere in the facility				
Closet/locked office	51.6%	44.3%	44.6%	24.3%**
Workshop/kitchen	31.7	36.8	23.0	9.6**
Shower/bathroom	30.6	28.2	29.1	7.3**
Classroom/library	17.5	7.6**	18.7	9.2**
Yard/recreation area	12.7	9.3	13.2	11.9
Other common area <sup>d</sup>	19.9	19.8	22.4	13.1
Off facility grounds <sup>e</sup>	7.0	2.8**	15.0	11.6
<b>Ever injured</b>				
Yes	9.3%	19.2%	17.4%	7.5%**
<b>Ever report an incident</b>				
Yes	20.6%	34.7%**	20.6%	19.6%

\*Comparison group.

\*\*Significant at the 95%-confidence level, when compared to male victims.

<sup>a</sup>Number of reported willing and unwilling incidents of sexual misconduct.

<sup>b</sup>Detail sums to more than 100% because some inmates reported more than one victimization.

<sup>c</sup>Based only on victims reporting incidents involving force, threat of force, or pressure.

<sup>d</sup>Includes another inmate's cell/room and stairs.

<sup>e</sup>Includes in a bus, van, or car and at a courthouse, temporary holding facility, or medical facility.

**Most victims and perpetrators of staff sexual misconduct were of the opposite sex**

Among the 39,121 male prison inmates who had been victims of staff sexual misconduct, 69% reported sexual activity with female staff; an additional 16% reported sexual activity with both female and male staff (table 18). In comparison, among the 2,123 female prison inmates who had been victimized, 72% reported that the staff perpetrator was male; an additional 19% reported both male and female staff.

Similar patterns of staff sexual misconduct were reported by jail inmates. Nearly two-thirds of the male jail inmates who had been victimized said the staff perpetrator was female (64%). About the same percentage (63%) of female victims said the perpetrator was a male staff member at the jail.

**Reports of staff sexual misconduct were linked to strip searches and pat downs**

Victims of staff sexual misconduct were asked if they touched a facility staff person's body or had their body touched in a sexual way. Regardless of whether they had wanted it to occur or not, nearly two-thirds of all victims of staff sexual misconduct in prison and jail reported at least one incident of sexual touching. An estimated 38,270 inmates reported such touching in the last 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months

(table 19). At least 4 of every 10 of these victims said that this had happened at least once as part of a strip search or a pat down. Among victims of sexual touching, male inmates (43%) were as likely as female inmates (40%) to report staff sexual misconduct as part of a strip search or pat down.

The majority of victims said they had also touched staff or been touched by staff in a sexual way outside of a strip search or pat down. An estimated 86% of male victims and 91% of female victims in prisons and jails said that this had happened at least once outside of a strip search or pat down.

**TABLE 18**  
Sex of perpetrator of staff sexual misconduct, by facility type and sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

	Victims in prison		Victims in jail	
	Male*	Female	Male*	Female
Number of victims	39,121	2,123	14,334	1,485
Sex of perpetrator(s)				
Male only	14.9%	71.8%**	18.2%	62.6%**
Female only	68.8	9.3**	64.3	27.7**
Both male and female	16.3	18.9	17.5	9.8

Note: Sex of staff perpetrator was reported for 69% of prison inmates and 66% of jail inmates reporting staff sexual misconduct.

\*Comparison group.

\*\*Significant at the 95%-confidence level, when compared to male victims.

**TABLE 19**  
Sexual touching between inmates and staff during and not during strip searches and pat downs, by sex of victim, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

	Prison and jail inmates reporting staff sexual touching <sup>a</sup>		
	All	Male	Female
Number of victims	38,270	35,887	2,383
All incidents <sup>b</sup>			
Part of strip search/pat down	42.7%	42.9%	40.0%
Strip search	30.8	30.8	30.0
Pat down	36.4	36.3	36.7
Not part of a strip search/pat down	86.1%	85.8%	90.8%
Not during strip search	78.4	78.0	84.1
Not during pat down	75.7	75.7	77.2

<sup>a</sup>Inmates being touched or touching a facility staff's body "in a sexual way."

<sup>b</sup>Detail sums to more than 100% because some inmates reported more than one victimization.

## Appendix 1. Survey items related to inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

### Males

E16. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to touch your butt, thighs, or penis in a sexual way?

E17. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to let them touch your butt, thighs, or penis in a sexual way?

E22. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you give or receive a hand job?

E23. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to give or receive a hand job?

E26. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you give or receive oral sex or a blow job?

E27. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to give or receive oral sex or a blow job?

E32. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you have anal sex?

E33. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to have anal sex?

E34. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you have any type of sex or sexual contact other than sexual touching, hand jobs, oral sex or blow jobs, or anal sex?

E35. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to have any type of sex or sexual contact other than sexual touching, hand jobs, oral sex or blow jobs, or anal sex?

### Females

E18. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to touch your butt, thighs, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way?

E19. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to let them touch your butt, thighs, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way?

E24. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you give or receive oral sex?

E25. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to give or receive oral sex?

E28. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you have vaginal sex?

E29. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to have vaginal sex?

E32. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you have anal sex?

E33. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to have anal sex?

E34. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force to make you have any type of sex or sexual contact other than sexual touching, oral sex, vaginal sex, or anal sex?

E35. During the last 12 months, did another inmate, without using physical force, pressure you or make you feel that you had to have any type of sex or sexual contact other than sexual touching, oral sex, vaginal sex, or anal sex?



## Appendix 2. Survey items related to staff sexual misconduct, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

These next questions are about the behavior of staff at this facility during the last 12 months. By staff we mean the employees of this facility and anybody who works as a volunteer in this facility.

G4. During the last 12 months, have any facility staff pressured you or made you feel that you had to let them have sex or sexual contact with you?

G5. During the last 12 months, have you been physically forced by any facility staff to have sex or sexual contact?

G7. During the last 12 months, have any facility staff offered you favors or special privileges in exchange for sex or sexual contact?

G2. During the last 12 months, have you willingly had sex or sexual contact with any facility staff?

G11. [IF G2 OR G4 OR G5 OR G7 = Yes] During the last 12 months, which of the following types of sex or sexual contact did you have with a facility staff person?

G11a. You touched a facility staff person's body or had your body touched in a sexual way.

G11b. You gave or received a hand job.

G11c. You gave or received oral sex or a blow job.

G11d. You had vaginal sex.

G11e. You had anal sex.

## Appendix 3. Follow-up questions for inmates reporting no sexual activity, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Follow-up questions for inmates reporting no sexual activity in the screener questions for sexual activity with inmates:

LCM1. During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force, pressure you, or make you feel that you had to have any type of sex or sexual contact?

LCM2. How long has it been since another inmate in this facility used physical force, pressured you, or made you feel that you had to have any type of sex or sexual contact?

1. Within the past 7 days
2. More than 7 days ago but within the past 30 days
3. More than 30 days ago but within the past 12 months
4. More than 12 months ago
5. This has not happened to me at this facility

LCM3.

[If Male] During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force, pressure you, or make you feel that you had to have oral or anal sex?

[If Female] During the last 12 months, did another inmate use physical force, pressure you, or make you feel that you had to have oral, vaginal, or anal sex?

LCM4.

[If Male] How long has it been since another inmate in this facility used physical force, pressured you, or made you feel that you had to have oral or anal sex?

[If Female] How long has it been since another inmate in this facility used physical force, pressured you, or made you feel that you had to have oral, vaginal, or anal sex?

Follow-up questions for inmates reporting no sexual activity in the screener questions for sexual activity with staff:

LCM5. During the last 12 months, have you had any sex or sexual contact with staff in this facility whether you wanted to have it or not?

LCM6. How long has it been since you had any sex or sexual contact with staff in this facility whether you wanted to or not?

1. Within the past 7 days
2. More than 7 days ago but within the past 30 days
3. More than 30 days ago but within the past 12 months
4. More than 12 months ago
5. This has not happened to me at this facility

LCM7.

[If Male] In the last 12 months, did you have oral, vaginal, or anal sex with any staff at this facility whether you wanted to or not?

[If Female] In the last 12 months, did you have oral, vaginal, or anal sex with any staff at this facility whether you wanted to or not?

LCM8.

[If Male] How long has it been since you had oral, vaginal, or anal sex with any staff at this facility whether you wanted to or not?

[If Female] How long has it been since you had oral, vaginal, or anal sex with any staff at this facility whether you wanted to or not?

The National Inmate Survey, 2008-09 (NIS-2) was conducted in 167 state and federal prisons between October 13, 2008, and March 11, 2009; 286 jails between January 20, 2009, and August 13, 2009; and 10 special (military, Indian country, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)) facilities between May 11, 2009, and December 17, 2009. The data were collected by RTI International under a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). The NIS-2 comprised two questionnaires—a survey of sexual victimization and a survey of past drug and alcohol use and treatment. Inmates were randomly assigned to receive one of the questionnaires so that at the time of the interview the content of the survey remained unknown to facility staff and the interviewers. A total of 81,566 inmates participated in the survey, including 32,029 inmates in state and federal prisons, 48,066 inmates in jails, 399 inmates in military facilities, 115 inmates in Indian country jails, and 957 inmates in facilities operated by ICE.

The interviews, which averaged 25 minutes in length, used computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) and audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI) data collection methods. For approximately the first two minutes, survey interviewers conducted a personal interview using CAPI to obtain background information and date of admission to the facility. For the remainder of the interview, respondents interacted with a computer-administered questionnaire using a touch-screen and synchronized audio instructions delivered via headphones. Respondents completed the ACASI portion of the interview in private, with the interviewer either leaving the room or moving away from the computer.

A shorter paper questionnaire was made available for inmates who were unable to come to the private interviewing room or interact with the computer. The paper form was completed by 496 prison inmates (or 1.5% of all prison interviews), 226 jail inmates (0.5%), and 4 military inmates (1%). Most of these inmates were housed in administrative or disciplinary segregation or were considered too violent to be interviewed. No inmates in Indian country or ICE facilities completed the paper questionnaire.

Before the interview, inmates were informed verbally and in writing that participation was voluntary and that all information provided would be held in confidence. Interviews were conducted in either English (98% in prisons, 95% in jails, 40% in ICE facilities, and 100% in military and Indian country facilities) or Spanish (2% in prisons, 5% in jails, and 60% in ICE facilities).

### Selection of state and federal prisons

A sample of 171 state and federal prisons was drawn to produce a sample representing approximately 10% of the 1,260 state and 192 federal adult confinement facilities identified in the *2005 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities*. The 2005 census was a complete enumeration of state prisons, including all publicly operated and privately operated facilities under contract to state correctional authorities. The NIS-2 was restricted to confinement facilities—institutions in which fewer than 50% of the inmates were regularly permitted to leave, unaccompanied by staff, for work, study, or treatment. Such facilities included prisons, penitentiaries, prison hospitals, prison farms, boot camps, and centers for reception, classification, or alcohol and drug treatment. The NIS-2 excluded community-based facilities, such as halfway houses, group homes, and work release centers. Based on estimates from *2008 National Prisoner Statistics*, the prisons in the study universe held an estimated 1,267,400 state and 190,300 federal inmates age 18 or older on June 30, 2008.

State and federal confinement facilities were sequentially sampled with probabilities of selection proportionate to size (as measured by the number of inmates held in state prisons on December 30, 2005, and in federal prisons on September 28, 2006). Facilities on the sampling frame were stratified by gender of inmates housed. The measures of size for facilities that participated in NIS-1 in 2007 were reduced to lower their probability of selection in NIS-2. (See page 32 for a listing of NIS-1 reports.) Within each stratum, facilities on the sampling frame were first sorted by region, state, and public or private operation. The sample size for facilities housing only female inmates was set to 36 facilities to ensure a sufficient number of women and allow for meaningful analyses of sexual victimization by gender. Facilities were sampled ensuring that at least one facility in every state was selected. Federal facilities were grouped together and treated like a state for sampling purposes. The remaining facilities were selected from each region with probabilities proportionate to size.

Of the 171 selected prison facilities, 4 were deemed ineligible and excluded from the survey for the following reasons:

- Albion Correctional Facility (NY)—Ongoing litigation.
- Robert Scott Correctional Facility (MI)—Ongoing litigation.
- Dinwiddie Correctional Unit (VA)—Closed prior to the start of data collection.
- Waseca FCI (BOP)—Transitioned from holding males to females during the data collection period (treated as a closed facility).

All other selected prison facilities participated fully in the survey.

### **Selection of inmates within prisons**

The number of inmates sampled in each facility varied based on 6 criteria:

- an expected sexual victimization prevalence rate of 4%.
- a desired level of precision based on a standard error of 1.75%.
- a projected 70% response rate among selected inmates.
- a 5% chance among participating inmates of not receiving the sexual victimization questionnaire.
- an adjustment factor of 1.75 to account for the complex survey design.
- the size of the facility.

A roster of inmates was obtained just prior to the start of interviewing at each facility. Inmates under age 18 and inmates expected to be released prior to data collection were deleted from the roster. Each eligible inmate was assigned a random number and sorted in ascending order. Inmates were selected from the list up to the expected number of inmates determined by the sampling criteria.

A total of 46,189 prison inmates were selected. After selection, 1,302 ineligible inmates were excluded—936 (2%) were released or transferred to another facility before interviewing began, 246 (0.5%) were mentally or physically unable to be interviewed, 13 (0.02%) were under age 18 or their age could not be obtained during the interview process, 11 (0.02%) were selected in error (i.e., an inmate was incorrectly listed on the facility roster), and 96 (0.2%) were on unsupervised work release or only served time on weekends.

Of all selected eligible prison inmates, 23% refused to participate in the survey, 2% were not available to be interviewed (e.g., in court, in medical segregation, determined by the facility to be too violent to be interviewed, or restricted from participation by another legal jurisdiction), and 2% were not interviewed due to survey logistics (e.g., language barriers, releases, or transfers to another facility after interviewing began).

Overall, 32,029 prison inmates participated in the survey, yielding a response rate of 71%. Approximately 95% of the participating inmates (29,954) received the sexual assault survey. (See appendix table 1 for the number of participating inmates in each prison facility.)

### **Selection of jail facilities**

A sample of 320 jails was drawn to represent approximately 10% of the 3,007 jail facilities identified in the *Census of Jail Inmates, 2005*. The 2005 census was a complete

enumeration of all jail jurisdictions, including all publicly operated and privately operated facilities under contract to jail authorities. The NIS-2 was restricted to jails that had five or more inmates on June 30, 2005. Based on estimates from the *Annual Survey of Jails, 2008*, these jails held an estimated 777,200 inmates age 18 or older on June 30, 2008.

Jail facilities were sequentially sampled with probabilities of selection proportionate to size (as measured by the number of inmates held on June 30, 2005). Eight facilities that were unable to participate in NIS-1 were selected with certainty, while the measures of size of facilities that participated in NIS-1 were reduced to give them a lower probability of selection. The remaining facilities were stratified such that facilities in each of the 10 largest jail jurisdictions were placed into strata; all other facilities were placed in a single stratum. Within the large jurisdiction stratum, 3 facilities were selected from the 5 largest jurisdictions with probability proportionate to size, and 2 facilities were selected from the next 5 largest jurisdictions with probability proportionate to size. Facilities in the second stratum were first sorted by region, state, and public or private operation. Facilities were sampled to ensure that at least one jail facility in every state was selected. The remaining jail facilities were selected from each region with probabilities proportionate to size.

Of the 320 selected jails in NIS-2, 10 facilities refused to participate:

- Baldwin Co. Corrections Center (AL)
- Marengo Co. Detention Center (AL)
- Merced Co. Jail (CA)
- Columbia Co. Detention Center (FL)
- Pike Co. Law Enforcement Center (IN)
- Flathead Co. Detention Center (MT)
- Rutherford Co. Jail (NC)
- Monmouth Co. Correctional Institution (NJ)
- Hildalgo Co. Detention Center (TX)
- Kenosha Co. Jail (WI).

Nine facilities were unable to participate due to lack of space, staffing shortages, or construction, but expect to be included in NIS-3 (to be conducted in 2011). Fifteen facilities were determined to be ineligible: 7 had closed, 4 were community-based facilities, 2 had fewer than 5 inmates, and 2 were prisons. All other selected jail facilities participated fully in the survey.

### **Selection of inmates within jails**

The number of inmates sampled in each facility varied based on 6 criteria:

- an expected prevalence rate of sexual victimization of 3%.
- a desired level of precision based on a standard error of 1.4%.
- a projected 65% response rate among selected inmates.

- a 5% chance among participating inmates of not receiving the sexual victimization questionnaire.
- an adjustment factor of 1.75 to account for the complex survey design.
- a pre-arraignment adjustment factor equal to 1 in facilities where the status was known for all inmates and less than 1 in facilities where only the overall proportion of inmates who were pre-arraigned was known.

A roster of inmates was obtained just prior to the start of interviewing at each facility. Inmates under age 18 and inmates who had not been arraigned were removed from the roster. Each eligible inmate was assigned a random number and sorted in ascending order. Inmates were selected from the list up to the expected number of inmates determined by the sampling criteria. Due to the dynamic nature of jail populations, a second roster of inmates was obtained on the first day of data collection. Eligible inmates who appeared on the second roster but who had not appeared on the initial roster were identified. These inmates had been arraigned since the initial roster was created or were newly admitted to the facility and arraigned. A random sample of these new inmates was chosen using the same probability of selection used to sample from the first roster.

A total of 81,306 jail inmates was selected. After selection, an additional 9,490 ineligible inmates were excluded—7,844 (9.7%) were released or transferred to another facility before interviewing began, 455 (0.6%) were mentally or physically unable to be interviewed, 144 (0.2%) were under age 18 or their age could not be obtained during the interview process, 308 (0.4%) were selected in error (i.e., an inmate was incorrectly listed on the facility roster), and 739 (0.9%) were on unsupervised work release or only served time on weekends.

Of all selected inmates, 17% refused to participate in the survey, 4% were not available to be interviewed (e.g., in court, in medical segregation, determined by the facility to be too violent to be interviewed, or restricted from participation by another legal jurisdiction), and 8% were not interviewed due to survey logistics (e.g., language barriers, releases, and transfers to another facility after interviewing began).

Overall, 48,066 jail inmates participated in the survey, yielding a response rate of 68%. Approximately 95% of the participating inmates (45,126) received the sexual assault survey. (See appendix table 5 for the number of participating inmates in each jail facility.)

#### **Selection of special confinement facilities**

A sample of 11 special facilities was drawn to represent the inmate populations in military, Indian country, and ICE

facilities. Three military, 3 Indian country, and 5 ICE facilities were included. The selected military facilities were the largest Army, Navy, and Marine facilities, including the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks (Leavenworth, KS), the Naval Consolidated Brig. (Miramar, CA), and the Marine Corps Base Brig. (Camp Pendleton, CA).

The selected Indian country facilities were the three largest facilities identified in the 2007 Survey of Jails in Indian Country. One facility, Tohono O'odham Detention Center (AZ) was undergoing major renovations to accommodate increased capacity and could not participate in the survey during the data collection period. This facility will be included in the NIS-3 data collection. The Navajo Department of Corrections Window Rock (AZ), participated in the survey but held fewer inmates in 2009 (14) than reported in the 2007 survey (99).

The 5 ICE facilities were sequentially sampled from the 22 facilities run by ICE with probabilities of selection proportionate to size (as measured by the number of persons held at yearend 2008). Facilities were sorted by region and state.

#### **Selection of inmates in special confinement facilities**

For purposes of inmate selection, military facilities were treated as prisons, and Indian country and ICE facilities were treated like jails. The assumptions used to determine the sample size within a prison or jail and the corresponding selection procedures were used. However, in ICE facilities, a second sample of newly admitted inmates was not drawn due to an inability to identify new inmates on the ICE rosters. In addition, inmates in ICE facilities who did not speak English or Spanish were defined as ineligible for the study.

Overall, 2,494 inmates were selected, including 546 in military facilities, 161 in Indian country facilities, and 1,787 in ICE facilities. After selection, 409 ineligible inmates were excluded—225 (9%) were released or transferred to another facility before interviewing began, 10 (0.4%) were mentally or physically unable to be interviewed, 4 (0.2%) were on unsupervised work release, and 170 (7%) in ICE facilities did not speak English or Spanish. A total of 16 inmates were excluded in military facilities, 15 in Indian country facilities, and 378 in ICE facilities.

Of all selected inmates in special facilities, 16% refused to participate in the survey, 0.2% were not available to be interviewed (e.g., in court, in medical segregation, determined by the facility to be too violent to be interviewed, or restricted from participation by another legal jurisdiction), and 7% were not interviewed due to survey logistics (e.g., language barriers, releases, and transfers to another facility after interviewing began).

Overall, 1,471 inmates participated in the survey (399

in military, 115 in Indian country, and 957 in ICE facilities), yielding a response rate of 71% (75% in military, 79% in Indian country, and 68% in ICE facilities). Approximately 95% of the participating inmates (1,379) received the sexual assault survey (379 in military, 107 in Indian country, and 893 in ICE facilities). (See appendix table 9 for the number of participating inmates in each special confinement facility.)

### Weighting and non-response adjustments

Responses from interviewed inmates were weighted to provide national-level and facility-level estimates. Each interviewed inmate was assigned an initial weight corresponding to the inverse of the probability of selection within each sampled facility. A series of adjustment factors was applied to the initial weight to minimize potential bias due to non-response and to provide national estimates.

Bias occurs when the estimated prevalence is different from the actual prevalence for a given facility. In each facility, bias could result if the random sample of inmates did not accurately represent the facility population. Bias could also result if the non-respondents were different from the respondents. Post-stratification and non-response adjustments were made to the data to compensate for these two possibilities. These adjustments included—

1. calibration of the weights of the responding inmates within each facility so that the estimates accurately reflected the facility's entire population in terms of known demographic characteristics. These characteristics included distributions by inmate age, sex, race, time since admission, and sentence length. This adjustment ensures that the estimates better reflect the entire population of the facility and not just the inmates who were randomly sampled.
2. calibration of the weights so that the weight from a non-responding inmate is assigned to a responding inmate with similar demographic characteristics. This adjustment ensures that the estimates accurately reflect the full sample, rather than only the inmates who responded.

For each inmate, these adjustments were based on a generalized exponential model, developed by Folsom and Singh, and applied to the sexual assault survey respondents.<sup>3</sup>

A final ratio adjustment to each inmate weight was made to provide national-level estimates for the total number of inmates ages 18 or older who were held at midyear 2008. These ratios represented the estimated number of inmates by sex (from BJS's *2008 Annual Survey of Jails* and *2008 National Prisoner Statistics, Midyear*) divided by the

number of inmates by sex in the NIS-2 after calibration for sampling and non-response. The national estimates for state prisons were 1,178,916 males and 88,518 females; for federal prisons, 178,153 males and 12,120 females; and for jails (with an average daily population of 6 or more inmates), 678,136 males and 99,096 females.

Final ratio adjustments were not applied to inmate weights in military, Indian country, and ICE facilities. Estimates for special confinement facilities were made at the facility level only.

### Standard errors and tests of significance

The NIS-2 is statistically unable to provide an exact ranking for all facilities as required under PREA. As with any survey, the NIS estimates are subject to error arising from the fact that they are based on a sample rather than a complete enumeration. Within each facility, the estimated sampling error varies by the size of the estimate, the number of completed interviews, and the size of the facility.

A common way to express this sampling variability is to construct a 95%-confidence interval around each survey estimate. Typically, multiplying the standard error by 1.96 and then adding or subtracting the result from the estimate produces the confidence interval. This interval expresses the range of values that could result among 95% of the different samples that could be drawn.

For small samples and estimates close to 0%, as is the case with sexual victimization in most prisons and jails, the use of the standard error to construct the 95%-confidence interval may not be reliable. An alternative developed by Wilson has been shown to perform better than the traditional method when constructing a confidence interval. (See note 1 on page 7.) This method produces an asymmetrical confidence interval around the facility estimates in which the lower bound is constrained to be greater than or equal to 0%. It also provides confidence intervals for facilities in which the survey estimates are zero (but other similarly conducted surveys could yield non-zero estimates). (See tables 2, 4, and 5 and appendix tables 5, 6, 8, and 9.)

When applied to large samples, the traditional and the Wilson confidence intervals are nearly identical. As a result, the tables that show national estimates display traditional standard errors. (See table 1.) The traditional standard errors have also been used to compare estimates of sexual victimization among selected groups of inmates that have been defined by type of incident, demographic subgroup, sexual history, and criminal justice status. (See tables 6 through 12 and tables 15 through 19.) To facilitate the analysis, rather than provide the detailed estimates for every standard error, differences in the estimates of sexual victimization for subgroups in these tables have been tested and notated for significance at the 95%-level confidence.

<sup>3</sup>Folsom, Jr., R.E., and A.C. Singh, (2002). "The Generalized Exponential Model for Sampling Weight Calibration for Extreme Values, Nonresponse, and Poststratification," Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Section on Survey Research Methods, pp. 598-603.

For example, the difference in the rate of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization among female prisoners (4.7%), compared to male prisoners (1.9%), is statistically significant at the 95% level of confidence (table 6). In all tables providing detailed comparisons, statistically significant differences at the 95% level of confidence or greater have been designated with two asterisks (\*\*).

### Exposure period

To calculate comparative rates of sexual victimization, respondents were asked to provide the most recent date of admission to the current facility. If the date of admission was at least 12 months prior to the date of the interview, inmates were asked questions related to their experiences during the past 12 months. If the admission date was less than 12 months prior to the interview, inmates were asked about their experiences since they had arrived at the facility.

The average exposure period of inmates participating in the sexual victimization survey was—

- 9.0 months for federal prisoners
- 7.9 months for state prisoners
- 3.4 months for jail inmates
- 8.4 months for inmates in military facilities
- 3.0 months for inmates in ICE facilities
- 4.4 months for inmates in Indian country facilities.

### Measurement of sexual victimization

The survey of sexual victimization relied on inmates reporting their direct experience, rather than inmates reporting on the experience of other inmates. Questions related to inmate-on-inmate sexual activity were asked separately from questions related to staff sexual misconduct. (For specific survey questions see appendices 1 and 2.)

The ACASI survey began with a series of questions that screened for specific sexual activities without restriction, including both wanted and unwanted sex and sexual contacts with other inmates. To fully measure all sexual activities, questions related to the touching of body parts in a sexual way were followed by questions related to manual stimulation and questions related to acts involving oral, anal, and vaginal sex. The nature of coercion (including use of physical force, pressure, and other forms of coercion) was measured for each type of reported sexual activity.

ACASI survey items related to staff sexual misconduct were asked in a different order. Inmates were first asked about being pressured or being made to feel they had to have sex or sexual contact with the staff and then asked about being physically forced. In addition, inmates were asked if any facility staff had offered favors or special privileges in exchange for sex. Finally, inmates were asked if they willingly had sex or sexual contact with staff. All reports of sex or sexual contact between an inmate and facility staff,

regardless of the level of coercion, were classified as staff sexual misconduct.

The ACASI survey included additional questions related to both inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and staff sexual misconduct. These questions, known as latent class measures, were included to assess the reliability of the survey questionnaire. After being asked detailed questions, all inmates were asked a series of general questions to determine if they had experienced any type of unwanted sex or sexual contact with another inmate or had any sex or sexual contact with staff. (See appendix 3.)

The entire ACASI questionnaire (listed as the National Inmate Survey-2) and the shorter paper and pencil survey form (PAPI) are available on the BJS web site at <<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=278>>.

### Interviews checked for inconsistent response patterns

Once data collection was completed, individual response patterns were assessed to identify interviewer error, interviews that had been completed in too short of time, and incomplete interviews. In 133 interviews, the interviewers administered sex-specific survey items inconsistent with the sex of the inmate. In 208 interviews, the inmate either failed to complete enough questions to be considered a completed interview or completed the survey in too short of time. These interviews were excluded from the calculations of sexual victimization.

Interviews were also examined for inconsistent response patterns. A list of 18 indicators were developed based on inmate characteristics (e.g., education, age, marital status, and time since admission) and items related to victimization (e.g., number of times, injuries, willing contact with staff, sex of staff perpetrator, and reporting of victimization). Indicators compared responses to initial questions with responses to detailed follow up questions. The results were combined into a count of the total number of inconsistent responses for each inmate.

Overall, the results revealed very high levels of consistency in survey responses. Of 45,126 completed interviews of jail inmates, 94.4% had no inconsistent responses, 5.2% had 1, and 0.4% had 2 or more. Of 29,954 completed interviews of prison inmates, 93.6% had no inconsistent responses, 5.9% had one, and 0.5% had two or more.

### Definition of terms

**Sexual victimization**—all types of sexual activity, e.g., oral, anal, or vaginal penetration; hand jobs; touching of the inmate's buttocks, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way; abusive sexual contacts; and both willing and unwilling sexual activity with staff.

**Nonconsensual sexual acts**—unwanted contacts with another inmate or any contacts with staff that involved oral, anal, vaginal penetration, hand jobs, and other sexual acts.

**Abusive sexual contacts only**—unwanted contacts with another inmate or any contacts with staff that involved touching of the inmate's buttocks, thigh, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way.

**Unwilling activity**—incidents of unwanted sexual contacts with another inmate or staff.

**Willing activity**—incidents of willing sexual contacts with staff. These contacts are characterized by the reporting inmates as willing; however, all sexual contacts between inmates and staff are legally nonconsensual.

**Staff sexual misconduct**—includes all incidents of willing and unwilling sexual contact with facility staff and all incidents of sexual activity that involved oral, anal, vaginal penetration, hand jobs, blow jobs, and other sexual acts with facility staff.

### Logistic regression models

Multivariate logistic regression estimation is a modeling technique used to determine what characteristics are statistically significant for predicting a dichotomous outcome (e.g., victimized or not victimized) while controlling for all the other characteristics in the model. NIS-2 used this technique to determine what inmate-level characteristics were significant predictors of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization and staff sexual misconduct. For each outcome, inmate-level characteristics were divided into 3 categories: demographic characteristics, sexual orientation and history, and criminal justice status and history. For each category a logistic model was iteratively run under a backwards selection technique until only predictors that were significant at the 95% level of confidence remained (tables 7, 9, 11).

Each reduced model was then combined to provide 4 models (for each type of sexual victimization and facility type). Backwards selection was conducted on each of the combined models until only predictors significant at the 95% level of confidence remained. Results for each model are displayed in terms of their conditional predicted probability (table 12).

In each of the logistic regression models, the conditional predicted probability represents the probability that an inmate with a particular characteristic has experienced sexual victimization (by type) conditional on the inmate having the mean value for all other predictors in the model. For example, based on demographic characteristics only, a female prison inmate has a 3.8% chance of being victimized by another inmate given that she was at the mean of the joint distribution of race or Hispanic origin, education level, and marital status. (See table 7 and note 2 on page 13.)

### Predicting facility-level rates of sexual victimization

Estimates of the expected rate of inmate-on-inmate and staff sexual misconduct in each high rate prison and jail were calculated based on the characteristics of the inmates housed in the facility and the estimated rates of victimization associated with each characteristic. For each level of a characteristic, the logistic models provide an estimate of the odds that an inmate was sexually victimized given that the inmate had that characteristic. (For presentation purposes, these odds have been converted into conditional probabilities.) Overall, the predicted odds that a particular inmate has been victimized is the sum of the odds that correspond to that inmate's set of characteristics.

For example, the inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization model for prison inmates consists of 7 inmate characteristics: sex, race or Hispanic origin, marital status, sexual orientation, prior sexual assault status, most serious offense, and sentence length. The model provides estimates of the odds for each level of each of these characteristics. The odds of victimization for an inmate who is male, white, never married, heterosexual, with no prior sexual assault, held for a property offense, and sentenced to 1 to 5 years in prison is the sum of the individual odds for each of those characteristics.

Once the overall odds for an inmate has been calculated, it can be converted to a probability. A predicted facility-level victimization rate is the weighted average of probabilities for all inmates in the facility. This weighted average in each high rate facility was calculated by summing across all inmates the product of the inmate's probability of victimization and the adjusted inmate sampling weights and dividing it by the eligible inmate population in the survey.

#### Five BJS reports on sexual victimization in prisons and jails:

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

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

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

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

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

#### An overview of all of the BJS prison rape collections:

*PREA Data Collection Activities, 2010* (NCJ 230448)

These reports are available online at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/>.

**BJS**

**APPENDIX TABLE 1****Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence rate <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Total</b>	275,442	29,954	71%	4.4%	3.9%	0.1%
<b>Alabama</b>						
Bibb Corr. Fac.	1,922	261	95%	4.4%	2.7%	7.2%
William Donaldson Corr. Fac.	1,631	206	77	8.8	5.7	13.2
<b>Alaska</b>						
Fairbanks Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	276	104	72%	2.1%	0.8%	5.7%
<b>Arizona</b>						
Arizona State Prison Complex - Lewis	5,237	201	69%	1.9%	0.7%	4.8%
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson <sup>h</sup>	3,728	233	82	3.5	1.8	6.6
<b>Arkansas</b>						
Diagnostic Unit <sup>g</sup>	454	118	82%	4.8%	2.4%	9.5%
McPherson Unit <sup>i</sup>	745	224	93	10.3	7.2	14.5
<b>California</b>						
California Corr. Ctr.	3,686	190	67%	1.4%	0.5%	4.0%
California Inst. for Women <sup>i</sup>	1,924	186	73	6.1	3.4	10.5
California Med. Fac.	3,067	258	60	9.0	6.2	12.7
Centinela State Prison	5,064	143	52	0.0	0.0	2.6
Central California Women's Fac. <sup>i</sup>	4,121	184	63	5.2	2.8	9.6
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	3,195	193	70	3.6	1.8	7.2
Deuel Vocational Inst.	3,821	197	55	2.6	1.2	5.6
Folsom State Prison	4,005	161	56	1.5	0.5	4.4
High Desert State Prison	3,895	153	55	3.5	1.7	7.4
Los Angeles County State Prison	4,835	218	74	3.9	2.1	7.3
North Kern State Prison	5,459	210	67	2.5	1.1	5.7
Pleasant Valley State Prison	5,097	181	62	6.0	3.3	10.5
Salinas Valley State Prison	4,014	162	57	4.8	2.1	10.4
Valley State Prison for Women <sup>i</sup>	4,086	216	72	8.2	5.1	13.0
Wasco State Prison-Reception Ctr.	5,855	221	72	1.9	0.7	4.7
<b>Colorado</b>						
Sterling Corr. Fac.	2,481	204	71%	7.5%	4.5%	12.1%
<b>Connecticut</b>						
Corrigan-Radgowski Corr. Ctr.	1,604	172	65%	3.0%	1.3%	6.9%
Osborn Corr. Inst.	1,937	190	67	4.0	2.1	7.3
York Corr. Fac. <sup>i</sup>	1,281	192	74	7.4	4.6	11.9
<b>Delaware</b>						
Sussex Corr. Inst.	1,166	207	85%	2.5%	1.3%	4.9%
<b>Florida</b>						
Century Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	1,775	208	78%	1.9%	0.8%	4.6%
Gadsden Corr. Fac. <sup>lj</sup>	1,516	208	81	2.4	1.0	5.3
Hernando Corr. Inst. <sup>i</sup>	423	183	90	6.5	4.2	9.9
Indian River Corr. Inst.	469	163	95	2.0	1.0	3.9



**APPENDIX TABLE 1 (continued)****Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence rate <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Florida (continued)</b>						
Lancaster Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	865	186	78%	6.7%	4.1%	10.5%
Liberty Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	1,554	229	90	2.0	0.9	4.4
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex, & Work Camp <sup>i</sup>	2,464	240	85	4.5	2.7	7.5
Moore Haven Corr. Fac. <sup>j</sup>	980	225	90	1.6	0.6	4.2
Okeechobee Corr. Inst.	1,655	241	88	6.1	3.9	9.5
Reception and Med. Ctr. & Reception and Med. Ctr.-West Unit <sup>h</sup>	2,618	259	72	1.7	0.7	4.2
South Florida Reception Ctr. & South Unit	1,477	237	81	1.8	0.8	4.0
<b>Georgia</b>						
Dodge State Prison	1,228	220	86%	2.5%	1.2%	5.4%
Dooly State Prison	1,686	215	79	2.7	1.3	5.6
Pulaski State Prison <sup>i</sup>	1,185	239	91	6.1	3.9	9.5
Washington State Prison	1,500	227	86	2.8	1.3	5.6
Wheeler Corr. Fac. <sup>j</sup>	1,747	232	86	3.1	1.7	5.7
<b>Hawaii</b>						
Oahu Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	1,138	146	58%	4.8%	2.1%	10.9%
Women's Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>i</sup>	278	100	61	5.0	2.5	9.8
<b>Idaho</b>						
Idaho Corr. Fac. <sup>j</sup>	1,484	212	76%	2.3%	1.1%	5.1%
Idaho State Corr. Inst.	1,208	213	69	6.0	3.5	10.2%
<b>Illinois</b>						
East Moline Corr. Ctr.	1,126	208	81%	1.4%	0.5%	3.7%
Illinois River Corr. Ctr.	1,973	194	73	1.3	0.5	3.7
Lincoln Corr. Ctr. <sup>i</sup>	986	190	77	1.4	0.5	3.9
Pontiac Corr. Ctr.	1,074	96	32	12.1	6.3	21.8
<b>Indiana</b>						
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	1,473	181	69%	7.5%	4.3%	12.7%
Putnamville Corr. Fac.	2,431	189	69	8.1	4.9	12.9
Westville Corr. Fac.	3,315	168	58	5.7	3.1	10.2
<b>Iowa</b>						
Iowa Corr. Inst. - Women <sup>i</sup>	601	191	85%	7.7%	5.0%	11.7%
Newton Corr. Fac.	1,188	170	72	5.7	3.1	10.1
<b>Kansas</b>						
Larned Corr. Mental Health Fac.	297	97	57%	9.0%	5.1%	15.4%
<b>Kentucky</b>						
Kentucky Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>i</sup>	648	173	80%	9.6%	6.1%	14.8%
Luther Lockett Corr. Complex	1,076	158	63	6.1	3.4	10.5

**APPENDIX TABLE 1 (continued)****Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence rate <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Louisiana</b>						
Avoyelles Corr. Ctr.	1,558	226	84%	5.3%	3.2%	8.7%
C. Paul Phelps Corr. Ctr.	915	237	93	4.1	2.4	7.0
Louisiana Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>1</sup>	1,027	229	90	7.5	5.0	11.0
<b>Maine</b>						
Maine State Prison - Warren	867	143	59%	9.9%	6.0%	15.8%
<b>Maryland</b>						
Jessup Pre-Release Unit	593	169	80%	5.0%	2.8%	8.8%
Maryland Corr. Inst. - Jessup	1,086	152	63	3.8	1.8	7.8
<b>Massachusetts</b>						
Massachusetts Corr. Inst. - Plymouth	208	85	53%	3.8%	1.6%	8.7%
<b>Michigan</b>						
Earnest C. Brooks Corr. Fac.	1,211	176	69%	6.3%	3.7%	10.5%
Mid-Michigan Corr. Fac.	590	143	63	4.2	2.1	8.2
Muskegon Corr. Fac.	1,300	176	66	11.4	6.2	20.0
Richard A. Handlon Corr. Fac.	1,241	209	79	7.3	4.5	11.6
<b>Minnesota</b>						
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Rush City	987	165	65%	7.3%	4.4%	11.9%
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Shakopee <sup>1</sup>	515	146	69	8.3	4.9	13.9
<b>Mississippi</b>						
Mississippi State Penitentiary	3,817	266	93%	7.5%	4.9%	11.3%
South Mississippi Corr. Inst.	3,028	252	87	5.7	3.5	9.0
<b>Missouri</b>						
Crossroads Corr. Fac.	1,416	207	77%	9.4%	6.2%	13.9%
Fulton Reception & Diagnostic Ctr.	1,481	217	81	1.7	0.7	4.0
Women's Eastern Reception, Diagnostic, & Corr. Ctr. <sup>1</sup>	1,959	218	82	8.7	5.7	13.2
<b>Montana</b>						
Montana State Prison	1,389	201	78%	10.6%	7.2%	15.5%
<b>Nebraska</b>						
Diagnostic & Evaluation Ctr.	313	103	67%	2.9%	1.3%	6.6%
<b>Nevada</b>						
Northern Nevada Corr. Ctr. <sup>9</sup>	1,327	206	82%	0.8%	0.2%	2.9%
<b>New Hampshire</b>						
Lakes Region Fac.	347	104	54%	5.1%	2.5%	10.1%
<b>New Jersey</b>						
Bayside State Prison - Ancora Unit	344	133	74%	1.7%	0.6%	4.6%
Edna Mahan Corr. Fac. for Women <sup>1</sup>	912	177	76	4.5	2.5	8.0

**APPENDIX TABLE 1 (continued)****Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence rate <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>New Mexico</b>						
Southern New Mexico Corr. Fac.	682	166	78%	3.1%	1.4%	6.7%
<b>New York</b>						
Attica Corr. Fac.	2,170	170	61%	8.0%	4.8%	13.2%
Bare Hill Corr. Fac.	1,675	209	81	7.8	4.9	12.2
Bayview Corr. Fac. <sup>i</sup>	137	96	73	14.6	11.1	19.1
Cape Vincent Corr. Fac.	850	178	73	1.0	0.3	3.3
Clinton Corr. Fac.	2,854	200	70	4.7	2.6	8.6
Coxsackie Corr. Fac.	1,035	204	80	5.7	3.5	9.2
Elmira Corr. Fac.	1,763	167	63	9.8	6.2	15.2
Walkill Corr. Fac.	591	163	72	3.2	1.5	6.8
<b>North Carolina</b>						
Brown Creek Corr. Inst.	908	170	70%	1.8%	0.7%	4.6%
Guilford Corr. Ctr.	165	47	55	0.0	0.0	7.6
Pender Corr. Inst.	753	156	67	1.8	0.7	4.7
Swannanoa Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>i</sup>	93	56	81	1.3	0.5	3.4
Warren Corr. Ctr.	828	134	57	6.9	3.9	11.9
<b>North Dakota</b>						
Dakota Women's Corr. & Rehab. Ctr. <sup>i</sup>	110	77	78%	3.0%	1.6%	5.5%
James River Corr. Ctr.	411	160	82	2.9	1.3	6.3
<b>Ohio</b>						
Corr. Reception Ctr.	1,648	242	84%	1.1%	0.4%	3.1%
Lebanon Corr. Inst.	2,653	231	81	5.6	3.4	9.3
Mansfield Corr. Inst.	2,443	186	68	4.4	2.3	8.3
Ohio Reformatory for Women <sup>i</sup>	2,514	233	82	7.7	5.0	11.7
Southeastern Corr. Inst.	1,672	144	52	5.3	2.7	9.9
<b>Oklahoma</b>						
Davis Corr. Fac. <sup>j</sup>	1,133	189	71%	9.2%	5.9%	13.9%
Mack H. Alford Corr. Ctr.	803	104	42	7.9	4.3	14.1
<b>Oregon</b>						
Coffee Creek Corr. Fac. <sup>i</sup>	1,071	208	83%	7.1%	4.4%	11.3%
<b>Pennsylvania</b>						
Camp Hill State Corr. Inst.	3,387	233	85%	1.2%	0.3%	4.4%
Coal Township State Corr. Inst.	1,903	221	80	3.9	2.1	7.1
Cresson State Corr. Inst.	1,576	238	89	5.6	3.5	9.0
<b>Rhode Island</b>						
Maximum Security Fac.	433	115	55%	0.6%	0.1%	2.7%

**APPENDIX TABLE 1 (continued)**

**Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				95%-confidence rate <sup>b</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>South Carolina</b>						
Goodman Corr. Inst. <sup>i</sup>	189	92	64%	3.1%	1.4%	6.7%
Ridgeland Corr. Inst.	1,265	221	84	6.2	3.9	9.8
Trenton Corr. Inst.	661	177	76	1.4	0.6	3.6
<b>South Dakota</b>						
Mike Durfee State Prison & Trusty Unit	1,465	169	65%	6.1%	3.2%	11.2%
<b>Tennessee</b>						
West Tennessee State Penitentiary	2,444	222	79%	5.6%	3.4%	9.3%
<b>Texas</b>						
Allred Unit	3,637	161	55%	10.9%	7.0%	16.7%
Beto Unit	3,322	216	76	7.3	4.6	11.4
Bridgeport Pre-Parole Fac. <sup>i,j</sup>	200	128	88	0.0	0.0	2.9
C. Moore Transfer Fac.	1,195	184	72	0.4	0.1	1.9
Coffield Unit	4,121	226	76	4.8	2.6	8.5
Cole State Jail	844	161	70	3.1	1.4	6.5
Crain Unit <sup>l</sup>	1,679	175	67	4.5	2.4	8.2
Ferguson Unit	2,370	236	83	8.5	5.4	13.2
Halbert Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Fac. <sup>i</sup>	598	229	97	0.9	0.3	2.5
Hobby Unit <sup>l</sup>	1,372	240	93	5.5	3.5	8.6
Hughes Unit	2,866	159	57	10.2	6.5	15.8
Jester Unit III	1,079	187	73	2.2	0.9	5.3
Lindsey State Jail <sup>j</sup>	1,022	199	82	1.8	0.8	4.4
Michael Unit	3,154	158	60	9.1	5.6	14.7
Mountain View Unit <sup>l</sup>	620	128	58	10.5	6.5	16.4
Neal Unit	1,681	179	68	4.3	2.2	8.1
Plane State Jail <sup>i</sup>	2,022	229	86	2.8	1.2	6.1
Smith Unit	2,067	160	59	5.5	2.9	10.0
Telford Unit	2,767	189	65	7.7	4.7	12.4
<b>Utah</b>						
Central Utah Corr. Fac.	1,329	201	75%	2.3%	1.1%	4.8%
<b>Vermont</b>						
Northwest State Corr. Fac.	145	96	80%	6.2%	4.0%	9.3
<b>Virginia</b>						
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. <sup>l</sup>	1,223	199	79%	14.3%	10.2%	19.6%
Haynesville Corr. Ctr.	1,118	165	68	2.5	1.1	5.4
Lawrenceville Corr. Ctr. <sup>j</sup>	1,547	196	72	3.8	1.9	7.6

**APPENDIX TABLE 1 (continued)****Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence rate <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Washington</b>						
Airway Heights Corr. Ctr.	2,122	180	70%	3.4%	1.7%	6.8%
Washington Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>i</sup>	836	193	85	6.0	3.6	9.9
<b>West Virginia</b>						
Mount Olive Corr. Complex	991	121	52%	6.8%	3.6%	12.4%
<b>Wisconsin</b>						
Dodge Corr. Inst. <sup>h</sup>	1,552	200	63%	1.0%	0.3%	3.3%
New Lisbon Corr. Inst.	983	108	43	2.5	0.9	6.9
Taycheedah Corr. Inst. <sup>i</sup>	679	171	75	12.9	9.1	18.0
Waupun Corr. Inst.	1,239	113	44	5.1	2.3	10.9
<b>Wyoming</b>						
Wyoming Honor Farm	210	117	78%	2.8%	1.5%	5.3%
<b>Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)</b>						
Big Sandy - Camp	89	55	69%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%
Brooklyn Metropolitan Det. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	2,564	230	78	0.7	0.1	3.4
Bryan Fed. Prison Camp <sup>i</sup>	931	183	72	2.3	1.0	5.2
Carswell Fed. Med. Ctr. <sup>i</sup>	1,547	154	59	4.8	2.5	9.2
Coleman I U.S. Penitentiary	1,678	147	54	5.0	2.3	10.3
Coleman Medium Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>h</sup>	1,600	179	66	0.7	0.1	3.6
Danbury Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>i</sup>	1,210	192	76	1.4	0.4	4.6
Elkton Fed. Corr. Inst.	2,076	176	64	0.0	0.0	2.1
Englewood Fed. Corr. Inst.	915	206	61	1.9	0.8	4.5
Fairton Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,354	171	67	1.6	0.5	5.5
Florence Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,190	76	30	1.4	0.3	7.3
Forrest City Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,923	204	75	1.6	0.6	4.3
Jesup-Fed. Satellite Low	624	156	71	0.9	0.2	4.2
Morgantown Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,034	159	65	0.0	0.0	2.4
Oakdale Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,188	197	75	1.0	0.2	4.8
Petersburg Medium Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,903	143	55	3.8	1.7	8.5

**APPENDIX TABLE 1 (continued)**

**Characteristics of state and federal prisons and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence rate <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons) (continued)</b>						
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,312	160	64%	2.2%	0.8%	5.5%
Texarkana Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,333	131	53	1.2	0.2	6.0
Victorville U.S. Penitentiary	1,641	130	50	2.4	0.8	6.5

<sup>a</sup>Includes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Indicates that different samples in the same facility would yield prevalence rates falling between the lower and upper bound estimates 95 out of 100 times.

<sup>c</sup>Number of inmates in custody on day when the facility provided the sample roster.

<sup>d</sup>Number of respondents completing the sexual victimization survey. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>e</sup>Response rate is equal to the number of respondents divided by the number of eligible sampled inmates times 100 percent.

<sup>f</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on select characteristics, including age, sex, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>g</sup>Facility houses both males and females; both were sampled at this facility.

<sup>h</sup>Facility houses both males and females; only males were sampled at this facility.

<sup>i</sup>Female facility.

<sup>j</sup>Privately operated facility.

**APPENDIX TABLE 2**  
**Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Total</b>	2.1%	1.7%	2.5%	2.8%	2.5%	3.2%
<b>Alabama</b>						
Bibb Corr. Fac.	3.3%	1.9%	5.7%	1.8%	0.8%	3.9%
William Donaldson Corr. Fac.	4.8	2.7	8.4	4.9	2.7	8.5
<b>Alaska</b>						
Fairbanks Corr. Ctr. <sup>d</sup>	1.1%	0.3%	4.1%	1.1%	0.3%	4.1%
<b>Arizona</b>						
Arizona State Prison Complex - Lewis	0.7%	0.1%	3.8%	1.9%	0.7%	4.8%
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson <sup>e</sup>	0.8	0.2	3.1	2.6	1.2	5.5
<b>Arkansas</b>						
Diagnostic Unit <sup>d</sup>	1.9%	0.7%	5.5%	2.9%	1.2%	7.1%
McPherson Unit <sup>f</sup>	7.7	5.0	11.6	4.4	2.5	7.4
<b>California</b>						
California Corr. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.4%	0.5%	4.0%
California Inst. for Women <sup>f</sup>	4.3	2.2	8.3	2.2	0.9	5.3
California Med. Fac.	5.8	3.7	9.1	3.6	2.0	6.2
Centinela State Prison	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.6
Central California Women's Fac. <sup>f</sup>	3.3	1.5	7.1	3.2	1.4	7.2
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	2.8	1.2	6.4	1.9	0.8	4.9
Deuel Vocational Inst.	1.8	0.7	4.5	1.3	0.4	3.6
Folsom State Prison	0.7	0.1	3.8	1.5	0.5	4.4
High Desert State Prison	3.0	1.3	6.8	0.9	0.3	3.3
Los Angeles County State Prison	2.0	0.8	5.0	2.5	1.1	5.3
North Kern State Prison	0.0	0.0	1.8	2.5	1.1	5.7
Pleasant Valley State Prison	5.5	3.0	9.9	1.9	0.7	5.5
Salinas Valley State Prison	2.4	0.9	6.2	2.4	0.7	8.1
Valley State Prison for Women <sup>f</sup>	6.8	4.0	11.1	4.7	2.4	9.0
Wasco State Prison-Reception Ctr.	0.5	0.1	2.7	1.9	0.7	4.7
<b>Colorado</b>						
Sterling Corr. Fac.	3.5%	1.7%	7.0%	6.2%	3.5%	10.7%
<b>Connecticut</b>						
Corrigan-Radgowski Corr. Ctr.	0.8%	0.2%	2.7%	2.2%	0.8%	6.1%
Osborn Corr. Inst.	2.7	1.3	5.6	1.3	0.5	3.6
York Corr. Fac. <sup>f</sup>	6.4	3.8	10.6	2.2	0.9	5.3
<b>Delaware</b>						
Sussex Corr. Inst.	1.7%	0.8%	3.8%	0.8%	0.2%	2.7%
<b>Florida</b>						
Century Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	0.5%	0.1%	2.5%	1.9%	0.8%	4.6%
Gadsden Corr. Fac. <sup>f,g</sup>	2.0	0.8	4.8	0.4	0.1	2.0
Hernando Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	5.5	3.4	8.8	1.5	0.7	3.5
Indian River Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.0	1.0	3.9
Lancaster Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	2.7	1.4	5.4	3.9	2.1	7.4
Liberty Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	0.7	0.2	2.2	1.3	0.5	3.7
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex, & Work Camp <sup>f</sup>	3.5	1.9	6.3	2.0	0.9	4.3
Moore Haven Corr. Fac. <sup>g</sup>	1.1	0.3	3.3	1.1	0.4	3.5

**APPENDIX TABLE 2 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Florida (continued)</b>						
Okeechobee Corr. Inst.	1.6%	0.7%	3.8%	4.9%	3.0%	8.1%
Reception and Med. Ctr. & Reception and Med. Ctr.-West Unit <sup>e</sup>	0.5	0.1	2.4	1.7	0.7	4.3
South Florida Reception Ctr. & South Unit	1.3	0.5	3.5	0.5	0.1	1.5
<b>Georgia</b>						
Dodge State Prison	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	2.5%	1.2%	5.4%
Dooly State Prison	0.8	0.2	2.7	2.7	1.3	5.6
Pulaski State Prison <sup>f</sup>	6.1	3.9	9.5	0.3	0.1	1.5
Washington State Prison	0.5	0.1	2.4	2.3	1.0	5.0
Wheeler Corr. Fac. <sup>g</sup>	0.7	0.2	2.5	2.4	1.2	4.7
<b>Hawaii</b>						
Oahu Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>d</sup>	4.6%	1.9%	10.7%	0.5%	0.1%	1.6%
Women's Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	3.8	1.7	8.0	2.9	1.2	6.9
<b>Idaho</b>						
Idaho Corr. Fac. <sup>g</sup>	0.5%	0.1%	2.4%	2.3%	1.1%	5.1%
Idaho State Corr. Inst.	2.5	1.1	5.5	4.0	2.0	7.7
<b>Illinois</b>						
East Moline Corr. Ctr.	0.4%	0.1%	1.8%	1.0%	0.3%	3.2%
Illinois River Corr. Ctr.	0.8	0.2	2.8	0.5	0.1	2.5
Lincoln Corr. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	0.7	0.2	2.1	0.7	0.1	3.4
Pontiac Corr. Ctr.	6.9	3.0	15.0	5.7	2.1	14.2
<b>Indiana</b>						
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	6.1%	3.3%	11.0%	2.2%	0.8%	6.0%
Putnamville Corr. Fac.	3.3	1.5	6.8	6.5	3.7	11.2
Westville Corr. Fac.	3.0	1.3	6.8	4.5	2.3	8.7
<b>Iowa</b>						
Iowa Corr. Inst. - Women <sup>f</sup>	7.3%	4.7%	11.3%	1.5%	0.5%	4.7%
Newton Corr. Fac.	3.7	1.8	7.2	2.0	0.7	5.8
<b>Kansas</b>						
Larned Corr. Mental Health Fac.	3.7%	1.5%	9.0%	6.3%	3.3%	11.6%
<b>Kentucky</b>						
Kentucky Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>f</sup>	7.3%	4.4%	11.9%	2.3%	0.8%	6.1%
Luther Luckett Corr. Complex	1.2	0.3	4.1	5.7	3.1	10.1
<b>Louisiana</b>						
Avoyelles Corr. Ctr.	1.7%	0.7%	4.0%	4.0%	2.2%	7.2%
C. Paul Phelps Corr. Ctr.	0.7	0.2	2.2	3.4	1.9	6.2
Louisiana Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>f</sup>	5.7	3.6	8.9	1.8	0.8	4.0



**APPENDIX TABLE 2 (continued)**

Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Maine</b>						
Maine State Prison - Warren	5.9%	3.1%	11.0%	4.9%	2.4%	9.7%
<b>Maryland</b>						
Jessup Pre-Release Unit	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	5.0%	2.8%	8.8%
Maryland Corr. Inst. - Jessup	1.0	0.2	4.8	2.8	1.3	6.1
<b>Massachusetts</b>						
Massachusetts Corr. Inst - Plymouth	0.8%	0.2%	3.3%	3.0%	1.1%	8.0%
<b>Michigan</b>						
Earnest C. Brooks Corr. Fac.	2.2%	0.8%	5.8%	4.9%	2.7%	8.7%
Mid-Michigan Corr. Fac.	2.9	1.3	6.6	1.3	0.4	4.1
Muskegon Corr. Fac.	4.8	2.6	8.6	6.7	2.5	16.3
Richard A. Handlon Corr. Fac.	4.7	2.5	8.7	4.4	2.3	8.1
<b>Minnesota</b>						
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Rush City	2.9%	1.3%	6.3%	5.2%	2.8%	9.5%
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Shakopeef	8.3	4.9	13.9	0.4	0.1	2.0
<b>Mississippi</b>						
Mississippi State Penitentiary	1.9%	0.9%	4.1%	5.9%	3.6%	9.5%
South Mississippi Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.2	2.2	5.0	3.0	8.3
<b>Missouri</b>						
Crossroads Corr. Fac.	2.3%	1.0%	5.1%	8.2%	5.3%	12.6%
Fulton Reception & Diagnostic Ctr.	0.3	0.1	1.6	1.7	0.7	4.0
Women's Eastern Reception, Diagnostic, & Corr. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	7.7	4.9	11.9	1.5	0.5	4.0
<b>Montana</b>						
Montana State Prison	3.8%	2.0%	7.2%	7.2%	4.4%	11.5%
<b>Nebraska</b>						
Diagnostic & Evaluation Ctr.	1.9%	0.7%	5.3%	1.9%	0.7%	5.3%
<b>Nevada</b>						
Northern Nevada Corr. Ctr. <sup>d</sup>	0.8%	0.2%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
<b>New Hampshire</b>						
Lakes Region Fac.	1.1%	0.3%	4.9%	4.0%	1.8%	8.6%
<b>New Jersey</b>						
Bayside State Prison - Ancora Unit	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	1.7%	0.6%	4.6%
Edna Mahan Corr. Fac. for Women <sup>f</sup>	3.6	1.8	6.9	1.9	0.8	4.6
<b>New Mexico</b>						
Southern New Mexico Corr. Fac.	2.2%	0.8%	5.7%	1.9%	0.7%	5.0%
<b>New York</b>						
Attica Corr. Fac.	0.6%	0.1%	2.9%	8.1%	4.8%	13.3%
Bare Hill Corr. Fac.	1.2	0.4	3.2	6.6	4.0	10.9

**APPENDIX TABLE 2 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>New York (continued)</b>						
Bayview Corr. Fac. <sup>f</sup>	4.6%	2.9%	7.3%	11.5%	8.3%	15.6%
Cape Vincent Corr. Fac.	1.0	0.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	2.1
Clinton Corr. Fac.	0.3	0.1	1.8	4.4	2.3	8.2
Coxsackie Corr. Fac.	1.4	0.6	3.4	4.6	2.6	7.8
Elmira Corr. Fac.	3.0	1.3	6.7	7.7	4.5	12.7
Walkill Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	2.3	3.2	1.5	6.8
<b>North Carolina</b>						
Brown Creek Corr. Inst.	0.5%	0.1%	2.6%	1.2%	0.4%	3.9%
Guilford Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	0.0	7.6
Pender Corr. Inst.	0.5	0.1	2.6	1.3	0.4	4.0
Swannanoa Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>f</sup>	1.3	0.5	3.4	0.0	0.0	6.4
Warren Corr. Ctr.	2.2	0.8	6.1	5.9	3.2	10.5
<b>North Dakota</b>						
Dakota Women's Corr. & Rehab. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	2.2%	1.1%	4.6%	0.8%	0.3%	2.1%
James River Corr. Ctr.	1.6	0.7	3.7	1.3	0.3	5.0
<b>Ohio</b>						
Corr. Reception Ctr.	0.4%	0.1%	2.2%	0.7%	0.2%	2.3%
Lebanon Corr. Inst.	3.7	1.9	7.1	2.9	1.4	5.7
Mansfield Corr. Inst.	1.5	0.5	4.3	2.9	1.3	6.4
Ohio Reformatory for Women <sup>f</sup>	5.2	3.0	8.8	3.1	1.5	6.2
Southeastern Corr. Inst.	1.7	0.6	4.6	4.2	2.0	8.6
<b>Oklahoma</b>						
Davis Corr. Fac. <sup>g</sup>	3.9%	1.9%	8.0%	6.1%	3.6%	10.1%
Mack H. Alford Corr. Ctr.	5.2	2.5	10.4	4.8	2.2	10.2
<b>Oregon</b>						
Coffee Creek Corr. Fac. <sup>f</sup>	5.5%	3.3%	9.3%	1.6%	0.5%	4.4%
<b>Pennsylvania</b>						
Camp Hill State Corr. Inst.	0.3%	0.1%	1.8%	1.2%	0.3%	4.4%
Coal Township State Corr. Inst.	2.6	1.3	5.5	1.7	0.7	4.1
Cresson State Corr. Inst.	2.5	1.2	5.1	3.9	2.2	6.8
<b>Rhode Island</b>						
Maximum Security Fac.	0.6%	0.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
<b>South Carolina</b>						
Goodman Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	3.1%	1.4%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
Ridgeland Corr. Inst.	2.2	1.0	4.8	4.8	2.8	8.1
Trenton Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.4	0.6	3.6
<b>South Dakota</b>						
Mike Dufree State Prison & Trusty Unit	3.7%	1.6%	8.0%	2.4%	0.9%	6.5%
<b>Tennessee</b>						
West Tennessee State Penitentiary	1.8%	0.7%	4.5%	5.2%	3.0%	8.7%
<b>Texas</b>						
Allred Unit	7.6%	4.4%	12.9%	5.6%	2.9%	10.4%
Beto Unit	3.1	1.5	6.2	6.0	3.6	9.9
Bridgeport Pre-Parole Fac. <sup>f,g</sup>	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9

**APPENDIX TABLE 2 (continued)**

**Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Texas (continued)</b>						
C. Moore Transfer Fac.	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.4%	0.1%	1.9%
Coffield Unit	1.7	0.6	4.8	3.2	1.6	6.3
Cole State Jail	1.4	0.4	4.3	1.7	0.6	4.5
Crain Unit <sup>f</sup>	3.1	1.4	6.4	2.7	1.2	6.0
Ferguson Unit	1.2	0.3	4.7	7.6	4.7	11.9
Halbert Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Fac. <sup>f</sup>	0.9	0.3	2.5	0.0	0.0	1.6
Hobby Unit <sup>f</sup>	4.3	2.6	7.2	2.0	0.9	4.3
Hughes Unit	8.6	5.2	14.0	3.1	1.3	7.1
Jester Unit III	2.2	0.9	5.3	0.0	0.0	2.0
Lindsey State Jail <sup>g</sup>	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.9	0.8	4.5
Michael Unit	6.1	3.3	11.0	4.8	2.5	9.2
Mountain View Unit <sup>f</sup>	9.2	5.6	14.7	4.3	2.0	9.1
Neal Unit	1.8	0.7	4.3	2.9	1.3	6.5
Plane State Jail <sup>f</sup>	2.8	1.2	6.1	0.1	0.0	0.6
Smith Unit	1.2	0.3	4.0	4.3	2.1	8.6
Telford Unit	4.6	2.4	8.4	5.5	3.1	9.8
<b>Utah</b>						
Central Utah Corr. Fac.	1.6%	0.7%	3.9%	0.7%	0.2%	2.3%
<b>Vermont</b>						
Northwest State Corr. Fac.	2.3%	1.1%	4.7%	3.9%	2.3%	6.4%
<b>Virginia</b>						
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	11.4%	7.7%	16.5%	6.0%	3.7%	9.5%
Haynesville Corr. Ctr.	1.0	0.3	3.4	1.5	0.5	4.0
Lawrenceville Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	0.8	0.2	4.0	3.0	1.4	6.3
<b>Washington</b>						
Airway Heights Corr. Ctr.	1.8%	0.7%	4.4%	2.2%	0.9%	5.3%
Washington Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>f</sup>	5.5	3.2	9.3	1.3	0.4	4.0
<b>West Virginia</b>						
Mount Olive Corr. Complex	3.1%	1.2%	7.5%	5.5%	2.7%	11.0%
<b>Wisconsin</b>						
Dodge Corr. Inst. <sup>e</sup>	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.0%	0.3%	3.3%
New Lisbon Corr. Inst.	0.7	0.1	3.8	2.5	0.9	6.9
Taycheedah Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	11.9	8.2	16.9	1.5	0.6	3.9
Waupun Corr. Inst.	3.1	1.2	8.0	2.5	0.8	7.1
<b>Wyoming</b>						
Wyoming Honor Farm	1.5%	0.6%	3.5%	1.4%	0.6%	3.4%

**APPENDIX TABLE 2 (continued)**

**Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)</b>						
Big Sandy - Camp	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%
Brooklyn Metropolitan Det. Ctr. <sup>d</sup>	0.7	0.1	3.4	0.0	0.0	1.6
Bryan Fed. Prison Camp <sup>f</sup>	1.7	0.6	4.4	0.6	0.1	2.7
Carswell Fed. Med. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	3.6	1.7	7.6	1.9	0.6	5.5
Coleman I U.S. Penitentiary	1.7	0.5	5.7	3.3	1.3	8.1
Coleman Medium Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>e</sup>	0.7	0.1	3.6	0.0	0.0	2.1
Danbury Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	1.4	0.4	4.6	0.0	0.0	2.0
Elkton Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1
Englewood Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.6	4.2	0.3	0.1	1.4
Fairton Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.1	3.0	1.0	0.2	5.0
Florence Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	4.8	1.4	0.3	7.3
Forrest City Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.6	0.6	4.3
Jesup-Fed. Satellite Low	0.9	0.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.4
Morgantown Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4
Oakdale Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.0	0.2	4.8
Petersburg Medium Fed. Corr. Inst.	3.1	1.3	7.6	3.0	1.2	7.7
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.2	2.6	1.4	0.4	4.9
Texarkana Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	2.8	1.2	0.2	6.0
Victorville U.S. Penitentiary	0.7	0.1	3.5	1.7	0.5	5.7

Note: Detail may sum to more than total victimization rate because victims may have reported both inmate-on-inmate and staff-on-inmate sexual victimization.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months, or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Indicates that different samples in the same facility would yield prevalence rates falling between the lower and upper bound estimates 95 out of 100 times.

<sup>c</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on select characteristics, including age, sex, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>c</sup>Standard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the survey estimates. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>d</sup>Facility houses both males and females; both were sampled at this facility.

<sup>e</sup>Facility houses both males and females; only males were sampled at this facility.

<sup>f</sup>Female facility.

<sup>g</sup>Privately operated facility.

**APPENDIX TABLE 3****Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Total</b>	1.3%	1.6%	1.0%	1.6%	1.8%
<b>Alabama</b>					
Bibb Corr. Fac.	1.9%	2.7%	0.3%	1.3%	1.1%
William Donaldson Corr. Fac.	2.9	3.9	1.4	1.5	4.5
<b>Alaska</b>					
Fairbanks Corr. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%
<b>Arizona</b>					
Arizona State Prison Complex - Lewis	0.0%	0.7%	1.4%	1.9%	0.4%
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson <sup>f</sup>	0.3	0.5	0.4	1.7	2.3
<b>Arkansas</b>					
Diagnostic Unit <sup>e</sup>	1.9%	1.9%	0.7%	0.0%	2.2%
McPherson Unit <sup>g</sup>	4.7	7.2	2.3	3.6	2.4
<b>California</b>					
California Corr. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.9%
California Inst. for Women <sup>g</sup>	2.8	3.6	1.6	1.1	1.3
California Med. Fac.	3.9	4.1	1.7	2.5	1.1
Centinela State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Central California Women's Fac. <sup>g</sup>	1.9	2.9	1.1	3.2	0.2
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	0.6	2.8	1.2	1.6	1.0
Deuel Vocational Inst.	1.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.9
Folsom State Prison	0.7	0.7	1.1	1.1	0.8
High Desert State Prison	2.6	1.7	0.4	0.4	0.5
Los Angeles County State Prison	1.1	2.0	1.6	1.8	1.0
North Kern State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.9	2.5
Pleasant Valley State Prison	1.9	5.5	0.6	0.6	1.3
Salinas Valley State Prison	1.6	1.9	0.5	0.8	1.6
Valley State Prison for Women <sup>g</sup>	5.0	6.5	1.3	3.6	2.0
Wasco State Prison-Reception Ctr.	0.5	0.5	1.3	1.0	1.0
<b>Colorado</b>					
Sterling Corr. Fac.	2.6%	2.7%	3.1%	5.0%	3.7%
<b>Connecticut</b>					
Corrigan-Radgowski Corr. Ctr.	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
Osborn Corr. Inst.	0.7	2.4	0.4	0.8	1.3
York Corr. Fac. <sup>g</sup>	4.0	4.1	1.1	2.2	0.4
<b>Delaware</b>					
Sussex Corr. Inst.	0.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
<b>Florida</b>					
Century Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	1.5%	1.4%
Gadsden Corr. Fac. <sup>g,h</sup>	1.4	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.0
Hernando Corr. Inst. <sup>g</sup>	3.6	4.5	0.4	1.0	1.2
Indian River Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.3
Lancaster Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	1.9	1.7	1.1	2.0	2.4
Liberty Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex, & Work Camp <sup>g</sup>	2.4	3.1	1.3	1.3	1.2
Moore Haven Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.1	1.1
Okeechobee Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.8	2.3	2.4	3.4

**APPENDIX TABLE 3 (continued)**

**Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Florida (continued)</b>					
Reception and Med. Ctr. & Reception and Med. Ctr.-West Unit <sup>f</sup>	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.7%	1.0%
South Florida Reception Ctr. & South Unit	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.3
<b>Georgia</b>					
Dodge State Prison	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.0%	2.5%
Dooly State Prison	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.5	2.2
Pulaski State Prison <sup>g</sup>	4.1	4.4	0.0	0.3	0.0
Washington State Prison	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.4	1.9
Wheeler Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.3	2.4
<b>Hawaii</b>					
Oahu Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	3.3%	3.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%
Women's Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	1.7	2.7	0.0	2.9	1.0
<b>Idaho</b>					
Idaho Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	1.0%	1.9%
Idaho State Corr. Inst.	1.7	2.5	1.3	1.3	1.9
<b>Illinois</b>					
East Moline Corr. Ctr.	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	1.0%	0.0%
Illinois River Corr. Ctr.	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.5
Lincoln Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.0
Pontiac Corr. Ctr.	5.0	4.4	0.8	3.4	2.5
<b>Indiana</b>					
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	5.0%	4.3%	1.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Putnamville Corr. Fac.	1.6	2.7	1.4	1.8	4.7
Westville Corr. Fac.	1.4	2.3	0.7	1.8	4.5
<b>Iowa</b>					
Iowa Corr. Inst. - Women <sup>g</sup>	3.4%	5.4%	0.4%	1.5%	1.5%
Newton Corr. Fac.	2.3	2.0	0.7	0.3	1.0
<b>Kansas</b>					
Larned Corr. Mental Health Fac.	0.0%	3.7%	2.5%	3.4%	2.9%
<b>Kentucky</b>					
Kentucky Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>g</sup>	5.1%	6.0%	0.7%	2.3%	0.7%
Luther Luckett Corr. Complex	1.2	1.2	2.1	4.2	3.9
<b>Louisiana</b>					
Avoyelles Corr. Ctr.	1.7%	1.3%	2.2%	3.1%	1.8%
C. Paul Phelps Corr. Ctr.	0.4	0.7	0.3	1.3	2.1
Louisiana Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>g</sup>	2.4	4.9	1.3	1.8	0.0
<b>Maine</b>					
Maine State Prison - Warren	2.7%	5.3%	1.6%	1.7%	2.9%
<b>Maryland</b>					
Jessup Pre-Release Unit	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	3.1%	3.8%
Maryland Corr. Inst. - Jessup	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.6	2.8
<b>Massachusetts</b>					
Massachusetts Corr. Inst - Plymouth	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
<b>Michigan</b>					
Earnest C. Brooks Corr. Fac.	1.4%	2.2%	1.9%	2.4%	2.8%
Mid-Michigan Corr. Fac.	1.4	2.9	0.8	0.8	0.5
Muskegon Corr. Fac.	0.7	4.8	1.1	1.1	5.6

**APPENDIX TABLE 3 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressured <sup>d</sup>
<b>Michigan (continued)</b>					
Richard A. Handlon Corr. Fac.	2.9%	2.7%	1.6%	3.6%	1.6%
<b>Minnesota</b>					
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Rush City	1.9%	1.8%	2.8%	3.5%	3.9%
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Shakopee <sup>9</sup>	5.5	6.8	0.4	0.4	0.0
<b>Mississippi</b>					
Mississippi State Penitentiary	1.2%	1.5%	1.9%	1.9%	5.9%
South Mississippi Corr. Inst.	0.4	0.3	1.0	3.1	2.8
<b>Missouri</b>					
Crossroads Corr. Fac.	1.7%	1.7%	3.8%	5.2%	4.1%
Fulton Reception & Diagnostic Ctr.	0.3	0.0	0.8	1.0	1.7
Women's Eastern Reception, Diagnostic, & Corr. Ctr. <sup>9</sup>	4.9	6.6	0.5	1.0	0.5
<b>Montana</b>					
Montana State Prison	3.6%	1.4%	1.7%	4.7%	5.9%
<b>Nebraska</b>					
Diagnostic & Evaluation Ctr.	1.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.0%
<b>Nevada</b>					
Northern Nevada Corr. Ctr. <sup>6</sup>	0.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>New Hampshire</b>					
Lakes Region Fac.	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
<b>New Jersey</b>					
Bayside State Prison - Ancora Unit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.7%
Edna Mahan Corr. Fac. for Women <sup>9</sup>	1.8	3.6	1.1	1.9	0.6
<b>New Mexico</b>					
Southern New Mexico Corr. Fac.	2.2%	0.9%	1.5%	0.9%	1.3%
<b>New York</b>					
Attica Corr. Fac.	0.6%	0.6%	6.4%	6.0%	2.8%
Bare Hill Corr. Fac.	0.4	1.2	1.7	2.8	4.8
Bayview Corr. Fac. <sup>9</sup>	3.0	4.6	6.5	10.8	0.6
Cape Vincent Corr. Fac.	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clinton Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.3	0.7	1.6	3.1
Coxsackie Corr. Fac.	1.4	1.4	2.9	4.1	1.1
Elmira Corr. Fac.	1.5	3.0	2.5	7.1	1.3
Walkill Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	0.9
<b>North Carolina</b>					
Brown Creek Corr. Inst.	0.0%	0.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%
Guilford Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pender Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.7
Swannanoa Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>9</sup>	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Warren Corr. Ctr.	1.2	1.8	2.0	2.8	5.1
<b>North Dakota</b>					
Dakota Women's Corr. & Rehab. Ctr. <sup>9</sup>	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
James River Corr. Ctr.	1.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.3

**APPENDIX TABLE 3 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Ohio</b>					
Corr. Reception Ctr.	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%
Lebanon Corr. Inst.	2.3	3.2	1.0	1.0	2.3
Mansfield Corr. Inst.	1.5	1.5	0.6	0.7	2.2
Ohio Reformatory for Women <sup>9</sup>	2.3	4.7	0.5	3.1	0.3
Southeastern Corr. Inst.	1.1	1.7	0.7	3.0	3.6
<b>Oklahoma</b>					
Davis Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	3.1%	3.3%	2.3%	3.5%	4.0%
Mack H. Alford Corr. Ctr.	4.7	3.3	1.7	2.6	4.8
<b>Oregon</b>					
Coffee Creek Corr. Fac. <sup>9</sup>	2.6%	3.5%	0.3%	1.6%	0.5%
<b>Pennsylvania</b>					
Camp Hill State Corr. Inst.	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.8%
Coal Township State Corr. Inst.	1.1	1.9	1.7	1.4	0.3
Cresson State Corr. Inst.	1.1	2.2	1.8	3.3	0.8
<b>Rhode Island</b>					
Maximum Security Fac.	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>South Carolina</b>					
Goodman Corr. Inst. <sup>9</sup>	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ridgeland Corr. Inst.	0.7	2.2	1.1	1.4	4.4
Trenton Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.9	0.5
<b>South Dakota</b>					
Mike Dufree State Prison & Trusty Unit	2.7%	3.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%
<b>Tennessee</b>					
West Tennessee State Penitentiary	1.2%	1.8%	1.2%	1.2%	4.7%
<b>Texas</b>					
Allred Unit	6.8%	3.9%	3.2%	3.7%	3.2%
Beto Unit	1.8	3.1	1.0	1.9	5.6
Bridgeport Pre-Parole Fac. <sup>9,h</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
C. Moore Transfer Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
Coffield Unit	1.7	0.4	0.9	1.4	2.3
Cole State Jail	1.4	0.7	1.2	0.5	0.5
Crain Unit <sup>9</sup>	1.9	2.2	0.5	1.1	1.6
Ferguson Unit	0.0	1.2	1.1	3.1	5.8
Halbert Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Fac. <sup>9</sup>	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hobby Unit <sup>9</sup>	3.2	1.9	1.1	0.8	0.4
Hughes Unit	5.9	6.5	1.1	2.6	1.7
Jester Unit III	1.3	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lindsey State Jail <sup>h</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	1.5
Michael Unit	3.1	6.1	1.7	3.2	2.8
Mountain View Unit <sup>9</sup>	5.0	7.1	2.1	3.7	0.7
Neal Unit	1.4	1.4	0.5	1.7	1.7
Plane State Jail <sup>9</sup>	1.7	2.4	0.0	0.1	0.0
Smith Unit	0.6	1.2	2.6	2.6	1.7
Telford Unit	3.1	3.9	2.2	1.3	4.2



**APPENDIX TABLE 3 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressured <sup>d</sup>
<b>Utah</b>					
Central Utah Corr. Fac.	1.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
<b>Vermont</b>					
Northwest State Corr. Fac.	0.0%	2.3%	0.8%	1.9%	2.0%
<b>Virginia</b>					
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	5.9%	9.5%	1.5%	4.3%	2.4%
Haynesville Corr. Ctr.	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.5	0.9
Lawrenceville Corr. Ctr. <sup>h</sup>	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.1	1.7
<b>Washington</b>					
Airway Heights Corr. Ctr.	1.4%	1.8%	1.6%	2.2%	1.1%
Washington Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>g</sup>	3.2	4.9	0.8	0.8	1.3
<b>West Virginia</b>					
Mount Olive Corr. Complex	1.9%	1.2%	2.7%	2.4%	3.5%
<b>Wisconsin</b>					
Dodge Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%
New Lisbon Corr. Inst.	0.7	0.7	0.0	1.9	1.3
Taycheedah Corr. Inst. <sup>g</sup>	3.9	10.8	1.0	0.5	0.6
Waupun Corr. Inst.	1.3	3.1	0.5	0.5	2.5
<b>Wyoming</b>					
Wyoming Honor Farm	0.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
<b>Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)</b>					
Big Sandy - Camp	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Brooklyn Metropolitan Det. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bryan Fed. Prison Camp <sup>g</sup>	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0
Carswell Fed. Med. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	1.9	2.4	1.2	1.0	0.0
Coleman I U.S. Penitentiary	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.6	1.2
Coleman Medium Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Danbury Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>g</sup>	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Elkton Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Englewood Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3
Fairton Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Florence Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4
Forrest City Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.0
Jesup-Fed. Satellite Low	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Morgantown Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oakdale Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Petersburg Medium Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	3.1	0.4	2.3	1.1

**APPENDIX TABLE 3 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons) (continued)</b>					
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0%	0.8%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%
Texarkana Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Victorville U.S. Penitentiary	0.0	0.7	1.0	1.7	0.7

Note: Detail may sum to more than total victimization rate because victims may report on more than one incident involving different levels of coercion.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Physical force or threat of physical force reported.

<sup>c</sup>Includes incidents in which the perpetrator, without using force, pressured the inmate or made the inmate feel that they had to participate. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>d</sup>Includes incidents in which the staff offered favors or privileges in exchange for sex or sexual contact and incidents in which the inmate reported that they willingly had sex or sexual contact with staff.

<sup>e</sup>Facility houses both males and females; both were sampled at this facility.

<sup>f</sup>Facility houses both males and females; only males were sampled in this facility.

<sup>g</sup>Female facility.

<sup>h</sup>Privately operated facility.

**APPENDIX TABLE 4****Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Total</b>	3.1%	2.7%	3.5%	1.3%	1.1%	1.6%
<b>Alabama</b>						
Bibb Corr. Fac.	2.4%	1.2%	4.6%	2.0%	1.0%	4.2%
William Donaldson Corr. Fac.	4.9	2.8	8.5	3.9	2.0	7.3
<b>Alaska</b>						
Fairbanks Corr. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	2.1%	0.8%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%
<b>Arizona</b>						
Arizona State Prison Complex - Lewis	1.9%	0.7%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson <sup>f</sup>	2.6	1.2	5.5	0.8	0.2	3.1
<b>Arkansas</b>						
Diagnostic Unit <sup>e</sup>	4.8%	2.4%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
McPherson Unit <sup>g</sup>	4.5	2.6	7.7	5.7	3.5	9.2
<b>California</b>						
California Corr. Ctr.	0.9%	0.2%	3.1%	0.5%	0.1%	2.9%
California Inst. for Women <sup>g</sup>	2.7	1.2	6.0	3.4	1.6	7.2
California Med. Fac.	3.9	2.3	6.6	5.1	3.1	8.2
Centinela State Prison	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.6
Central California Women's Fac. <sup>g</sup>	3.3	1.4	7.3	1.9	0.8	4.9
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	2.7	1.2	6.1	0.9	0.3	3.3
Deuel Vocational Inst.	1.7	0.7	4.2	0.9	0.3	3.4
Folsom State Prison	0.4	0.1	2.1	1.1	0.3	4.0
High Desert State Prison	2.6	1.1	6.2	0.9	0.2	3.5
Los Angeles County State Prison	3.4	1.7	6.6	0.5	0.1	2.7
North Kern State Prison	2.5	1.1	5.7	0.0	0.0	1.8
Pleasant Valley State Prison	4.6	2.4	8.5	1.4	0.4	5.0
Salinas Valley State Prison	3.5	1.2	9.4	1.3	0.4	3.8
Valley State Prison for Women <sup>g</sup>	5.3	2.8	9.7	2.9	1.4	6.0
Wasco State Prison-Reception Ctr.	1.9	0.7	4.7	0.0	0.0	1.7
<b>Colorado</b>						
Sterling Corr. Fac.	6.2%	3.5%	10.7%	1.3%	0.4%	3.6%
<b>Connecticut</b>						
Corrigan-Radgowski Corr. Ctr.	1.8%	0.6%	5.1%	1.2%	0.3%	4.4%
Osborn Corr. Inst.	2.6	1.2	5.4	1.4	0.5	3.9
York Corr. Fac. <sup>g</sup>	2.6	1.2	5.6	4.9	2.6	8.8
<b>Delaware</b>						
Sussex Corr. Inst.	2.5%	1.3%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
<b>Florida</b>						
Century Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	1.9%	0.8%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Gadsden Corr. Fac. <sup>g,h</sup>	0.4	0.1	2.0	2.0	0.8	4.8
Hernando Corr. Inst. <sup>g</sup>	3.2	1.7	6.0	3.3	1.8	5.9
Indian River Corr. Inst.	1.2	0.5	2.9	0.7	0.2	2.3
Lancaster Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	4.3	2.4	7.8	2.3	1.1	4.9
Liberty Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	1.5	0.6	3.7	0.5	0.1	2.5
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex, & Work Camp <sup>g</sup>	3.2	1.7	5.9	1.3	0.5	3.2
Moore Haven Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	1.6	0.6	4.2	0.0	0.0	1.7

**APPENDIX TABLE 4 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Florida (continued)</b>						
Okeechobee Corr. Inst.	4.4%	2.6%	7.3%	1.8%	0.7%	4.2%
Reception and Med. Ctr. & Reception and Med. Ctr.-West Unit <sup>f</sup>	1.4	0.5	4.0	0.3	0.1	1.4
South Florida Reception Ctr. & South Unit	0.9	0.3	2.5	0.8	0.2	3.0
<b>Georgia</b>						
Dodge State Prison	2.0%	0.8%	4.7%	0.5%	0.1%	2.5%
Dooly State Prison	2.4	1.1	5.3	0.3	0.1	1.5
Pulaski State Prison <sup>g</sup>	2.7	1.4	5.1	3.5	1.8	6.4
Washington State Prison	2.3	1.0	5.0	0.5	0.1	2.4
Wheeler Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	2.5	1.3	4.9	0.6	0.2	2.1
<b>Hawaii</b>						
Oahu Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	3.5%	1.3%	9.0%	1.3%	0.2%	6.3%
Women's Community Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	4.0	1.8	8.4	1.1	0.3	4.3
<b>Idaho</b>						
Idaho Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	2.3%	1.1%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Idaho State Corr. Inst.	6.0	3.5	10.2	0.0	0.0	1.8
<b>Illinois</b>						
East Moline Corr. Ctr.	1.4%	0.5%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Illinois River Corr. Ctr.	1.3	0.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	1.9
Lincoln Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.4	0.5	3.9
Pontiac Corr. Ctr.	7.4	3.4	15.6	4.6	1.5	13.4
<b>Indiana</b>						
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	3.3%	1.4%	7.2%	4.3%	2.0%	8.8%
Putnamville Corr. Fac.	5.7	3.2	10.1	2.4	0.9	5.7
Westville Corr. Fac.	4.8	2.5	9.2	0.9	0.3	3.3
<b>Iowa</b>						
Iowa Corr. Inst. - Women <sup>g</sup>	4.3%	2.4%	7.5%	3.4%	1.7%	6.6%
Newton Corr. Fac.	3.4	1.5	7.5	2.3	1.0	5.2
<b>Kansas</b>						
Larned Corr. Mental Health Fac.	5.3%	2.6%	10.5%	3.7%	1.5%	9.0%
<b>Kentucky</b>						
Kentucky Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>g</sup>	2.8%	1.2%	6.4%	6.8%	3.9%	11.4%
Luther Lockett Corr. Complex	5.1	2.7	9.4	1.0	0.3	3.4
<b>Louisiana</b>						
Avoyelles Corr. Ctr.	4.0%	2.2%	7.1%	1.3%	0.5%	3.6%
C. Paul Phelps Corr. Ctr.	2.9	1.5	5.4	1.3	0.5	3.2
Louisiana Corr. Inst. for Women <sup>g</sup>	2.5	1.3	5.0	4.9	3.0	8.0
<b>Maine</b>						
Maine State Prison - Warren	9.3%	5.5%	15.1%	0.6%	0.1%	3.0%
<b>Maryland</b>						
Jessup Pre-Release Unit	4.3%	2.3%	7.9%	0.7%	0.2%	3.0%
Maryland Corr. Inst. - Jessup	3.8	1.8	7.8	0.0	0.0	2.5
<b>Massachusetts</b>						
Massachusetts Corr. Inst - Plymouth	3.0%	1.1%	8.0%	0.8%	0.2%	3.3%

**APPENDIX TABLE 4 (continued)**

**Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Michigan</b>						
Earnest C. Brooks Corr. Fac.	5.0%	2.7%	9.0%	1.3%	0.4%	3.5%
Mid-Michigan Corr. Fac.	3.4	1.6	7.1	0.8	0.2	3.6
Muskegon Corr. Fac.	7.0	4.1	11.8	4.4	1.1	15.3
Richard A. Handlon Corr. Fac.	5.0	2.8	8.7	2.3	0.9	5.6
<b>Minnesota</b>						
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Rush City	3.1%	1.4%	6.8%	4.2%	2.1%	8.0%
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Shakopee <sup>9</sup>	4.6	2.0	10.1	3.7	2.0	6.9
<b>Mississippi</b>						
Mississippi State Penitentiary	7.0%	4.5%	10.8%	0.5%	0.1%	1.8%
South Mississippi Corr. Inst.	4.5	2.7	7.7	1.1	0.4	3.2
<b>Missouri</b>						
Crossroads Corr. Fac.	7.1%	4.4%	11.3%	2.2%	1.0%	5.0%
Fulton Reception & Diagnostic Ctr.	1.7	0.7	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Women's Eastern Reception, Diagnostic, & Corr. Ctr. <sup>9</sup>	2.0	0.8	4.8	6.8	4.2	10.8
<b>Montana</b>						
Montana State Prison	7.8%	4.9%	12.2%	2.9%	1.4%	6.0%
<b>Nebraska</b>						
Diagnostic & Evaluation Ctr.	1.9%	0.7%	5.3%	1.0%	0.2%	3.8%
<b>Nevada</b>						
Northern Nevada Corr. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	0.8%	0.2%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
<b>New Hampshire</b>						
Lakes Region Fac.	4.0%	1.8%	8.6%	1.1%	0.3%	4.9%
<b>New Jersey</b>						
Bayside State Prison - Ancora Unit	1.7%	0.6%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Edna Mahan Corr. Fac. for Women <sup>9</sup>	0.9	0.3	3.0	3.6	1.8	6.9
<b>New Mexico</b>						
Southern New Mexico Corr. Fac.	1.7%	0.6%	4.6%	1.5%	0.5%	4.5%
<b>New York</b>						
Attica Corr. Fac.	2.7%	1.1%	6.8%	5.3%	2.8%	9.6%
Bare Hill Corr. Fac.	6.0	3.5	10.2	1.8	0.7	4.3
Bayview Corr. Fac. <sup>9</sup>	10.2	7.3	14.2	4.4	2.6	7.3
Cape Vincent Corr. Fac.	0.4	0.1	2.1	0.6	0.1	2.8
Clinton Corr. Fac.	3.1	1.4	6.6	1.6	0.6	4.1
Coxsackie Corr. Fac.	3.3	1.9	5.9	2.4	1.1	5.3
Elmira Corr. Fac.	8.0	4.8	13.0	1.8	0.6	5.0
Walkill Corr. Fac.	0.9	0.3	2.9	2.3	0.9	5.9
<b>North Carolina</b>						
Brown Creek Corr. Inst.	1.2%	0.4%	3.9%	0.5%	0.1%	2.6%
Guilford Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	0.0	7.6
Pender Corr. Inst.	1.1	0.4	3.6	0.7	0.1	3.2
Swannanoa Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>9</sup>	0.0	0.0	6.4	1.3	0.5	3.4
Warren Corr. Ctr.	3.5	1.8	7.0	3.4	1.4	8.1

**APPENDIX TABLE 4 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>North Dakota</b>						
Dakota Women's Corr. & Rehab. Ctr. <sup>9</sup>	2.1%	1.0%	4.3%	0.9%	0.3%	2.5%
James River Corr. Ctr.	0.4	0.1	1.6	2.5	1.0	5.9
<b>Ohio</b>						
Corr. Reception Ctr.	0.7%	0.2%	2.3%	0.4%	0.1%	2.2%
Lebanon Corr. Inst.	3.6	2.0	6.6	2.0	0.8	5.0
Mansfield Corr. Inst.	1.9	0.7	5.3	2.5	1.1	5.6
Ohio Reformatory for Women <sup>9</sup>	3.2	1.6	6.1	4.5	2.5	7.9
Southeastern Corr. Inst.	5.3	2.7	9.9	0.0	0.0	2.6
<b>Oklahoma</b>						
Davis Corr. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	6.9%	4.1%	11.4%	2.3%	1.0%	5.0%
Mack H. Alford Corr. Ctr.	5.1	2.4	10.4	2.8	1.0	7.8
<b>Oregon</b>						
Coffee Creek Corr. Fac. <sup>9</sup>	2.3%	1.0%	5.4%	4.8%	2.7%	8.4%
<b>Pennsylvania</b>						
Camp Hill State Corr. Inst.	1.2%	0.3%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Coal Township State Corr. Inst.	2.3	1.0	5.0	1.6	0.7	4.0
Cresson State Corr. Inst.	3.6	2.0	6.5	2.0	0.9	4.4
<b>Rhode Island</b>						
Maximum Security Fac.	0.6%	0.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
<b>South Carolina</b>						
Goodman Corr. Inst. <sup>9</sup>	1.1%	0.3%	3.8%	2.0%	0.8%	5.2%
Ridgeland Corr. Inst.	5.3	3.1	8.7	0.9	0.3	3.1
Trenton Corr. Inst.	0.9	0.3	2.7	0.5	0.1	2.4
<b>South Dakota</b>						
Mike Durfee State Prison & Trusty Unit	4.5%	2.1%	9.5%	1.6%	0.6%	4.4%
<b>Tennessee</b>						
West Tennessee State Penitentiary	5.6%	3.4%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
<b>Texas</b>						
Allred Unit	6.5%	3.7%	11.2%	4.4%	2.0%	9.2%
Beto Unit	6.0	3.6	9.8	1.3	0.5	3.7
Bridgeport Pre-Parole Fac. <sup>9,h</sup>	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.9
C. Moore Transfer Fac.	0.4	0.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.0
Coffield Unit	3.6	1.8	6.8	1.2	0.3	4.4
Cole State Jail	0.5	0.1	2.4	2.6	1.1	5.9
Crain Unit <sup>9</sup>	2.6	1.1	5.8	1.9	0.8	4.6
Ferguson Unit	7.3	4.4	11.9	1.2	0.5	3.2
Halbert Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Fac. <sup>9</sup>	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.9	0.3	2.5
Hobby Unit <sup>9</sup>	2.3	1.1	4.6	3.2	1.7	5.8
Hughes Unit	3.9	1.9	7.7	6.4	3.5	11.3
Jester Unit III	1.2	0.4	3.8	1.0	0.3	3.7
Lindsey State Jail <sup>h</sup>	1.5	0.6	4.1	0.3	0.1	1.6
Michael Unit	7.6	4.4	12.8	1.5	0.4	5.2
Mountain View Unit <sup>9</sup>	4.8	2.4	9.4	5.6	2.9	10.6
Neal Unit	2.9	1.3	6.5	1.4	0.5	3.7

**APPENDIX TABLE 4 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Texas (continued)</b>						
Plane State Jail <sup>g</sup>	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	2.8%	1.2%	6.1%
Smith Unit	2.3	0.9	5.6	3.2	1.4	7.3
Telford Unit	7.3	4.3	11.9	0.4	0.1	2.4
<b>Utah</b>						
Central Utah Corr. Fac.	1.1%	0.4%	2.9%	1.2%	0.5%	3.4%
<b>Vermont</b>						
Northwest State Corr. Fac.	6.2%	4.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%
<b>Virginia</b>						
Fluvanna Corr. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	10.5%	7.0%	15.4%	3.8%	2.0%	7.2%
Haynesville Corr. Ctr.	1.5	0.6	4.1	1.0	0.3	3.2
Lawrenceville Corr. Ctr. <sup>h</sup>	2.6	1.1	5.9	1.2	0.3	4.1
<b>Washington</b>						
Airway Heights Corr. Ctr.	2.0%	0.8%	4.8%	1.5%	0.5%	4.1%
Washington Corr. Ctr. for Women <sup>g</sup>	4.2	2.2	7.8	1.8	0.8	4.3
<b>West Virginia</b>						
Mount Olive Corr. Complex	6.0%	3.0%	11.5%	0.8%	0.1%	3.9%
<b>Wisconsin</b>						
Dodge Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	1.0%	0.3%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
New Lisbon Corr. Inst.	2.5	0.9	6.9	0.0	0.0	3.4
Taycheedah Corr. Inst. <sup>g</sup>	6.5	4.0	10.3	6.4	3.7	10.8
Waupun Corr. Inst.	5.1	2.3	10.9	0.0	0.0	3.3
<b>Wyoming</b>						
Wyoming Honor Farm	2.8%	1.5%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
<b>Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)</b>						
Big Sandy - Camp	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%
Brooklyn Metropolitan Det. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	0.7	0.1	3.4	0.0	0.0	1.6
Bryan Fed. Prison Camp <sup>g</sup>	0.6	0.1	2.7	1.7	0.6	4.4
Carswell Fed. Med. Ctr. <sup>g</sup>	2.0	0.7	5.5	2.9	1.2	6.6
Coleman I U.S. Penitentiary	5.0	2.3	10.3	0.0	0.0	2.5
Coleman Medium Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>f</sup>	0.7	0.1	3.6	0.0	0.0	2.1
Danbury Fed. Corr. Inst. <sup>g</sup>	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.4	0.4	4.6
Elkton Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1
Englewood Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.5	0.1	2.3	1.4	0.5	3.8
Fairton Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.2	5.0	0.6	0.1	3.0
Florence Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.4	0.3	7.3	0.0	0.0	4.8
Forrest City Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.6	4.3	0.0	0.0	1.8
Jesup-Fed. Satellite Low	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.9	0.2	4.2
Morgantown Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4
Oakdale Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	1.9
Petersburg Medium Fed. Corr. Inst.	3.4	1.4	8.1	0.4	0.1	2.4

**APPENDIX TABLE 4 (continued)****Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)</b>						
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	2.2	0.8	5.5	0.0	0.0	2.3
Texarkana Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.2%	0.2%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Victorville U.S. Penitentiary	2.4	0.8	6.5	0.0	0.0	2.9

Note: Detail may not sum to total percent victimized within facility due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all inmates who reported unwanted contacts with another inmate or unwilling contacts with staff that involved oral sex, anal sex, vaginal sex, handjobs, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Includes all inmates who reported unwanted contacts with another inmate or unwilling contacts with staff that involved touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>c</sup>Indicates that different samples in the same facility would yield prevalence rates falling between the lower and upper bound estimates 95 out of 100 times.

<sup>d</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on select characteristics, including age, sex, race, time served, and sentence length. (See Methodology.)

<sup>e</sup>Facility houses both males and females; both were sampled at this facility.

<sup>f</sup>Facility houses both males and females; only males were sampled at this facility.

<sup>g</sup>Female facility.

<sup>h</sup>Privately operated facility.



**APPENDIX TABLE 5****Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Total</b>	224,484	45,126	68%	3.1%	2.9%	3.3%
<b>Alabama</b>						
Chilton Co. Jail	152	98	86%	3.5%	2.2%	5.6%
Houston Co. Jail	528	216	89	7.4	5.0	10.7
Madison Co. Det. Fac.	890	293	71	7.2	5.1	9.9
Montgomery Co. Det. Fac.	567	243	90	3.1	1.9	5.1
Russell Co. Jail	323	174	86	3.2	1.9	5.3
<b>Arizona</b>						
Maricopa Co. - Durango Jail	2,178	281	83%	3.0%	1.7%	5.4%
Maricopa Co. - Tent City Jail	970	254	84	1.9	0.9	4.0
Maricopa Co. - Towers Jail	992	237	77	6.2	3.9	9.9
Mohave Co. Jail	515	190	77	4.8	3.0	7.5
Pima Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	1,890	260	77	1.0	0.4	2.7
<b>Arkansas</b>						
Drew Co. Det. Fac.	35	25	93%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%
Faulkner Co. Det. Ctr.	191	129	84	3.5	2.3	5.2
Garland Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	261	130	74	5.8	3.7	9.1
Sharp Co. Det. Ctr.	43	34	92	0.0	0.0	10.2
<b>California</b>						
Butte Co. Jail	523	186	76%	2.7%	1.4%	5.3%
Fresno Co. - Main Jail, North Annex, & South Annex	3,268	231	55	4.9	2.8	8.5
Kern Co. - Lerdo Min. Security Fac.	615	230	85	2.4	1.3	4.6
Lake Co. - Hill Road Corr. Fac.	233	111	57	0.5	0.2	1.9
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - East Fac.	2,033	251	75	3.8	2.0	7.1
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - North Fac.	1,240	212	66	1.0	0.3	3.7
Los Angeles Co. - Men's Central Jail	5,512	234	53	5.0	2.4	10.0
Madera Co. Jail	430	164	64	4.9	3.0	8.1
Mendocino Co. Jail	336	160	69	2.8	1.3	5.9
Monterey Co. Jail	1,082	198	65	3.7	1.9	7.3
Orange Co. - Central Jail Complex	2,675	236	72	3.0	1.6	5.8
Orange Co. - J.A. Musick Fac.	732	224	76	2.2	1.1	4.4
Riverside Co. - Robert Presley Det. Ctr.	1,250	162	51	4.7	2.4	9.0
Riverside Co. - Southwest Det. Ctr.	1,164	191	58	3.1	1.4	6.6
Sacramento Co. - Main Jail	2,688	258	68	5.4	3.3	8.9
San Bernardino Co. - Central Det. Ctr.	1,059	211	70	0.7	0.2	2.2
San Bernardino Co. - West Valley Det. Ctr.	3,180	320	44	5.1	3.3	7.7
San Diego Co. - Central Det. Fac.	1,077	174	56	6.7	4.0	11.1
San Diego Co. - Descanso Det. Fac.	340	141	73	1.8	0.9	3.7
San Francisco Co. - County Jail #8	413	123	73	6.0	3.8	9.3
San Joaquin Co. Jail	1,699	215	66	2.8	1.2	6.3
San Mateo Co. - Maguire Corr. Fac.	1,033	177	64	1.6	0.6	4.1
Santa Cruz Co. - Blaine Street Fac. <sup>9</sup>	17	13	82	7.7	3.1	17.8
Solano Co. - Sentenced Det. Fac.	360	118	67	0.7	0.2	2.7
Sonoma Co. - North Det. Fac.	323	166	81	1.6	0.8	3.2

**APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)****Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Colorado</b>						
Adams Co. Det. Fac.	1,548	214	65%	1.1%	0.5%	2.6%
Arapahoe Co. Jail	1,293	227	67	2.8	1.3	5.7
El Paso Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	1,603	251	63	1.7	0.7	4.1
Jefferson Co. Jail	1,179	239	69	1.4	0.6	3.3
Logan Co. Jail	94	66	73	3.3	1.6	6.8
<b>District of Columbia</b>						
D.C. Dept of Corr. - Central Det. Fac. & Corr. Treatment Fac.	3,136	167	46%	6.0%	3.1%	11.0%
<b>Florida</b>						
Bay Co. Jail	801	226	79%	2.3%	1.1%	4.7%
Broward Co. - Joseph V. Conte Fac.	1,362	234	75	3.5	1.8	6.4
Broward Co. - Main Jail	1,602	181	57	4.6	2.5	8.2
Broward Co. - North Broward Bureau	767	209	74	4.5	2.7	7.5
Broward Co. - Paul Rein Det. Fac.	1,071	237	77	3.2	1.7	5.7
Charlotte Co. Jail	534	140	59	3.2	1.5	6.8
Hardee Co. Jail	91	60	73	2.2	0.8	5.9
Highlands Co. Jail	454	167	66	1.7	0.7	3.9
Hillsborough Co. - Falkenburg Road Jail	2,697	250	68	2.1	0.9	4.5
Jacksonville - James I. Montgomery Corr. Ctr.	600	250	93	2.1	1.1	3.9
Marion Co. Jail	1,516	270	80	1.8	0.8	3.9
Miami-Dade Co. - Metro West Det. Ctr.	2,389	233	66	1.7	0.7	4.2
Miami-Dade Co. - Pre-trial Det. Ctr.	1,780	158	50	7.8	4.9	12.2
Monroe Co. Det. Ctr.	611	192	81	2.9	1.5	5.5
Nassau Co. Det. Fac.	271	168	87	0.7	0.2	1.9
Okaloosa Co. Jail	525	224	83	2.6	1.4	4.5
Osceola Co. Jail	1,257	207	69	1.0	0.3	3.4
Palm Beach Co. - Main Det. Ctr.	2,103	218	63	2.4	1.1	4.9
Pinellas Co. Med. Security Fac.	804	239	85	3.4	2.0	5.7
Polk Co. - Central County Jail	1,033	226	63	1.6	0.7	4.0
St. Lucie Co. Main Jail	1,458	268	79	2.5	1.2	5.1
Volusia Co. Branch Jail	1,030	248	80	2.2	1.1	4.7
Walton Co. Jail	218	148	85	3.3	2.1	5.0
<b>Georgia</b>						
Atlanta City Jail	1,071	188	71%	4.5%	2.4%	8.2%
Bulloch Co. Jail	416	210	93	5.0	3.4	7.3
Chatham Co. Det. Ctr.	1,960	255	64	1.4	0.6	3.3
Clarke Co. Jail	438	182	83	1.5	0.7	3.2
Clayton Co. Jail	1,828	248	78	1.6	0.8	3.5
Cobb Co. - Jail & Prison Unit	2,630	276	84	2.1	0.9	4.6
Coweta Co. Prison	211	184	91	0.0	0.0	2.0
Dekalb Co. Jail	3,713	263	76	4.3	2.5	7.4
Fulton Co. - Alpharetta Annex	50	33	81	0.0	0.0	10.4
Gilmer Co. Jail	125	54	54	0.0	0.0	6.6
Houston Co. Jail	579	186	75	1.9	0.9	4.1

**APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)**

**Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 200-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Georgia (continued)</b>						
Jackson Co. Jail	163	84	63%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%
Jasper Co. Jail	30	19	79	0.0	0.0	16.8
Lowndes Co. Jail	805	243	81	2.3	1.2	4.4
Muscogee Co. Prison	592	232	86	2.2	1.1	4.2
Richmond Co. - Charles B. Webster Det. Ctr.	696	219	80	3.2	1.7	5.7
Roswell City Jail	40	9	53	0.0	0.0	29.9
Turner Co. Jail	48	21	65	0.0	0.0	15.5
Ware Co. Jail	387	212	93	4.1	2.7	6.1
<b>Idaho</b>						
Canyon Co. Jail	475	194	76%	3.5%	2.0%	6.0%
Madison Co. Jail	78	40	56	1.1	0.3	3.9
<b>Illinois</b>						
Cook Co. Jail - Division 1	1,175	265	81%	5.2%	3.3%	8.0%
Cook Co. Jail - Division 6	1,026	268	86	6.4	4.4	9.3
Cook Co. Jail - Division 9	864	195	65	5.0	2.9	8.5
DuPage Co. Jail	855	215	71	3.6	2.0	6.3
LaSalle Co. Jail	210	118	77	3.9	2.3	6.5
Vermilion Co. Jail	225	143	86	3.1	1.9	5.0
Winnebago Co. Jail	842	204	69	4.3	2.5	7.5
<b>Indiana</b>						
Boone Co. Jail	102	72	85%	1.3%	0.6%	3.0%
Brown Co. Jail	40	22	77	0.0	0.0	14.9
Madison Co. Det. Ctr.	312	158	78	5.5	3.8	8.0
Marion Co. Jail II <sup>h</sup>	1,378	218	67	3.4	1.7	7.0
Pulaski Co. Jail	107	88	95	1.9	1.2	2.8
Vigo Co. Jail	318	148	80	6.5	4.3	9.6
<b>Iowa</b>						
Black Hawk Co. Jail	224	140	78%	2.7%	1.6%	4.4%
Linn Co. Corr. Ctr.	305	126	58	4.1	2.0	8.0
<b>Kansas</b>						
Butler Co. Jail	216	121	71%	3.9%	2.4%	6.4%
Johnson Co. - New Century Adult Det. Ctr.	313	112	64	2.4	1.0	5.5
Rice Co. Jail	45	13	38	0.0	0.0	22.8
Sedgwick Co. Jail	1,405	187	69	2.1	1.0	4.6
<b>Kentucky</b>						
Campbell Co. Det. Ctr.	379	184	77%	2.7%	1.5%	4.8%
Floyd Co. Det. Ctr.	170	87	64	3.2	1.4	7.0
Franklin Co. Regional Jail	306	110	71	0.0	0.0	3.4
Henderson Co. Det. Ctr.	554	177	69	1.5	0.6	3.7
Jessamine Co. Det. Ctr.	137	46	44	0.0	0.0	7.7
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Community Corr. Ctr.	204	88	56	2.8	1.3	5.9
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Metro Corr. Fac.	1,782	225	68	2.0	0.9	4.3
Warren Co. Regional Jail	535	192	71	3.3	1.7	6.1

**APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)****Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Louisiana</b>						
Calcasieu Parish Corr. Ctr.	1,244	253	77%	2.6%	1.3%	5.4%
Morehouse Parish Det. Ctr.	231	176	93	1.1	0.6	2.2
Natchitoches Det. Ctr.	438	201	88	1.3	0.6	2.5
Orleans Parish - Conchetta Jail	442	141	62	3.2	1.5	6.8
Orleans Parish - Old Parish Prison	997	263	72	3.1	1.7	5.6
Orleans Parish - South White Street Jail <sup>g</sup>	209	138	83	8.9	6.7	11.7
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase III	914	201	57	5.1	3.0	8.5
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase V	286	116	54	3.5	2.0	6.2
Ouachita Parish Corr. Fac.	944	256	92	5.2	3.3	8.1
Richland Parish Det. Ctr.	673	270	96	2.8	1.7	4.7
Webster Parish - Bayou Dorcheat Corr. Ctr.	411	203	94	1.7	0.8	3.5
<b>Maine</b>						
Kennebec Co. Jail	161	93	66%	4.8%	2.5%	9.0%
<b>Maryland</b>						
Allegany Co. Det. Ctr.	146	56	47%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%
Baltimore Co. Det. Ctr.	1,424	159	52	4.0	1.9	8.1
Caroline Co. Jail	86	32	46	10.0	3.2	27.4
Cecil Co. Det. Ctr.	257	117	54	2.7	1.4	5.3
Prince George's Co. Corr. Ctr.	1,264	228	70	3.5	1.9	6.4
<b>Massachusetts</b>						
Bristol Co. - Dartmouth Fac.	1,212	229	51%	3.0%	1.6%	5.5%
Bristol Co. - New Bedford Fac.	199	124	75	0.7	0.2	1.9
Hampshire Co. - Jail & House of Corr.	299	158	82	1.0	0.4	2.4
Suffolk Co. House of Corr.	1,799	216	65	4.2	2.0	8.4
Worcester Co. Jail & House of Corr.	1,166	204	67	1.5	0.6	4.0
<b>Michigan</b>						
Barry Co. Jail	54	36	76%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%
Jackson Co. - Chanter Road Corr. Fac.	208	119	69	3.6	2.0	6.4
Kent Co. Corr. Fac.	1,185	215	71	3.8	2.1	6.9
Lenawee Co. Jail	267	141	76	0.9	0.4	2.0
Muskegon Co. Jail	395	195	88	2.9	1.6	5.1
Saginaw Co. Jail	501	158	63	3.0	1.5	5.8
Wayne Co. - Andrew C. Baird Det. Fac.	1,606	254	74	2.3	1.1	4.7
<b>Minnesota</b>						
Beltrami Co. Jail	125	37	48%	2.9%	0.7%	10.7%
Morrison Co. Jail	79	39	67	4.2	1.8	9.5
Sherburne Co. Jail	501	128	49	2.3	0.9	5.6
<b>Mississippi</b>						
Bolivar Co. Jail	423	213	92%	2.0%	1.1%	3.6%
Copiah Co. Det. Ctr.	60	46	86	2.1	1.0	4.7
Hinds Co. Penal Farm	271	164	80	0.5	0.2	1.6
Issaquena Co. Corr. Fac.	66	39	73	3.5	1.2	9.3
Jackson Co. Jail	425	211	87	4.7	3.0	7.2

**APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)**

**Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Mississippi (continued)</b>						
Lee. Co. Work Ctr.	16	12	93%	0.0%	0.0%	24.3%
Rankin Co. Jail	409	182	72	6.0	3.6	9.7
Winston-Choctaw Co. Regional Corr. Fac.	327	188	87	3.4	2.1	5.6
<b>Missouri</b>						
Jackson Co. Det. Ctr.	1,065	231	70%	5.4%	3.4%	8.5%
Jefferson Co. Jail	218	127	81	5.5	3.7	7.9
Joplin City Jail	73	29	82	2.5	1.0	6.3
Lincoln Co. Jail	188	94	66	3.3	1.7	6.4
St. Louis - Med. Security Inst. & City Justice Ctr.	789	150	57	5.8	3.4	9.6
<b>Nebraska</b>						
Buffalo Co. Jail	76	40	75%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%
Dodge Co. Jail	39	18	49	0.0	0.0	17.6
Douglas Co. Corr. Ctr.	1,321	196	58	4.0	1.9	8.0
<b>Nevada</b>						
Carson City Jail	228	136	77%	0.8%	0.3%	2.0%
North Las Vegas Det. Ctr.	1,031	213	66	1.1	0.3	3.4
<b>New Hampshire</b>						
Rockingham Co. Jail & House of Corr.	337	151	72%	2.8%	1.3%	6.3%
<b>New Jersey</b>						
Atlantic Co. - Gerard L. Gormley Justice Fac.	1,088	139	46	2.5	0.7	8.8
Camden Co. Jail	1,771	184	55%	2.8%	1.2%	6.2%
Essex Co. Corr. Fac.	3,470	254	55	3.5	1.8	6.5
Passaic Co. Jail	1,357	262	82	0.4	0.1	2.1
Sussex Co. - Walter Keogh Dwyer Corr. Fac.	217	76	43	1.0	0.2	3.8
<b>New Mexico</b>						
Chaves Co. Det. Ctr.	255	152	79%	3.3%	2.0%	5.6%
Lea Co. Det. Fac.	281	36	15	0.0	0.0	9.6
Roosevelt Co. Det. Ctr.	85	60	78	1.7	0.7	4.3
<b>New York</b>						
Columbia Co. Jail	105	62	73%	2.6%	1.2%	5.6%
Livingston Co. Jail	93	53	72	2.6	1.1	5.8
Monroe Co. Jail	1,478	200	61	2.7	0.9	8.1
Nassau Co. Corr. Ctr.	538	154	54	4.1	2.2	7.5
New York City - Eric M. Taylor Ctr.	1,503	198	63	2.6	1.1	5.7
New York City - Manhattan Det. Ctr.	985	126	33	4.8	2.3	9.6
New York City - Vernon C. Bain Ctr.	1,019	171	43	4.4	2.4	7.9
Onondaga Co. Penitentiary	442	149	65	1.7	0.7	4.1
Orleans Co. Jail	75	55	82	5.6	3.5	8.9
Wayne Co. Jail	137	92	78	4.2	2.6	6.7

**APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)****Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>North Carolina</b>						
Alamance Co. Jail	533	206	59%	4.0%	2.4%	6.5%
Davidson Co. Jail	234	147	80	1.8	1.0	3.1
Durham Co. Jail	654	220	78	5.2	3.3	8.2
Johnston Co. Jail	236	123	69	0.0	0.0	3.0
McDowell Co. Jail	83	58	82	2.8	1.2	6.4
Orange Co. Jail	182	83	65	0.0	0.0	4.4
Rowan Co. Jail	274	128	63	5.2	2.9	9.0
Wilson Co. Jail	204	68	41	4.5	1.9	9.8
<b>Ohio</b>						
Ashtabula Co. Jail	105	51	57%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
Clermont Co. Jail	342	170	82	1.8	0.9	3.6
Hamilton Co. - Talbert House - Turning Point Treatment Ctr.	73	44	87	0.0	0.0	8.0
Lake Co. - Adult Max. Security Det. Ctr.	285	120	70	0.5	0.1	1.6
Montgomery Co. Jail	1,052	189	61	1.4	0.5	3.8
Pickaway Co. Jail	149	104	78	1.6	0.8	3.2
Wood Co. Justice Ctr.	167	81	63	3.6	1.4	9.3
<b>Oklahoma</b>						
Muskogee Co. Jail	336	141	69%	1.9%	0.8%	4.2%
Oklahoma Co. Jail	2,618	281	66	4.5	2.6	7.7
Pawnee Co. Jail	27	14	60	0.0	0.0	21.5
Texas Co. Jail	72	44	86	0.0	0.0	8.0
Tulsa Co. - David L. Moss Criminal Justice Ctr.	1,552	216	59	0.4	0.1	1.8
<b>Oregon</b>						
Deschutes Co. Jail	263	139	76%	3.2%	1.9%	5.5%
Polk Co. Jail	148	76	78	8.0	5.3	12.0
<b>Pennsylvania</b>						
Allegheny Co. Jail	3,044	216	60%	2.7%	1.2%	5.9%
Centre Co. Corr. Fac.	232	116	68	4.1	2.4	6.9
Chester Co. Prison	965	241	73	1.1	0.5	2.6
Dauphin Co. Prison	913	239	72	3.7	2.1	6.3
Lackawanna Co. Prison	860	231	73	3.5	1.8	6.6
Lawrence Co. Corr. Fac.	232	103	61	3.9	2.0	7.5
Lehigh Co. Prison	1,207	247	75	2.7	1.4	5.1
Lycoming Co. Prison	231	56	26	4.4	1.9	10.2
Monroe Co. Corr. Fac.	376	157	71	0.8	0.3	2.4
Philadelphia City - Det. Ctr. & Prison Health Services Unit	2,818	165	49	4.0	2.0	7.7
Philadelphia City - House of Corr.	1,765	207	60	2.5	1.1	5.5
Philadelphia City - Industrial Corr. Ctr.	1,170	212	69	6.5	4.2	10.1
Tioga Co. Jail	69	42	72	3.0	1.0	8.7
Westmoreland Co. Prison	521	132	52	2.0	0.8	5.2

**APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)**

**Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>South Carolina</b>						
Georgetown Co. Det. Ctr.	229	81	48%	3.9%	1.4%	10.5%
Greenville Co. Det. Fac.	1,094	245	68	1.4	0.4	4.5
Horry Co. - J. Reuben Long Det. Ctr.	695	226	76	4.6	2.6	8.0
Lancaster Co. Det. Ctr.	181	85	57	2.6	1.0	6.3
Richland Co. Det. Ctr.	1,048	219	71	3.4	1.8	6.3
York Co. Moss Justice Ctr.	382	108	49	2.3	0.8	6.6
<b>South Dakota</b>						
Faulk Co. Jail <sup>i</sup>	1	0	100%	:	:	:
<b>Tennessee</b>						
Bedford Co. Jail	168	105	84%	1.2%	0.5%	2.8%
Crockett Co. Jail	40	30	84	4.4	1.8	10.0
Davidson Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	618	138	60	2.8	1.2	6.1
Davidson Co. - Metro Det. Fac. <sup>h</sup>	1,066	259	80	4.3	2.6	6.9
Hamilton Co. Jail	582	211	75	1.2	0.5	2.9
Putnam Co. Jail	246	127	70	0.7	0.2	2.3
Silverdale Penal Farm <sup>h</sup>	946	233	76	4.0	2.3	7.0
White Co. Jail	142	96	82	3.3	2.1	5.3
<b>Texas</b>						
Collin Co. Min. Security Fac.	112	71	79%	4.4%	2.5%	7.6%
Dallas Co. - North Tower	3,118	241	65	1.9	0.8	4.9
Dallas Co. - West Tower	1,529	176	51	4.2	2.2	7.8
Ector Co. Jail	554	112	42	1.9	0.7	5.1
Ellis Co. Jail	367	157	72	2.4	1.2	4.8
Fort Bend Co. Jail	796	190	62	1.6	0.7	3.7
Harris Co. Jail	5,122	260	67	2.4	1.1	5.1
Harris Co. Jail - Baker Street	4,929	279	70	4.6	2.8	7.6
Henderson Co. Jail	288	106	54	2.5	0.9	6.9
Hood Co. Jail	179	129	87	4.5	3.2	6.2
Hunt Co. Criminal Justice Ctr.	385	144	74	1.4	0.6	3.7
Lubbock Co. Jail	814	134	49	1.4	0.4	4.4
Newton Co. Corr. Ctr. <sup>h</sup>	866	247	81	0.7	0.2	2.3
Nueces Co. Jail	1,021	245	81	2.1	1.0	4.4
Smith Co. Jail - Min. & Med. Security Fac.	496	157	65	3.4	1.7	6.6
Tarrant Co. Corr. Ctr.	2,005	179	54	5.2	2.9	9.2
Tarrant Co. - Green Bay Fac.	1,035	164	51	3.7	1.6	8.1
Terry Co. Jail	147	91	75	1.2	0.4	3.5
Van Zandt Co. Jail	168	106	82	0.0	0.0	3.5
Walker Co. Jail	154	74	57	5.4	2.8	10.1
Webb Co. Jail	604	152	57	2.0	0.8	5.0
Wichita Co. Jail	217	112	66	3.4	1.6	7.0
<b>Utah</b>						
Salt Lake Co. Jail	2,168	294	81%	3.9%	2.2%	6.6%
Uintah Co. Jail	114	41	55	0.0	0.0	8.6
Utah Co. Jail	798	239	86	1.7	0.8	3.5

**APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)**

**Characteristics of jails and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Virginia</b>						
Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail	572	171	66%	4.8%	2.7%	8.4%
Alexandria City Det. Ctr.	485	98	42	1.7	0.5	5.2
Chesapeake Corr. Ctr.	1,068	117	36	2.6	0.9	6.7
Eastern Shore Regional Jail	68	27	49	9.9	4.3	21.5
Fairfax Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	1,168	197	61	2.3	1.1	4.9
Hampton Roads Regional Jail	1,303	214	66	5.3	3.1	8.8
Loudoun Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	251	81	50	3.3	1.5	7.1
Middle Peninsula Regional Security Ctr.	124	74	73	6.5	3.9	10.5
Norfolk City Jail	1,547	178	52	1.4	0.5	3.9
Northwestern Regional Adult Det. Ctr.	509	168	70	1.1	0.4	3.3
Page Co. Jail	49	23	67	0.0	0.0	14.3
Roanoke City Jail	851	188	69	5.2	3.0	8.8
Southside Regional Jail	217	89	55	2.6	0.9	6.9
<b>Washington</b>						
Clallam Co. Corr. Fac.	132	75	71%	8.4%	5.2%	13.1%
King Co. Corr. Fac.	1,639	229	64	5.5	3.2	9.2
Pierce Co. Det. and Corr. Ctr. - New Jail & Main Jail	1,592	207	60	2.0	0.8	4.8
Spokane Co. - Geiger Corr. Ctr.	444	172	68	3.5	2.0	6.1
Spokane Co. Jail	703	179	65	2.8	1.5	5.4
<b>West Virginia</b>						
Southwestern Regional Jail	431	147	63%	6.4%	4.1%	9.9%
<b>Wisconsin</b>						
Chippewa Co. Jail	130	56	56%	2.9%	1.1%	7.3%
Dane Co. Jail	1,039	100	51	4.2	1.9	9.1
LaCrosse Co. Jail	236	91	48	5.2	2.5	10.5
Ozaukee Co. Jail	176	104	70	1.9	0.9	4.1
Racine Co. Jail	1,019	184	67	3.3	1.6	6.9
<b>Wyoming</b>						
Natrona Co. Det. Ctr.	323	147	69%	4.8%	3.0%	7.7%

:Not available.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Indicates that different samples in the same facility would yield prevalence rates falling between the lower and upper bound estimates 95 out of 100 times.

<sup>c</sup>Number of inmates in the facility on the day of the roster plus any new inmates admitted prior to the first day of data collection.

<sup>d</sup>Number of respondents consenting to the sexual victimization survey on NIS. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>e</sup>Response rate is equal to the number of respondents divided by the number of eligible inmates sampled times 100 percent.

<sup>f</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on select characteristics, including age, sex, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>g</sup>Female facility.

<sup>h</sup>Privately operated facility.

<sup>i</sup>Sole inmate at time of visit received the alternative questionnaire—no sexual victimization data available for this facility.



**APPENDIX TABLE 6****Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Total</b>	1.5%	1.4%	1.7%	2.0%	1.9%	2.2%
<b>Alabama</b>						
Chilton Co. Jail	1.0%	0.4%	2.2%	3.5%	2.2%	5.6%
Houston Co. Jail	4.0	2.3	6.7	4.4	2.7	7.0
Madison Co. Det. Fac.	5.5	3.7	7.9	1.7	0.9	3.3
Montgomery Co. Det. Fac.	2.7	1.6	4.6	1.7	0.8	3.3
Russell Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	2.2	3.2	1.9	5.3
<b>Arizona</b>						
Maricopa Co. - Durango Jail	1.5%	0.7%	3.3%	1.5%	0.6%	3.5%
Maricopa Co. - Tent City Jail	1.4	0.6	3.2	0.5	0.1	2.2
Maricopa Co. - Towers Jail	1.9	0.8	4.5	5.1	3.0	8.7
Mohave Co. Jail	2.6	1.3	5.0	2.6	1.4	4.6
Pima Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	0.6	0.2	2.1	0.4	0.1	1.9
<b>Arkansas</b>						
Drew Co. Det. Fac.	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%
Faulkner Co. Det. Ctr.	2.8	1.7	4.4	1.5	0.8	2.9
Garland Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	3.3	1.8	6.0	4.3	2.5	7.2
Sharp Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	10.2	0.0	0.0	10.2
<b>California</b>						
Butte Co. Jail	0.7%	0.2%	2.7%	2.7%	1.4%	5.3%
Fresno Co. - Main Jail, North Annex, & South Annex	2.5	1.1	5.3	2.8	1.4	5.7
Kern Co. - Lerdo Min. Security Fac.	1.9	0.9	3.8	2.0	1.0	4.0
Lake Co. - Hill Road Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.2	1.9	0.5	0.2	1.9
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - East Fac.	1.3	0.4	4.2	3.3	1.6	6.5
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - North Fac.	0.8	0.2	3.6	0.3	0.1	1.4
Los Angeles Co. - Men's Central Jail	3.0	1.1	7.5	2.4	0.9	6.2
Madera Co. Jail	2.9	1.5	5.6	2.8	1.4	5.5
Mendocino Co. Jail	1.7	0.7	4.3	1.8	0.7	4.6
Monterey Co. Jail	2.6	1.2	5.7	2.5	1.0	5.9
Orange Co. - Central Jail Complex	2.4	1.1	5.0	1.6	0.6	3.9
Orange Co. - J.A. Musick Fac.	0.9	0.3	2.6	1.9	0.9	4.0
Riverside Co. - Robert Presley Det. Ctr.	2.0	0.8	4.8	4.1	2.0	8.2
Riverside Co. - Southwest Det. Ctr.	2.8	1.2	6.3	1.3	0.3	4.8
Sacramento Co. - Main Jail	2.4	1.2	5.0	3.5	1.8	6.5
San Bernardino Co. - Central Det. Ctr.	0.4	0.1	1.7	0.4	0.1	1.7
San Bernardino Co. - West Valley Det. Ctr.	2.4	1.3	4.5	3.2	1.9	5.4
San Diego Co. - Central Det. Fac.	3.4	1.6	7.1	3.4	1.7	6.7
San Diego Co. - Descanso Det. Fac.	0.5	0.1	1.6	1.3	0.5	3.1
San Francisco Co. - County Jail #8	2.8	1.4	5.4	3.2	1.7	5.9
San Joaquin Co. Jail	1.1	0.3	4.2	1.7	0.6	4.5
San Mateo Co. - Maguire Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.1	2.5	1.1	0.3	3.3
Santa Cruz Co. - Blaine Street Fac. <sup>d</sup>	0.0	0.0	22.8	7.7	3.1	17.8
Solano Co. - Sentenced Det. Fac.	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.7	0.2	2.8
Sonoma Co. - North Det. Fac.	1.0	0.4	2.3	0.6	0.2	2.0

**APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)**

**Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Colorado</b>						
Adams Co. Det. Fac.	0.8%	0.3%	2.1%	0.6%	0.2%	2.0%
Arapahoe Co. Jail	1.1	0.4	3.0	1.7	0.6	4.5
El Paso Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	1.0	0.3	3.2	0.7	0.2	2.4
Jefferson Co. Jail	1.0	0.4	2.7	0.7	0.2	2.3
Logan Co. Jail	3.3	1.6	6.8	2.0	0.7	5.5
<b>District of Columbia</b>						
D.C. Dept of Corr. - Central Det. Fac. & Corr. Treatment Fac.	3.1%	1.3%	7.0%	5.5%	2.8%	10.5%
<b>Florida</b>						
Bay Co. Jail	0.4%	0.1%	1.7%	2.3%	1.1%	4.7%
Broward Co. - Joseph V. Conte Fac.	0.9	0.3	3.1	2.6	1.2	5.2
Broward Co. - Main Jail	1.8	0.7	4.5	3.2	1.6	6.5
Broward Co. - North Broward Bureau	2.5	1.2	5.1	2.5	1.3	4.9
Broward Co. - Paul Rein Det. Fac.	0.7	0.2	2.2	2.8	1.5	5.2
Charlotte Co. Jail	0.9	0.2	4.0	2.3	0.9	5.3
Hardee Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	6.0	2.2	0.8	5.9
Highlands Co. Jail	1.2	0.4	3.5	1.7	0.7	3.9
Hillsborough Co. - Falkenburg Road Jail	1.3	0.4	3.7	1.3	0.5	3.4
Jacksonville - James I. Montgomery Corr. Ctr.	1.3	0.5	2.9	1.2	0.5	2.7
Marion Co. Jail	1.4	0.6	3.4	0.7	0.2	2.4
Miami-Dade Co. - Metro West Det. Ctr.	0.7	0.2	2.3	1.4	0.5	3.8
Miami-Dade Co. - Pre-trial Det. Ctr.	5.1	2.9	9.1	3.5	1.8	6.7
Monroe Co. Det. Ctr.	1.5	0.6	3.5	1.5	0.6	3.5
Nassau Co. Det. Fac.	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.7	0.2	1.9
Okaloosa Co. Jail	0.4	0.1	1.6	2.6	1.4	4.5
Osceola Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.0	0.3	3.4
Palm Beach Co. - Main Det. Ctr.	1.6	0.6	3.9	1.2	0.4	3.2
Pinellas Co. Med. Security Fac.	2.3	1.2	4.3	1.5	0.7	3.3
Polk Co. - Central County Jail	1.6	0.7	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
St. Lucie Co. Main Jail	1.8	0.8	4.3	0.7	0.2	2.2
Volusia Co. Branch Jail	1.4	0.6	3.7	1.2	0.5	3.0
Walton Co. Jail	0.6	0.2	1.7	3.3	2.1	5.0
<b>Georgia</b>						
Atlanta City Jail	3.2%	1.6%	6.3%	1.7%	0.6%	4.7%
Bulloch Co. Jail	2.4	1.4	4.2	4.6	3.0	6.8
Chatham Co. Det. Ctr.	0.3	0.1	1.4	1.1	0.4	3.0
Clarke Co. Jail	0.5	0.1	1.9	0.9	0.4	2.4
Clayton Co. Jail	0.7	0.2	2.4	0.9	0.3	2.3
Cobb Co. - Jail & Prison Unit	1.2	0.4	3.3	1.2	0.4	3.3
Coweta Co. Prison	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Dekalb Co. Jail	3.5	1.9	6.4	1.5	0.6	3.7
Fulton Co. - Alpharetta Annex	0.0	0.0	10.4	0.0	0.0	10.4
Gilmer Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	6.6	0.0	0.0	6.6
Houston Co. Jail	0.5	0.1	2.2	1.4	0.6	3.2

**APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Georgia (continued)</b>						
Jackson Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%
Jasper Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	16.8	0.0	0.0	16.8
Lowndes Co. Jail	0.7	0.2	2.2	1.8	0.9	3.6
Muscogee Co. Prison	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.2	1.1	4.2
Richmond Co. - Charles B. Webster Det. Ctr.	2.3	1.1	4.5	1.5	0.6	3.5
Roswell City Jail	0.0	0.0	29.9	0.0	0.0	29.9
Turner Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	15.5	0.0	0.0	15.5
Ware Co. Jail	3.2	2.0	5.0	0.9	0.4	2.1
<b>Idaho</b>						
Canyon Co. Jail	0.8%	0.3%	2.3%	3.0%	1.6%	5.4%
Madison Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	8.8	1.1	0.3	3.9
<b>Illinois</b>						
Cook Co. Jail - Division 1	1.8%	0.9%	3.5%	4.3%	2.6%	7.1%
Cook Co. Jail - Division 6	2.2	1.1	4.3	5.5	3.6	8.3
Cook Co. Jail - Division 9	2.0	0.8	4.9	3.0	1.5	5.9
DuPage Co. Jail	2.0	0.9	4.4	2.0	0.9	4.1
LaSalle Co. Jail	2.3	1.1	4.8	3.9	2.3	6.5
Vermilion Co. Jail	3.1	1.9	5.0	0.6	0.2	1.5
Winnebago Co. Jail	2.1	0.9	4.6	3.2	1.7	5.9
<b>Indiana</b>						
Boone Co. Jail	1.3%	0.6%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
Brown Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	14.9	0.0	0.0	14.9
Madison Co. Det. Ctr.	3.9	2.5	6.1	2.7	1.6	4.5
Marion Co. Jail II <sup>e</sup>	0.5	0.1	2.4	3.4	1.7	7.0
Pulaski Co. Jail	1.0	0.6	1.8	0.9	0.5	1.5
Vigo Co. Jail	3.8	2.2	6.4	4.8	2.9	7.7
<b>Iowa</b>						
Black Hawk Co. Jail	1.4%	0.7%	2.8%	1.9%	1.1%	3.4%
Linn Co. Corr. Ctr.	3.4	1.5	7.3	0.7	0.2	2.5
<b>Kansas</b>						
Butler Co. Jail	1.6%	0.8%	3.5%	3.1%	1.8%	5.3%
Johnson Co. - New Century Adult Det. Ctr.	2.0	0.8	5.2	0.4	0.1	1.4
Rice Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	22.8	0.0	0.0	22.8
Sedgwick Co. Jail	1.1	0.4	3.1	1.3	0.5	3.6
<b>Kentucky</b>						
Campbell Co. Det. Ctr.	1.1%	0.4%	2.8%	2.7%	1.5%	4.8%
Floyd Co. Det. Ctr.	1.9	0.6	6.1	1.3	0.5	3.1
Franklin Co. Regional Jail	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.4
Henderson Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.5	0.6	3.7
Jessamine Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	7.7
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Community Corr. Ctr.	0.9	0.3	3.2	2.8	1.3	5.9
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Metro Corr. Fac.	0.6	0.2	2.1	1.6	0.7	3.9
Warren Co. Regional Jail	1.2	0.4	3.6	2.0	1.0	4.3

**APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Louisiana</b>						
Calcasieu Parish Corr. Ctr.	1.6%	0.7%	3.6%	1.5%	0.5%	4.0%
Morehouse Parish Det. Ctr.	0.6	0.2	1.4	1.1	0.6	2.2
Natchitoches Det. Ctr.	1.0	0.4	2.2	0.6	0.2	1.6
Orleans Parish - Conchetta Jail	2.1	0.9	4.9	1.8	0.6	5.2
Orleans Parish - Old Parish Prison	1.1	0.4	2.7	2.1	1.0	4.4
Orleans Parish - South White Street Jail <sup>d</sup>	7.5	5.5	10.2	2.4	1.3	4.2
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase III	3.4	1.8	6.2	3.5	1.8	6.6
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase V	0.6	0.2	2.2	3.5	2.0	6.2
Ouachita Parish Corr. Fac.	2.9	1.6	5.4	2.2	1.1	4.3
Richland Parish Det. Ctr.	2.8	1.7	4.7	0.4	0.1	1.4
Webster Parish - Bayou Dorcheat Corr. Ctr.	1.7	0.8	3.5	0.6	0.2	2.0
<b>Maine</b>						
Kennebec Co. Jail	3.8%	1.7%	7.9%	4.1%	1.9%	8.3%
<b>Maryland</b>						
Allegany Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%
Baltimore Co. Det. Ctr.	0.5	0.1	2.7	3.5	1.6	7.5
Caroline Co. Jail	7.9	2.0	26.6	10.0	3.2	27.4
Cecil Co. Det. Ctr.	2.0	0.9	4.4	2.2	1.0	4.8
Prince George's Co. Corr. Ctr.	1.2	0.4	3.5	2.9	1.5	5.7
<b>Massachusetts</b>						
Bristol Co. - Dartmouth Fac.	1.6%	0.7%	3.4%	1.4%	0.5%	3.6%
Bristol Co. - New Bedford Fac.	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.7	0.2	1.9
Hampshire Co. - Jail & House of Corr.	0.5	0.1	1.5	0.6	0.2	1.8
Suffolk Co. House of Corr.	1.8	0.7	4.4	3.7	1.7	7.8
Worcester Co. Jail & House of Corr.	1.5	0.6	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
<b>Michigan</b>						
Barry Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%
Jackson Co. - Chanter Road Corr. Fac.	1.2	0.4	3.5	2.4	1.2	4.7
Kent Co. Corr. Fac.	3.0	1.5	5.9	2.0	0.8	4.5
Lenawee Co. Jail	0.4	0.1	1.3	0.9	0.4	2.0
Muskegon Co. Jail	1.3	0.5	3.1	1.6	0.8	3.4
Saginaw Co. Jail	1.7	0.7	4.0	1.8	0.8	4.3
Wayne Co. - Andrew C. Baird Det. Fac.	0.4	0.1	2.0	2.3	1.1	4.7
<b>Minnesota</b>						
Beltrami Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	2.9%	0.7%	10.7%
Morrison Co. Jail	2.1	0.6	6.6	4.2	1.8	9.5
Sherburne Co. Jail	1.4	0.5	4.3	1.6	0.5	4.8
<b>Mississippi</b>						
Bolivar Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	2.0%	1.1%	3.6%
Copiah Co. Det. Ctr.	2.1	1.0	4.7	2.1	1.0	4.7
Hinds Co. Penal Farm	0.5	0.2	1.6	0.5	0.2	1.6
Issaquena Co. Corr. Fac.	3.5	1.2	9.3	0.0	0.0	9.0
Jackson Co. Jail	2.3	1.2	4.1	2.4	1.3	4.4

**APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Mississippi (continued)</b>						
Lee. Co. Work Ctr.	0.0	0.0	24.3	0.0%	0.0%	24.3%
Rankin Co. Jail	1.5	0.7	3.4	4.9	2.8	8.5
Winston-Choctaw Co. Regional Corr. Fac.	0.6	0.2	1.9	3.4	2.1	5.6
<b>Missouri</b>						
Jackson Co. Det. Ctr.	2.2%	1.1%	4.7%	3.2%	1.8%	5.7%
Jefferson Co. Jail	4.0	2.5	6.2	1.5	0.7	2.9
Joplin City Jail	0.0	0.0	11.7	2.5	1.0	6.3
Lincoln Co. Jail	2.0	0.9	4.5	2.6	1.2	5.7
St. Louis - Med. Security Inst. & City Justice Ctr.	0.5	0.1	2.1	5.3	3.1	9.1
<b>Nebraska</b>						
Buffalo Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%
Dodge Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	17.6	0.0	0.0	17.6
Douglas Co. Corr. Ctr.	1.0	0.3	3.8	3.7	1.7	7.8
<b>Nevada</b>						
Carson City Jail	0.8%	0.3%	2.0%	0.8%	0.3%	2.0%
North Las Vegas Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.1	0.3	3.4
<b>New Hampshire</b>						
Rockingham Co. Jail & House of Corr.	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.8%	1.3%	6.3%
<b>New Jersey</b>						
Atlantic Co. - Gerard L. Gormley Justice Fac.	1.8%	0.4%	8.7%	0.7%	0.1%	3.5%
Camden Co. Jail	0.6	0.1	3.2	2.2	0.9	5.3
Essex Co. Corr. Fac.	1.9	0.8	4.6	2.1	1.0	4.7
Passaic Co. Jail	0.4	0.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.4
Sussex Co. - Walter Keogh Dwyer Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	4.8	1.0	0.2	3.8
<b>New Mexico</b>						
Chaves Co. Det. Ctr.	1.6%	0.7%	3.6%	1.7%	0.9%	3.2%
Lea Co. Det. Fac.	0.0	0.0	9.6	0.0	0.0	9.6
Roosevelt Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	6.0	1.7	0.7	4.3
<b>New York</b>						
Columbia Co. Jail	1.1%	0.4%	3.2%	1.5%	0.5%	4.3%
Livingston Co. Jail	1.3	0.4	4.0	2.6	1.1	5.8
Monroe Co. Jail	0.4	0.1	2.2	2.3	0.6	8.0
Nassau Co. Corr. Ctr.	2.2	1.0	4.8	2.5	1.1	5.4
New York City - Eric M. Taylor Ctr.	0.8	0.3	2.8	1.7	0.6	4.8
New York City - Manhattan Det. Ctr.	1.2	0.4	4.1	3.5	1.5	8.1
New York City - Vernon C. Bain Ctr.	1.4	0.5	3.7	4.1	2.2	7.5
Onondaga Co. Penitentiary	0.5	0.1	2.2	1.2	0.4	3.4
Orleans Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	6.5	5.6	3.5	8.9
Wayne Co. Jail	1.0	0.4	2.6	3.1	1.8	5.4

**APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>North Carolina</b>						
Alamance Co. Jail	1.8%	0.9%	3.4%	2.6%	1.4%	4.9%
Davidson Co. Jail	1.8	1.0	3.1	0.5	0.2	1.4
Durham Co. Jail	2.3	1.1	5.0	2.9	1.6	5.0
Johnston Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
McDowell Co. Jail	2.8	1.2	6.4	0.0	0.0	6.2
Orange Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	4.4
Rowan Co. Jail	1.3	0.4	4.3	5.2	2.9	9.0
Wilson Co. Jail	1.6	0.4	6.3	4.5	1.9	9.8
<b>Ohio</b>						
Ashtabula Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
Clermont Co. Jail	1.2	0.5	2.7	1.2	0.5	2.9
Hamilton Co. - Talbert House - Turning Point Treatment Ctr.	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
Lake Co. - Adult Max. Security Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.5	0.1	1.6
Montgomery Co. Jail	1.4	0.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	2.0
Pickaway Co. Jail	0.8	0.3	2.1	0.8	0.3	2.0
Wood Co. Justice Ctr.	3.6	1.4	9.3	0.8	0.2	2.5
<b>Oklahoma</b>						
Muskogee Co. Jail	1.9%	0.8%	4.2%	1.3%	0.5%	3.6%
Oklahoma Co. Jail	3.2	1.6	6.3	1.5	0.7	3.2
Pawnee Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	21.5	0.0	0.0	21.5
Texas Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
Tulsa Co. - David L. Moss Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.4	0.1	1.8
<b>Oregon</b>						
Deschutes Co. Jail	2.0%	1.0%	3.9%	2.0%	1.0%	4.0%
Polk Co. Jail	3.0	1.5	6.1	5.1	3.0	8.5
<b>Pennsylvania</b>						
Allegheny Co. Jail	2.1%	0.8%	5.3%	0.6%	0.2%	2.2%
Centre Co. Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.2	2.4	3.4	1.9	6.0
Chester Co. Prison	1.1	0.5	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.6
Dauphin Co. Prison	1.3	0.5	3.1	2.9	1.6	5.4
Lackawanna Co. Prison	2.7	1.3	5.7	0.8	0.3	2.3
Lawrence Co. Corr. Fac.	2.2	0.9	5.5	2.9	1.3	6.1
Lehigh Co. Prison	1.1	0.4	2.9	2.0	0.9	4.2
Lycoming Co. Prison	1.6	0.5	5.0	3.7	1.4	9.4
Monroe Co. Corr. Fac.	0.8	0.3	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4
Philadelphia City - Det. Ctr. & Prison Health Services Unit	1.2	0.3	4.0	3.5	1.6	7.1
Philadelphia City - House of Corr.	1.2	0.4	4.0	1.3	0.5	3.5
Philadelphia City - Industrial Corr. Ctr.	2.5	1.2	5.0	4.0	2.3	7.1
Tioga Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	8.4	3.0	1.0	8.7
Westmoreland Co. Prison	1.6	0.5	4.8	1.3	0.4	4.1

**APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)**

**Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>South Carolina</b>						
Georgetown Co. Det. Ctr.	0.8%	0.2%	3.1%	3.2%	0.9%	10.1%
Greenville Co. Det. Fac.	1.0	0.2	4.3	0.4	0.1	1.7
Horry Co. - J. Reuben Long Det. Ctr.	2.0	1.0	4.1	3.1	1.4	6.5
Lancaster Co. Det. Ctr.	0.9	0.3	3.2	2.6	1.0	6.3
Richland Co. Det. Ctr.	1.0	0.3	3.0	3.4	1.8	6.3
York Co. Moss Justice Ctr.	1.0	0.2	4.2	1.3	0.3	5.5
<b>South Dakota</b>						
Faulk Co. Jail	:	:	:	:	:	:
<b>Tennessee</b>						
Bedford Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	1.2%	0.5%	2.8%
Crockett Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	11.4	4.4	1.8	10.0
Davidson Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.6	0.1	2.6	2.8	1.3	6.2
Davidson Co. - Metro Det. Fac. <sup>e</sup>	0.4	0.1	1.8	4.3	2.6	6.9
Hamilton Co. Jail	0.4	0.1	1.8	1.2	0.5	2.9
Putnam Co. Jail	0.7	0.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	3.0
Silverdale Penal Farm <sup>e</sup>	1.7	0.8	4.0	2.7	1.4	5.5
White Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.4	2.1	5.4
<b>Texas</b>						
Collin Co. Min. Security Fac.	1.7%	0.7%	4.3%	2.8%	1.4%	5.4%
Dallas Co. - North Tower	1.0	0.3	3.3	1.0	0.3	3.6
Dallas Co. - West Tower	1.0	0.3	3.4	3.2	1.5	6.7
Ector Co. Jail	1.3	0.4	4.4	1.4	0.4	4.6
Ellis Co. Jail	0.5	0.1	1.7	1.9	0.8	4.3
Fort Bend Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.6	0.7	3.7
Harris Co. Jail	2.4	1.1	5.1	0.9	0.3	2.7
Harris Co. Jail - Baker Street	3.9	2.2	6.7	1.0	0.4	2.9
Henderson Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.5	2.5	0.9	6.9
Hood Co. Jail	2.2	1.3	3.5	3.8	2.6	5.4
Hunt Co. Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.8	0.2	2.9	1.4	0.6	3.7
Lubbock Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	2.8	1.4	0.4	4.4
Newton Co. Corr. Ctr. <sup>e</sup>	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.7	0.2	2.3
Nueces Co. Jail	1.7	0.8	3.9	1.3	0.5	3.3
Smith Co. Jail - Min. & Med. Security Fac.	1.1	0.4	3.1	2.8	1.3	5.8
Tarrant Co. Corr. Ctr.	2.6	1.1	5.7	3.0	1.4	6.4
Tarrant Co. - Green Bay Fac.	1.9	0.6	6.4	2.9	1.2	7.2
Terry Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	4.1	1.2	0.4	3.5
Van Zandt Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	3.5
Walker Co. Jail	4.0	1.9	8.2	2.7	1.1	6.6
Webb Co. Jail	0.8	0.2	3.4	1.3	0.4	3.8
Wichita Co. Jail	3.4	1.6	7.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
<b>Utah</b>						
Salt Lake Co. Jail	2.0%	1.0%	4.1%	2.2%	1.0%	4.5%
Uintah Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	8.6
Utah Co. Jail	1.2	0.5	2.9	0.4	0.1	1.8

**APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>			Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>c</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>b</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Virginia</b>						
Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail	2.4%	1.1%	5.5%	2.8%	1.4%	5.6%
Alexandria City Det. Ctr.	1.7	0.5	5.2	0.9	0.2	4.0
Chesapeake Corr. Ctr.	0.3	0.1	1.6	2.6	0.9	6.7
Eastern Shore Regional Jail	0.0	0.0	12.5	9.9	4.3	21.5
Fairfax Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	1.5	0.5	4.2	0.8	0.3	2.1
Hampton Roads Regional Jail	1.3	0.5	3.6	4.0	2.2	7.1
Loudoun Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	1.0	0.3	3.5	3.3	1.5	7.1
Middle Peninsula Regional Security Ctr.	2.2	0.8	6.0	4.3	2.5	7.2
Norfolk City Jail	0.9	0.3	3.1	1.1	0.3	3.6
Northwestern Regional Adult Det. Ctr.	0.4	0.1	1.8	0.7	0.2	2.9
Page Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3
Roanoke City Jail	3.7%	1.9%	7.0%	2.7%	1.3%	5.5%
Southside Regional Jail	0.0	0.0	4.1	2.6	0.9	6.9
<b>Washington</b>						
Clallam Co. Corr. Fac.	4.4%	2.2%	8.3%	6.1%	3.4%	10.6%
King Co. Corr. Fac.	2.3	1.0	5.0	3.3	1.6	6.5
Pierce Co. Det. and Corr. Ctr. - New Jail & Main Jail	1.6	0.6	4.3	0.4	0.1	2.2
Spokane Co. - Geiger Corr. Ctr.	2.2	1.1	4.5	1.8	0.9	3.8
Spokane Co. Jail	1.4	0.6	3.5	1.8	0.8	4.1
<b>West Virginia</b>						
Southwestern Regional Jail	3.6%	2.1%	6.4%	2.8%	1.4%	5.5%
<b>Wisconsin</b>						
Chippewa Co. Jail	1.5%	0.4%	5.3%	1.4%	0.4%	5.0%
Dane Co. Jail	2.1	0.8	5.9	3.0	1.1	8.0
LaCrosse Co. Jail	3.3	1.5	7.3	4.1	1.7	9.1
Ozaukee Co. Jail	0.9	0.3	2.6	1.0	0.3	2.9
Racine Co. Jail	1.5	0.5	4.5	2.5	1.1	5.7
<b>Wyoming</b>						
Natrona Co. Det. Ctr.	2.2%	1.1%	4.2%	3.0%	1.7%	5.5%

Note: Detail may sum to more than total victimization rate because victims may have reported both inmate-on-inmate and staff-on-inmate sexual victimization.

:Not available.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Indicates that different samples in the same facility would yield prevalence rates falling between the lower and upper bound estimates 95 out of 100 times.

<sup>c</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on select characteristics, including age, sex, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>d</sup>Female facility.

<sup>e</sup>Privately operated facility.



**APPENDIX TABLE 7****Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Total</b>	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%
<b>Alabama</b>					
Chilton Co. Jail	1.0%	0.0%	3.5%	3.5%	1.0%
Houston Co. Jail	2.6	3.1	2.5	2.8	3.7
Madison Co. Det. Fac.	3.4	4.1	1.0	1.0	0.4
Montgomery Co. Det. Fac.	2.4	1.8	0.6	1.3	0.7
Russell Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.7	1.6
<b>Arizona</b>					
Maricopa Co. - Durango Jail	1.2%	1.2%	0.7%	0.8%	1.1%
Maricopa Co. - Tent City Jail	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.0
Maricopa Co. - Towers Jail	0.0	1.9	3.1	4.3	1.9
Mohave Co. Jail	2.2	0.9	1.6	1.6	1.4
Pima Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4
<b>Arkansas</b>					
Drew Co. Det. Fac.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Faulkner Co. Det. Ctr.	2.0	1.3	0.8	0.7	0.0
Garland Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	2.6	2.3	1.9	1.9	2.4
Sharp Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>California</b>					
Butte Co. Jail	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	1.6%	2.4%
Fresno Co. - Main Jail, North Annex, & South Annex	1.4	1.1	1.1	2.8	0.8
Kern Co. - Lerdo Min. Security Fac.	1.4	0.9	2.0	1.6	0.0
Lake Co. - Hill Road Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - East Fac.	1.3	1.3	1.9	2.9	0.8
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - North Fac.	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.3
Los Angeles Co. - Men's Central Jail	1.9	3.0	1.6	2.4	0.0
Madera Co. Jail	0.7	2.7	1.3	1.1	2.8
Mendocino Co. Jail	0.8	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8
Monterey Co. Jail	1.7	1.3	0.0	2.5	0.8
Orange Co. - Central Jail Complex	1.6	2.1	1.1	1.6	0.5
Orange Co. - J.A. Musick Fac.	0.5	0.9	1.4	0.9	1.0
Riverside Co. - Robert Presley Det. Ctr.	2.0	2.0	2.2	3.6	1.5
Riverside Co. - Southwest Det. Ctr.	2.2	2.8	0.0	1.0	0.3
Sacramento Co. - Main Jail	0.9	2.0	0.8	1.7	2.4
San Bernardino Co. - Central Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
San Bernardino Co. - West Valley Det. Ctr.	1.4	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.4
San Diego Co. - Central Det. Fac.	1.7	3.0	2.4	2.0	1.1
San Diego Co. - Descanso Det. Fac.	0.0	0.5	0.6	1.3	0.0
San Francisco Co. - County Jail #8	0.2	2.6	1.7	2.8	0.8
San Joaquin Co. Jail	0.0	1.1	1.1	0.6	0.6
San Mateo Co. - Maguire Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.0	1.1	1.1	0.0
Santa Cruz Co. - Blaine Street Fac. <sup>e</sup>	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7
Solano Co. - Sentenced Det. Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.0
Sonoma Co. - North Det. Fac.	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.0

**APPENDIX TABLE 7 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-0**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Colorado</b>					
Adams Co. Det. Fac.	0.8%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%
Arapahoe Co. Jail	1.1	0.8	1.3	1.3	0.4
El Paso Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	1.0	1.0	0.4	0.0	0.4
Jefferson Co. Jail	1.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.0
Logan Co. Jail	2.0	3.3	2.0	2.0	2.0
<b>District of Columbia</b>					
D.C. Dept of Corr. - Central Det. Fac. & Corr. Treatment Fac.	2.2%	1.4%	3.6%	4.4%	0.9%
<b>Florida</b>					
Bay Co. Jail	0.0%	0.4%	1.0%	1.0%	2.3%
Broward Co. - Joseph V. Conte Fac.	0.3	0.9	1.4	1.1	1.1
Broward Co. - Main Jail	0.8	1.5	1.6	0.6	1.0
Broward Co. - North Broward Bureau	2.1	1.0	1.8	2.2	1.2
Broward Co. - Paul Rein Det. Fac.	0.3	0.7	1.8	2.3	1.2
Charlotte Co. Jail	0.0	0.9	1.0	0.7	1.2
Hardee Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0
Highlands Co. Jail	1.2	1.2	1.7	1.7	1.2
Hillsborough Co. - Falkenburg Road Jail	0.8	1.3	0.6	0.6	1.3
Jacksonville - James I. Montgomery Corr. Ctr.	0.3	0.9	0.4	0.4	0.4
Marion Co. Jail	1.4	1.1	0.7	0.7	0.4
Miami-Dade Co. - Metro West Det. Ctr.	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.8
Miami-Dade Co. - Pre-trial Det. Ctr.	2.2	3.7	2.0	2.0	2.0
Monroe Co. Det. Ctr.	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.5	1.0
Nassau Co. Det. Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Okaloosa Co. Jail	0.4	0.0	1.3	0.9	1.7
Osceola Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.5
Palm Beach Co. - Main Det. Ctr.	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2
Pinellas Co. Med. Security Fac.	1.0	2.0	0.7	0.8	0.4
Polk Co. - Central County Jail	1.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Lucie Co. Main Jail	0.7	1.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
Volusia Co. Branch Jail	0.4	1.4	0.8	0.4	0.8
Walton Co. Jail	0.6	0.6	1.4	1.4	2.5
<b>Georgia</b>					
Atlanta City Jail	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%
Bulloch Co. Jail	1.5	2.4	1.0	2.2	2.9
Chatham Co. Det. Ctr.	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.8
Clarke Co. Jail	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.5
Clayton Co. Jail	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3
Cobb Co. - Jail & Prison Unit	0.7	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.8
Coweta Co. Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dekalb Co. Jail	2.2	3.5	1.1	1.5	0.3
Fulton Co. - Alpharetta Annex	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gilmer Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Houston Co. Jail	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.9	1.0

**APPENDIX TABLE 7 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-0**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Georgia (continued)</b>					
Jackson Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jasper Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lowndes Co. Jail	0.7	0.1	0.6	1.0	0.8
Muscogee Co. Prison	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.3	0.9
Richmond Co. - Charles B. Webster Det. Ctr.	1.9	2.0	0.5	0.4	0.5
Roswell City Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Turner Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ware Co. Jail	1.8	1.4	0.4	0.4	0.5
<b>Idaho</b>					
Canyon Co. Jail	0.8%	0.3%	1.5%	1.5%	2.1%
Madison Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0
<b>Illinois</b>					
Cook Co. Jail - Division 1	1.8%	1.2%	0.6%	0.9%	3.7%
Cook Co. Jail - Division 6	1.6	1.5	2.0	1.7	3.8
Cook Co. Jail - Division 9	1.5	2.0	1.0	1.6	1.4
DuPage Co. Jail	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.1	0.6
LaSalle Co. Jail	2.3	1.2	2.7	3.9	0.8
Vermilion Co. Jail	3.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.0
Winnebago Co. Jail	1.5	1.5	1.6	2.6	0.9
<b>Indiana</b>					
Boone Co. Jail	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Brown Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madison Co. Det. Ctr.	3.5	2.7	1.1	1.0	1.6
Marion Co. Jail II <sup>f</sup>	0.5	0.5	2.0	2.8	3.4
Pulaski Co. Jail	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.0	0.0
Vigo Co. Jail	2.6	3.1	2.7	2.0	3.4
<b>Iowa</b>					
Black Hawk Co. Jail	1.4%	1.4%	0.6%	1.9%	0.0%
Linn Co. Corr. Ctr.	1.3	3.4	0.0	0.7	0.0
<b>Kansas</b>					
Butler Co. Jail	0.8%	1.6%	3.1%	2.4%	0.8%
Johnson Co. - New Century Adult Det. Ctr.	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
Rice Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sedgwick Co. Jail	1.1	0.7	0.9	1.0	0.0
<b>Kentucky</b>					
Campbell Co. Det. Ctr.	1.1%	1.1%	1.6%	2.7%	0.0%
Floyd Co. Det. Ctr.	1.9	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.6
Franklin Co. Regional Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Henderson Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.5	0.5
Jessamine Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Community Corr. Ctr.	0.9	0.9	1.8	1.8	1.9
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Metro Corr. Fac.	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.6	0.5
Warren Co. Regional Jail	0.4	1.2	1.1	0.9	1.1

**APPENDIX TABLE 7 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-0**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressured <sup>d</sup>
<b>Louisiana</b>					
Calcasieu Parish Corr. Ctr.	1.3%	1.2%	0.8%	1.5%	0.4%
Morehouse Parish Det. Ctr.	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.1
Natchitoches Det. Ctr.	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Orleans Parish - Conchetta Jail	2.1	2.1	1.8	1.1	0.0
Orleans Parish - Old Parish Prison	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.0	2.1
Orleans Parish - South White Street Jail <sup>e</sup>	5.4	4.5	0.7	1.7	0.7
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase III	3.4	1.2	0.5	1.4	2.5
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase V	0.6	0.6	1.2	2.9	1.8
Ouachita Parish Corr. Fac.	2.1	1.8	1.4	1.9	1.3
Richland Parish Det. Ctr.	2.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Webster Parish - Bayou Dorcheat Corr. Ctr.	1.7	1.3	0.6	0.0	0.6
<b>Maine</b>					
Kennebec Co. Jail	3.1%	1.4%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%
<b>Maryland</b>					
Allegany Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Baltimore Co. Det. Ctr.	0.5	0.0	0.7	1.4	2.1
Caroline Co. Jail	7.9	7.9	10.0	7.9	7.9
Cecil Co. Det. Ctr.	1.5	1.3	0.9	1.5	2.2
Prince George's Co. Corr. Ctr.	0.6	0.6	1.0	2.2	1.5
<b>Massachusetts</b>					
Bristol Co. - Dartmouth Fac.	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%
Bristol Co. - New Bedford Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Hampshire Co. - Jail & House of Corr.	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6
Suffolk Co. House of Corr.	1.8	0.7	2.6	3.2	2.3
Worcester Co. Jail & House of Corr.	0.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Michigan</b>					
Barry Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jackson Co. - Chanter Road Corr. Fac.	1.2	0.0	1.6	2.4	0.8
Kent Co. Corr. Fac.	2.6	0.4	1.0	1.6	0.8
Lenawee Co. Jail	0.4	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9
Muskegon Co. Jail	1.3	0.4	0.5	1.0	1.2
Saginaw Co. Jail	1.7	1.2	1.8	1.8	0.7
Wayne Co. - Andrew C. Baird Det. Fac.	0.4	0.0	1.5	1.5	2.3
<b>Minnesota</b>					
Beltrami Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%
Morrison Co. Jail	2.1	2.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Sherburne Co. Jail	1.4	0.8	0.0	1.6	0.0
<b>Mississippi</b>					
Bolivar Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	2.0%
Copiah Co. Det. Ctr.	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0
Hinds Co. Penal Farm	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
Issaquena Co. Corr. Fac.	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jackson Co. Jail	2.3	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.2

**APPENDIX TABLE 7 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-0**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Mississippi (continued)</b>					
Lee. Co. Work Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Rankin Co. Jail	1.5	1.0	2.4	3.0	1.5
Winston-Choctaw Co. Regional Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.6	2.3	2.2	2.2
<b>Missouri</b>					
Jackson Co. Det. Ctr.	2.2%	1.1%	0.8%	1.5%	1.6%
Jefferson Co. Jail	3.3	1.5	0.7	0.7	0.7
Joplin City Jail	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	0.0
Lincoln Co. Jail	2.0	2.0	1.3	2.6	1.3
City of St. Louis - Med. Security Inst. & City Justice Ctr.	0.5	0.5	2.6	3.3	2.2
<b>Nebraska</b>					
Buffalo Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dodge Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Douglas Co. Corr. Ctr.	0.3	0.8	1.2	1.4	2.7
<b>Nevada</b>					
Carson City Jail	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
City of North Las Vegas Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.4
<b>New Hampshire</b>					
Rockingham Co. Jail & House of Corr.	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.8%	0.0%
<b>New Jersey</b>					
Camden Co. Jail	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	1.0%	1.8%
Essex Co. Corr. Fac.	1.6	0.9	0.8	1.2	2.0
Atlantic Co. - Gerard L. Gormley Justice Fac.	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Passaic Co. Jail	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sussex Co. - Walter Keogh Dwyer Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
<b>New Mexico</b>					
Chaves Co. Det. Ctr.	1.0%	1.6%	0.6%	1.1%	1.7%
Lea Co. Det. Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Roosevelt Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0
<b>New York</b>					
Columbia Co. Jail	0.0%	1.1%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%
Livingston Co. Jail	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Monroe Co. Jail	0.4	0.4	1.7	1.7	0.6
Nassau Co. Corr. Ctr.	0.6	1.7	1.6	1.9	0.0
New York City - Eric M. Taylor Ctr.	0.4	0.5	1.2	0.9	0.0
New York City - Manhattan Det. Ctr.	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.7	0.5
New York City - Vernon C. Bain Ctr.	0.8	1.1	2.1	4.1	1.3
Onondaga Co. Penitentiary	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.7
Orleans Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6
Wayne Co. Jail	1.0	0.0	3.1	3.1	1.1

**APPENDIX TABLE 7 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-0**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>North Carolina</b>					
Alamance Co. Jail	1.8%	0.8%	1.8%	1.8%	1.6%
Davidson Co. Jail	1.8	1.8	0.5	0.5	0.0
Durham Co. Jail	1.8	0.6	0.5	0.5	2.3
Johnston Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
McDowell Co. Jail	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Orange Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rowan Co. Jail	0.0	1.3	0.4	3.5	1.3
Wilson Co. Jail	1.6	1.6	3.3	4.5	3.3
<b>Ohio</b>					
Ashtabula Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clermont Co. Jail	1.2	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.0
Hamilton Co. - Talbert House - Turning Point Treatment Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lake Co. - Adult Max. Security Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Montgomery Co. Jail	1.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pickaway Co. Jail	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Wood Co. Justice Ctr.	0.8	3.6	0.8	0.8	0.8
<b>Oklahoma</b>					
Muskogee Co. Jail	1.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.5%	1.3%
Oklahoma Co. Jail	2.7	1.6	1.2	0.8	0.2
Pawnee Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Texas Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tulsa Co. - David L. Moss Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
<b>Oregon</b>					
Deschutes Co. Jail	1.5%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%
Polk Co. Jail	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.4	3.0
<b>Pennsylvania</b>					
Allegheny Co. Jail	1.2%	2.1%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%
Centre Co. Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.0	1.5	2.2	1.2
Chester Co. Prison	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dauphin Co. Prison	0.8	1.3	1.0	1.6	2.6
Lackawanna Co. Prison	0.5	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.8
Lawrence Co. Corr. Fac.	1.0	2.2	1.9	2.9	0.8
Lehigh Co. Prison	0.7	0.8	0.8	1.2	1.2
Lycoming Co. Prison	1.6	0.8	2.2	2.3	1.4
Monroe Co. Corr. Fac.	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Philadelphia City - Det. Ctr. & Prison Health Services Unit	0.0	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.7
Philadelphia City - House of Corr.	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.9
Philadelphia City - Industrial Corr. Ctr.	2.1	1.6	2.3	2.1	3.3
Tioga Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Westmoreland Co. Prison	0.0	1.6	0.0	1.3	0.4

**APPENDIX TABLE 7 (continued)**

**Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-0**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>South Carolina</b>					
Georgetown Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0%	0.8%	2.7%	2.7%	0.4%
Greenville Co. Det. Fac.	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
Horry Co. - J. Reuben Long Det. Ctr.	0.9	2.0	2.7	2.1	0.5
Lancaster Co. Det. Ctr.	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.6
Richland Co. Det. Ctr.	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.9	2.4
York Co. Moss Justice Ctr.	1.0	1.0	1.3	0.0	0.0
<b>South Dakota</b>					
Faulk Co. Jail	:	:	:	:	:
<b>Tennessee</b>					
Bedford Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Crockett Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	4.4	4.4	4.4
Davidson Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.6	0.6	0.0	1.2	1.6
Davidson Co. - Metro Det. Fac. <sup>f</sup>	0.4	0.4	1.9	1.9	3.1
Hamilton Co. Jail	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.9	0.8
Putnam Co. Jail	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Silverdale Penal Farm <sup>f</sup>	0.7	1.7	2.1	1.9	1.6
White Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.6	2.5
<b>Texas</b>					
Collin Co. Min. Security Fac.	1.7%	0.0%	1.3%	1.5%	0.0%
Dallas Co. - North Tower	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.0
Dallas Co. - West Tower	1.0	1.0	2.1	1.0	2.8
Ector Co. Jail	0.0	1.3	0.9	0.5	1.4
Ellis Co. Jail	0.0	0.5	1.4	1.4	0.5
Fort Bend Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
Harris Co. Jail	2.4	1.5	0.9	0.9	0.7
Harris Co. Jail - Baker Street	1.4	3.1	0.7	1.0	0.0
Henderson Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.3
Hood Co. Jail	2.2	2.2	2.3	3.1	2.2
Hunt Co. Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.6
Lubbock Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.8
Newton Co. Corr. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Nueces Co. Jail	1.3	1.2	0.4	0.8	0.5
Smith Co. Jail - Min. & Med. Security Fac.	1.1	0.5	1.4	1.9	2.0
Tarrant Co. Corr. Ctr.	1.5	2.2	1.5	1.9	2.2
Tarrant Co. - Green Bay Fac.	1.2	1.9	2.3	1.9	0.5
Terry Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Van Zandt Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Walker Co. Jail	4.0	4.0	0.0	1.4	1.3
Webb Co. Jail	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.3
Wichita Co. Jail	0.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Utah</b>					
Salt Lake Co. Jail	1.3%	1.7%	0.4%	0.7%	1.8%
Uintah Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah Co. Jail	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.4	0.0

**APPENDIX TABLE 7 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting sexual victimization, by level of coercion, and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-0**

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate <sup>a</sup>		Staff sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>		
	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Physically forced <sup>b</sup>	Pressured <sup>c</sup>	Without force or pressure <sup>d</sup>
<b>Virginia</b>					
Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail	0.4%	2.0%	1.3%	1.1%	1.7%
Alexandria City Det. Ctr.	1.7	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Chesapeake Corr. Ctr.	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	2.6
Eastern Shore Regional Jail	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	9.9
Fairfax Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	1.5	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.3
Hampton Roads Regional Jail	0.5	0.8	1.0	2.0	3.1
Loudoun Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	1.0	1.0	2.2	1.0	1.1
Middle Peninsula Regional Security Ctr.	2.2	0.0	2.1	2.1	3.4
Norfolk City Jail	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.1
Northwestern Regional Adult Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7
Page Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Roanoke City Jail	3.3	1.9	1.2	2.2	2.2
Southside Regional Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
<b>Washington</b>					
Clallam Co. Corr. Fac.	4.4%	2.0%	5.2%	5.0%	2.0%
King Co. Corr. Fac.	1.0	2.3	1.1	2.8	0.4
Pierce Co. Det. and Corr. Ctr. - New Jail & Main Jail	1.6	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.4
Spokane Co. - Geiger Corr. Ctr.	1.5	1.8	1.0	1.4	1.4
Spokane Co. Jail	1.4	0.9	0.9	1.3	0.5
<b>West Virginia</b>					
Southwestern Regional Jail	2.6%	1.4%	2.2%	2.2%	1.7%
<b>Wisconsin</b>					
Chippewa Co. Jail	1.5%	0.0%	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%
Dane Co. Jail	1.6	2.1	1.0	1.9	2.1
LaCrosse Co. Jail	3.3	3.3	4.1	4.1	2.1
Ozaukee Co. Jail	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Racine Co. Jail	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.9	0.7
<b>Wyoming</b>					
Natrona Co. Det. Ctr.	1.0%	2.2%	2.1%	2.5%	1.0%

:Not available.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.<sup>b</sup>Physical force or threat of physical force reported.<sup>c</sup>Includes incidents in which the perpetrator, without using force, pressured the inmate or made the inmate feel that they had to participate. (See *Methodology*.)<sup>d</sup>Includes incidents in which the staff offered favors or privileges in exchange for sex or sexual contact and incidents in which the inmate reported that they willingly had sex or sexual contact with staff.<sup>e</sup>Female facility.<sup>f</sup>Privately operated facility.



**APPENDIX TABLE 8****Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Total</b>	2.0%	1.8%	2.2%	1.1%	1.0%	1.2%
<b>Alabama</b>						
Chilton Co. Jail	1.9%	1.1%	3.4%	1.6%	0.7%	3.4%
Houston Co. Jail	4.5	2.7	7.2	2.9	1.5	5.4
Madison Co. Det. Fac.	2.7	1.6	4.7	4.4	2.9	6.7
Montgomery Co. Det. Fac.	2.0	1.1	3.7	1.1	0.5	2.4
Russell Co. Jail	1.1	0.6	2.3	2.1	1.0	4.1
<b>Arizona</b>						
Maricopa Co. - Durango Jail	1.8%	0.8%	3.9%	1.2%	0.5%	2.9%
Maricopa Co. - Tent City Jail	0.4	0.1	1.7	1.5	0.7	3.5
Maricopa Co. - Towers Jail	4.3	2.3	7.7	2.0	0.9	4.1
Mohave Co. Jail	4.4	2.7	7.1	0.4	0.1	1.4
Pima Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	0.7	0.2	2.2	0.3	0.1	1.7
<b>Arkansas</b>						
Drew Co. Det. Fac.	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%
Faulkner Co. Det. Ctr.	1.1	0.6	2.2	2.3	1.4	3.9
Garland Co. Adult Det. Ctr.	4.2	2.4	7.1	1.7	0.7	3.8
Sharp Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	10.2	0.0	0.0	10.2
<b>California</b>						
Butte Co. Jail	2.7%	1.4%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Fresno Co. - Main Jail, North Annex, & South Annex	2.6	1.2	5.6	2.3	1.1	5.0
Kern Co. - Lerdo Min. Security Fac.	1.4	0.6	3.2	1.0	0.4	2.7
Lake Co. - Hill Road Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.3
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - East Fac.	1.9	0.8	4.8	1.9	0.8	4.4
Los Angeles Co. - Pitchess Det. Ctr. - North Fac.	1.0	0.3	3.7	0.0	0.0	1.8
Los Angeles Co. - Men's Central Jail	1.9	0.5	6.8	3.1	1.4	6.8
Madera Co. Jail	4.2	2.4	7.2	0.7	0.2	2.4
Mendocino Co. Jail	0.8	0.2	2.7	2.0	0.8	5.0
Monterey Co. Jail	1.1	0.3	3.9	2.6	1.2	5.7
Orange Co. - Central Jail Complex	2.2	1.0	4.7	0.8	0.2	2.9
Orange Co. - J.A. Musick Fac.	1.9	0.9	4.0	0.4	0.1	1.5
Riverside Co. - Robert Presley Det. Ctr.	3.9	1.9	7.7	0.9	0.2	4.4
Riverside Co. - Southwest Det. Ctr.	1.8	0.6	5.2	1.3	0.5	3.6
Sacramento Co. - Main Jail	3.3	1.8	6.3	2.1	0.9	4.6
San Bernardino Co. - Central Det. Ctr.	0.4	0.1	1.7	0.4	0.1	1.7
San Bernardino Co. - West Valley Det. Ctr.	2.5	1.4	4.7	2.5	1.4	4.6
San Diego Co. - Central Det. Fac.	5.2	2.8	9.3	1.5	0.6	4.2
San Diego Co. - Descanso Det. Fac.	1.8	0.9	3.7	0.0	0.0	2.7
San Francisco Co. - County Jail #8	4.0	2.3	6.9	2.0	0.9	4.3
San Joaquin Co. Jail	1.7	0.6	4.5	1.1	0.3	4.2
San Mateo Co. - Maguire Corr. Fac.	1.1	0.3	3.3	0.5	0.1	2.5
Santa Cruz Co. - Blaine Street Fac. <sup>e</sup>	7.7	3.1	17.8	0.0	0.0	22.8
Solano Co. - Sentenced Det. Fac.	0.7	0.2	2.7	0.0	0.0	3.2
Sonoma Co. - North Det. Fac.	1.2	0.5	2.7	0.5	0.1	1.5

**APPENDIX TABLE 8 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Colorado</b>						
Adams Co. Det. Fac.	0.6%	0.2%	2.0%	0.5%	0.1%	1.6%
Arapahoe Co. Jail	1.7	0.7	4.1	1.0	0.3	3.6
El Paso Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.8	0.2	2.5	0.9	0.3	3.1
Jefferson Co. Jail	0.3	0.1	1.4	1.1	0.4	3.0
Logan Co. Jail	3.3	1.6	6.8	0.0	0.0	5.5
<b>District of Columbia</b>						
D.C. Dept of Corr. - Central Det. Fac. & Corr. Treatment Fac.	4.4%	2.1%	8.8%	1.6%	0.4%	5.8%
<b>Florida</b>						
Bay Co. Jail	1.4%	0.6%	3.4%	0.9%	0.3%	2.8%
Broward Co. - Joseph V. Conte Fac.	2.5	1.2	5.2	0.9	0.3	3.1
Broward Co. - Main Jail	1.5	0.5	4.0	3.1	1.5	6.4
Broward Co. - North Broward Bureau	3.9	2.3	6.6	0.6	0.1	2.8
Broward Co. - Paul Rein Det. Fac.	1.9	0.9	4.1	1.2	0.5	3.1
Charlotte Co. Jail	1.5	0.5	4.2	1.6	0.5	4.9
Hardee Co. Jail	2.2	0.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	6.0
Highlands Co. Jail	1.7	0.7	3.9	0.0	0.0	2.2
Hillsborough Co. - Falkenburg Road Jail	1.2	0.4	3.3	0.9	0.3	2.8
Jacksonville - James I. Montgomery Corr. Ctr.	1.7	0.8	3.5	0.3	0.1	1.3
Marion Co. Jail	1.1	0.4	2.9	0.7	0.2	2.2
Miami-Dade Co. - Metro West Det. Ctr.	1.2	0.4	3.2	0.5	0.1	2.8
Miami-Dade Co. - Pre-trial Det. Ctr.	6.8	4.1	11.1	1.0	0.3	3.2
Monroe Co. Det. Ctr.	0.3	0.1	1.4	2.6	1.3	5.1
Nassau Co. Det. Fac.	0.7	0.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.2
Okaloosa Co. Jail	2.1	1.1	4.0	0.4	0.1	1.7
Osceola Co. Jail	1.0	0.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	1.8
Palm Beach Co. - Main Det. Ctr.	1.4	0.5	3.7	1.0	0.4	2.8
Pinellas Co. Med. Security Fac.	1.1	0.4	2.6	2.3	1.2	4.4
Polk Co. - Central County Jail	0.6	0.1	2.5	1.1	0.4	3.1
St. Lucie Co. Main Jail	1.0	0.4	2.6	1.5	0.6	4.0
Volusia Co. Branch Jail	2.2	1.1	4.7	0.0	0.0	1.5
Walton Co. Jail	3.3	2.1	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
<b>Georgia</b>						
Atlanta City Jail	1.3%	0.5%	3.4%	3.2%	1.5%	6.7%
Bulloch Co. Jail	3.9	2.5	6.0	1.2	0.5	2.5
Chatham Co. Det. Ctr.	1.1	0.4	3.0	0.3	0.1	1.4
Clarke Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.5	0.7	3.2
Clayton Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.6	0.8	3.5
Cobb Co. - Jail & Prison Unit	1.6	0.7	4.0	0.4	0.1	2.2
Coweta Co. Prison	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Dekalb Co. Jail	2.3	1.1	4.9	1.9	0.9	4.3
Fulton Co. - Alpharetta Annex	0.0	0.0	10.4	0.0	0.0	10.4
Gilmer Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	6.6	0.0	0.0	6.6
Houston Co. Jail	1.1	0.4	3.0	0.9	0.3	2.4

**APPENDIX TABLE 8 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Georgia (continued)</b>						
Jackson Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%
Jasper Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	16.8	0.0	0.0	16.8
Lowndes Co. Jail	1.8	0.9	3.6	0.5	0.1	2.1
Muscogee Co. Prison	1.7	0.8	3.6	0.4	0.1	1.7
Richmond Co. - Charles B. Webster Det. Ctr.	2.0	0.9	4.3	1.2	0.5	2.9
Roswell City Jail	0.0	0.0	29.9	0.0	0.0	29.9
Turner Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	15.5	0.0	0.0	15.5
Ware Co. Jail	2.8	1.7	4.6	1.3	0.6	2.5
<b>Idaho</b>						
Canyon Co. Jail	3.0%	1.6%	5.4%	0.5%	0.1%	1.9%
Madison Co. Jail	1.1	0.3	3.9	0.0	0.0	8.8
<b>Illinois</b>						
Cook Co. Jail - Division 1	3.8%	2.2%	6.5%	1.4%	0.7%	2.9%
Cook Co. Jail - Division 6	4.3	2.7	6.9	2.1	1.1	4.0
Cook Co. Jail - Division 9	2.4	1.2	4.8	2.6	1.1	5.8
DuPage Co. Jail	1.6	0.7	3.7	1.9	0.8	4.3
LaSalle Co. Jail	3.9	2.3	6.5	0.0	0.0	3.2
Vermilion Co. Jail	2.1	1.2	3.7	1.0	0.4	2.5
Winnebago Co. Jail	3.8	2.1	6.7	0.6	0.1	2.5
<b>Indiana</b>						
Boone Co. Jail	1.3%	0.6%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
Brown Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	14.9	0.0	0.0	14.9
Madison Co. Det. Ctr.	2.0	1.1	3.6	3.5	2.2	5.6
Marion Co. Jail II <sup>f</sup>	3.1	1.4	6.6	0.4	0.1	1.9
Pulaski Co. Jail	1.9	1.2	2.8	0.0	0.0	4.2
Vigo Co. Jail	4.6	2.8	7.4	1.9	0.9	4.0
<b>Iowa</b>						
Black Hawk Co. Jail	1.9%	1.1%	3.4%	0.8%	0.3%	2.0%
Linn Co. Corr. Ctr.	1.3	0.4	4.7	2.7	1.2	6.0
<b>Kansas</b>						
Butler Co. Jail	3.1%	1.8%	5.3%	0.9%	0.3%	2.5%
Johnson Co. - New Century Adult Det. Ctr.	1.6	0.5	4.4	0.9	0.2	3.1
Rice Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	22.8	0.0	0.0	22.8
Sedgwick Co. Jail	1.3	0.5	3.6	0.8	0.2	2.7
<b>Kentucky</b>						
Campbell Co. Det. Ctr.	1.6%	0.7%	3.3%	1.1%	0.4%	2.8%
Floyd Co. Det. Ctr.	1.3	0.5	3.1	1.9	0.6	6.1
Franklin Co. Regional Jail	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.4
Henderson Co. Det. Ctr.	1.5	0.6	3.7	0.0	0.0	2.1
Jessamine Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	7.7
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Community Corr. Ctr.	1.8	0.7	4.5	1.0	0.3	3.3
Louisville Metro Dept. of Corr. - Metro Corr. Fac.	1.1	0.4	3.0	0.8	0.3	2.8
Warren Co. Regional Jail	2.3	1.1	5.0	0.9	0.3	2.6

**APPENDIX TABLE 8 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Louisiana</b>						
Calcasieu Parish Corr. Ctr.	2.2%	1.0%	4.9%	0.4%	0.1%	1.9%
Morehouse Parish Det. Ctr.	1.1	0.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.1
Natchitoches Det. Ctr.	0.6	0.2	1.6	0.6	0.2	1.7
Orleans Parish - Conchetta Jail	2.1	0.9	4.9	1.1	0.3	4.5
Orleans Parish - Old Parish Prison	1.8	0.8	4.1	1.3	0.6	2.9
Orleans Parish - South White Street Jail <sup>e</sup>	2.3	1.3	4.1	6.6	4.7	9.1
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase III	3.3	1.8	5.9	1.8	0.7	4.8
Orleans Parish - Templeman Phase V	2.9	1.6	5.5	0.6	0.2	2.2
Ouachita Parish Corr. Fac.	3.0	1.7	5.4	2.1	1.0	4.3
Richland Parish Det. Ctr.	0.7	0.2	1.9	2.1	1.2	3.8
Webster Parish - Bayou Dorcheat Corr. Ctr.	1.7	0.8	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.9
<b>Maine</b>						
Kennebec Co. Jail	3.8%	1.7%	7.9%	1.0%	0.3%	3.1%
<b>Maryland</b>						
Allegany Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%
Baltimore Co. Det. Ctr.	2.2	0.8	6.0	1.8	0.6	4.8
Caroline Co. Jail	7.9	2.0	26.6	2.1	0.5	8.3
Cecil Co. Det. Ctr.	1.5	0.6	3.9	1.2	0.4	3.0
Prince George's Co. Corr. Ctr.	2.5	1.2	5.2	1.0	0.4	2.6
<b>Massachusetts</b>						
Bristol Co. - Dartmouth Fac.	0.9%	0.3%	3.3%	2.0%	1.0%	3.9%
Bristol Co. - New Bedford Fac.	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.7	0.2	1.9
Hampshire Co. - Jail & House of Corr.	0.6	0.2	1.8	0.5	0.1	1.5
Suffolk Co. House of Corr.	3.1	1.4	6.4	1.1	0.2	5.4
Worcester Co. Jail & House of Corr.	1.5	0.6	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
<b>Michigan</b>						
Barry Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%
Jackson Co. - Chanter Road Corr. Fac.	2.4	1.2	4.7	1.2	0.4	3.5
Kent Co. Corr. Fac.	2.0	0.8	4.5	1.8	0.8	4.2
Lenawee Co. Jail	0.9	0.4	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.7
Muskegon Co. Jail	2.1	1.1	3.9	0.8	0.2	2.7
Saginaw Co. Jail	2.5	1.1	5.2	0.5	0.1	2.1
Wayne Co. - Andrew C. Baird Det. Fac.	2.0	0.9	4.2	0.4	0.1	1.9
<b>Minnesota</b>						
Beltrami Co. Jail	2.9%	0.7%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%
Morrison Co. Jail	4.2	1.8	9.5	0.0	0.0	9.0
Sherburne Co. Jail	1.6	0.5	4.8	0.7	0.1	2.9
<b>Mississippi</b>						
Bolivar Co. Jail	1.5%	0.7%	2.9%	0.5%	0.2%	1.6%
Copiah Co. Det. Ctr.	2.1	1.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	7.7
Hinds Co. Penal Farm	0.5	0.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.3
Issaquena Co. Corr. Fac.	0.0	0.0	9.0	3.5	1.2	9.3
Jackson Co. Jail	2.1	1.1	4.1	2.6	1.5	4.5

**APPENDIX TABLE 8 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Mississippi (continued)</b>						
Lee. Co. Work Ctr.	0.0%	0.0%	24.3%	0.0%	0.0%	24.3%
Rankin Co. Jail	5.5	3.2	9.1	0.5	0.1	1.8
Winston-Choctaw Co. Regional Corr. Fac.	3.4	2.1	5.6	0.0	0.0	2.0
<b>Missouri</b>						
Jackson Co. Det. Ctr.	3.3%	1.8%	5.9%	2.1%	1.0%	4.4%
Jefferson Co. Jail	1.5	0.7	2.9	4.0	2.5	6.2
Joplin City Jail	0.0	0.0	11.7	2.5	1.0	6.3
Lincoln Co. Jail	2.6	1.2	5.7	0.7	0.2	2.1
City of St. Louis - Med. Security Inst. & City Justice Ctr.	4.7	2.6	8.2	1.1	0.3	3.4
<b>Nebraska</b>						
Buffalo Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%
Dodge Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	17.6	0.0	0.0	17.6
Douglas Co. Corr. Ctr.	3.7	1.7	7.8	0.3	0.1	1.3
<b>Nevada</b>						
Carson City Jail	0.8%	0.3%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
City of North Las Vegas Det. Ctr.	1.1	0.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	1.8
<b>New Hampshire</b>						
Rockingham Co. Jail & House of Corr.	2.8%	1.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
<b>New Jersey</b>						
Camden Co. Jail	1.5%	0.5%	4.2%	1.3%	0.4%	4.3%
Essex Co. Corr. Fac.	2.2	1.0	4.8	1.2	0.4	3.7
Atlantic Co. - Gerard L. Gormley Justice Fac.	0.7	0.1	3.5	1.8	0.4	8.7
Passaic Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.4	0.1	2.1
Sussex Co. - Walter Keogh Dwyer Corr. Fac.	1.0	0.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	4.8
<b>New Mexico</b>						
Chaves Co. Det. Ctr.	1.1%	0.5%	2.4%	2.2%	1.1%	4.3%
Lea Co. Det. Fac.	0.0	0.0	9.6	0.0	0.0	9.6
Roosevelt Co. Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	6.0	1.7	0.7	4.3
<b>New York</b>						
Columbia Co. Jail	1.5%	0.5%	4.3%	1.1%	0.4%	3.2%
Livingston Co. Jail	2.6	1.1	5.8	0.0	0.0	6.8
Monroe Co. Jail	2.7	0.9	8.1	0.0	0.0	1.9
Nassau Co. Corr. Ctr.	1.5	0.5	4.4	2.6	1.3	5.2
New York City - Eric M. Taylor Ctr.	2.2	0.9	5.3	0.4	0.1	1.9
New York City - Manhattan Det. Ctr.	4.3	2.0	9.1	0.5	0.1	2.3
New York City - Vernon C. Bain Ctr.	4.0	2.1	7.3	0.5	0.1	2.2
Onondaga Co. Penitentiary	1.7	0.7	4.1	0.0	0.0	2.5
Orleans Co. Jail	3.8	2.1	6.8	1.8	0.8	4.0
Wayne Co. Jail	3.1	1.8	5.4	1.0	0.4	2.6

**APPENDIX TABLE 8 (continued)****Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>North Carolina</b>						
Alamance Co. Jail	3.0%	1.7%	5.3%	1.0%	0.4%	2.5%
Davidson Co. Jail	1.1	0.5	2.2	0.7	0.3	1.7
Durham Co. Jail	1.9	0.9	3.6	3.4	1.8	6.2
Johnston Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
McDowell Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	6.2	2.8	1.2	6.4
Orange Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	4.4
Rowan Co. Jail	3.6	1.8	7.2	1.5	0.6	4.0
Wilson Co. Jail	4.5	1.9	9.8	0.0	0.0	5.3
<b>Ohio</b>						
Ashtabula Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
Hamilton Co. - Talbert House - Turning Point Treatment Ctr.	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
Clermont Co. Jail	1.2	0.5	2.9	0.6	0.2	1.9
Lake Co. - Adult Max. Security Det. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.5	0.1	1.6
Montgomery Co. Jail	0.6	0.1	2.8	0.8	0.3	2.7
Pickaway Co. Jail	0.8	0.3	2.0	0.8	0.3	2.1
Wood Co. Justice Ctr.	0.8	0.2	2.5	2.9	0.9	8.9
<b>Oklahoma</b>						
Muskogee Co. Jail	1.3%	0.5%	3.6%	0.5%	0.1%	2.0%
Oklahoma Co. Jail	2.4	1.2	5.0	2.1	0.9	4.7
Pawnee Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	21.5	0.0	0.0	21.5
Texas Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
Tulsa Co. - David L. Moss Criminal Justice Ctr.	0.4	0.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.7
<b>Oregon</b>						
Deschutes Co. Jail	0.7%	0.2%	2.3%	2.5%	1.3%	4.5%
Polk Co. Jail	5.9	3.6	9.8	2.1	1.0	4.2
<b>Pennsylvania</b>						
Allegheny Co. Jail	1.3%	0.5%	3.2%	1.4%	0.4%	4.8%
Centre Co. Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.2	1.8	3.6	2.0	6.2
Chester Co. Prison	0.8	0.3	2.1	0.3	0.1	1.4
Dauphin Co. Prison	2.9	1.6	5.4	0.8	0.3	2.3
Lackawanna Co. Prison	0.8	0.3	2.3	2.7	1.3	5.7
Lawrence Co. Corr. Fac.	2.9	1.3	6.3	1.0	0.3	3.4
Lehigh Co. Prison	2.0	0.9	4.2	0.7	0.2	2.2
Lycoming Co. Prison	2.2	0.7	7.0	2.2	0.7	7.1
Monroe Co. Corr. Fac.	0.6	0.2	2.2	0.2	0.1	0.8
Philadelphia City - Det. Ctr. & Prison Health Services Unit	1.8	0.6	4.9	2.2	0.9	5.3
Philadelphia City - House of Corr.	1.5	0.5	4.2	1.0	0.3	3.3
Philadelphia City - Industrial Corr. Ctr.	5.4	3.3	8.7	1.2	0.4	3.1
Tioga Co. Jail	3.0	1.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	8.4
Westmoreland Co. Prison	1.3	0.4	4.1	0.7	0.2	3.3

**APPENDIX TABLE 8 (continued)**

**Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>South Carolina</b>						
Georgetown Co. Det. Ctr.	1.2%	0.4%	3.5%	2.7%	0.7%	10.1%
Greenville Co. Det. Fac.	0.4	0.1	1.7	1.0	0.2	4.3
Horry Co. - J. Reuben Long Det. Ctr.	3.9	2.0	7.3	0.7	0.2	2.1
Lancaster Co. Det. Ctr.	0.9	0.3	3.2	1.6	0.5	5.4
Richland Co. Det. Ctr.	1.8	0.8	4.0	1.6	0.6	4.1
York Co. Moss Justice Ctr.	2.3	0.8	6.6	0.0	0.0	3.4
<b>South Dakota</b>						
Faulk Co. Jail	:	:	:	:	:	:
<b>Tennessee</b>						
Bedford Co. Jail	1.2%	0.5%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
Crockett Co. Jail	4.4	1.8	10.0	0.0	0.0	11.4
Davidson Co. - Criminal Justice Ctr.	2.1	0.8	5.3	0.7	0.1	2.9
Davidson Co. - Metro Det. Fac. <sup>f</sup>	4.3	2.6	6.9	0.0	0.0	1.5
Hamilton Co. Jail	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.9	0.3	2.6
Putnam Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.7	0.2	2.3
Silverdale Penal Farm <sup>f</sup>	1.9	0.9	3.9	2.1	0.9	4.9
White Co. Jail	1.8	0.9	3.4	1.6	0.8	3.1
<b>Texas</b>						
Collin Co. Min. Security Fac.	1.7%	0.7%	4.3%	2.7%	1.4%	5.3%
Dallas Co. - North Tower	1.7	0.6	4.7	0.3	0.1	1.5
Dallas Co. - West Tower	3.6	1.8	7.0	0.6	0.1	3.1
Ector Co. Jail	1.3	0.4	4.4	0.5	0.1	2.6
Ellis Co. Jail	0.5	0.1	1.7	1.9	0.8	4.3
Fort Bend Co. Jail	1.6	0.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	2.0
Harris Co. Jail	1.3	0.5	3.3	1.1	0.3	3.7
Harris Co. Jail - Baker Street	2.2	1.0	4.6	2.5	1.3	4.9
Henderson Co. Jail	1.3	0.3	5.3	1.2	0.3	4.7
Hood Co. Jail	2.9	1.9	4.3	1.6	0.9	2.8
Hunt Co. Criminal Justice Ctr.	1.4	0.6	3.7	0.0	0.0	2.6
Lubbock Co. Jail	1.4	0.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	2.8
Newton Co. Corr. Ctr. <sup>f</sup>	0.7	0.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.5
Nueces Co. Jail	1.7	0.8	3.9	0.4	0.1	1.7
Smith Co. Jail - Min. & Med. Security Fac.	3.4	1.7	6.6	0.0	0.0	2.4
Tarrant Co. Corr. Ctr.	2.7	1.2	6.0	2.6	1.1	5.7
Tarrant Co. - Green Bay Fac.	2.9	1.2	7.2	0.7	0.1	3.5
Terry Co. Jail	1.2	0.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	4.1
Van Zandt Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	3.5
Walker Co. Jail	1.3	0.4	4.4	4.1	2.0	8.4
Webb Co. Jail	2.0	0.8	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Wichita Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	3.3	3.4	1.6	7.0
<b>Utah</b>						
Salt Lake Co. Jail	2.4%	1.2%	4.8%	1.4%	0.6%	3.4%
Uintah Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	8.6
Utah Co. Jail	0.4	0.1	1.8	1.2	0.5	2.9

**APPENDIX TABLE 8 (continued)**

**Percent of jail inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts <sup>a</sup>			Abusive sexual contacts only <sup>b</sup>		
	Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>		Percent victimized <sup>d</sup>	95%-confidence interval <sup>c</sup>	
		Lower bound	Upper bound		Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Virginia</b>						
Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail	3.8%	1.9%	7.2%	1.0%	0.3%	3.1%
Alexandria City Det. Ctr.	0.9	0.2	4.0	0.8	0.2	3.9
Chesapeake Corr. Ctr.	2.6	0.9	6.7	0.0	0.0	3.2
Eastern Shore Regional Jail	9.9	4.3	21.5	0.0	0.0	12.5
Fairfax Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	1.5	0.6	3.7	0.8	0.2	2.9
Hampton Roads Regional Jail	3.3	1.7	6.3	2.0	0.9	4.4
Loudoun Co. - Adult Det. Ctr.	2.0	0.8	5.2	1.2	0.3	4.4
Middle Peninsula Regional Security Ctr.	3.1	1.6	5.6	3.4	1.6	7.2
Norfolk City Jail	1.4	0.5	3.9	0.0	0.0	2.1
Northwestern Regional Adult Det. Ctr.	0.7	0.2	2.9	0.4	0.1	1.8
Page Co. Jail	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3
Roanoke City Jail	4.1	2.1	7.5	1.1	0.4	2.9
Southside Regional Jail	2.6	0.9	6.9	0.0	0.0	4.1
<b>Washington</b>						
Clallam Co. Corr. Fac.	5.4%	3.0%	9.5%	3.0%	1.3%	6.6%
King Co. Corr. Fac.	4.0	2.1	7.6	1.5	0.6	3.6
Pierce Co. Det. and Corr. Ctr. - New Jail & Main Jail	0.4	0.1	2.2	1.6	0.6	4.3
Spokane Co. - Geiger Corr. Ctr.	1.4	0.6	3.2	2.1	1.0	4.4
Spokane Co. Jail	1.4	0.5	3.4	1.5	0.6	3.6
<b>West Virginia</b>						
Southwestern Regional Jail	2.1%	1.0%	4.5%	4.3%	2.5%	7.2%
<b>Wisconsin</b>						
Chippewa Co. Jail	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	2.9%	1.1%	7.3%
Dane Co. Jail	1.9	0.6	6.1	2.3	0.8	6.4
LaCrosse Co. Jail	5.2	2.5	10.5	0.0	0.0	4.1
Ozaukee Co. Jail	1.0	0.3	2.9	0.9	0.3	2.6
Racine Co. Jail	2.1	0.8	5.3	1.3	0.4	3.9
<b>Wyoming</b>						
Natrona Co. Det. Ctr.	3.5%	2.0%	5.9%	1.4%	0.6%	3.3%

:Not available.

<sup>a</sup>Includes all inmates who reported unwanted contacts with another inmate or any contacts with staff that involved oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Includes all inmates who reported unwanted contacts with another inmate or any contacts with staff that involved touching of the inmate's buttocks, thigh, penis, breasts or vagina in a sexual way occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>c</sup>Indicates that different samples in the same facility would yield prevalence rates falling between the lower and upper bound estimates 95 out of 100 times.

<sup>d</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on select characteristics, including age, sex, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>e</sup>Female facility.

<sup>f</sup>Privately operated facility.



**APPENDIX TABLE 9****Characteristics of special correctional facilities and prevalence of sexual victimization, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Special correctional facilities	Number of inmates in custody <sup>c</sup>	Respondents to sexual victimization survey <sup>d</sup>	Response rate <sup>e</sup>	Inmates reporting sexual victimization <sup>a</sup>		
				Percent <sup>f</sup>	Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Immigration and Customs Enforcement facilities</b>						
Eloy Det. Ctr. (AZ) <sup>g,h</sup>	1,464	241	63%	0.7%	0.2%	2.4%
Stewart Det. Ctr. (GA) <sup>h</sup>	1,506	138	66	0.9	0.2	4.5
Elizabeth Contract Det. Fac. (NJ) <sup>g,h</sup>	224	100	68	0.8	0.3	2.7
El Paso Processing Ctr. (TX) <sup>g</sup>	767	250	79	2.1	1.1	4.0
South Texas Det. Complex (TX) <sup>g</sup>	991	164	64	0.0	0.0	2.3
<b>Military facilities</b>						
Marine Corps Base Brig, Camp Pendleton (CA)	171	105	85%	0.5%	0.2%	1.6%
Naval Consolidated Brig, Miramar (CA) <sup>g</sup>	266	125	73	2.9	1.4	5.6
U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Leavenworth (KS)	437	149	71	6.0	3.6	10.0
<b>Tribal jails</b>						
Gila River DOC and Rehab. (AZ) <sup>g</sup>	149	97	77%	1.0%	0.4%	2.6%
Navajo Nation-Window Rock (AZ)	14	10	100	0.0	0.0	27.8

<sup>a</sup>Includes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, hand jobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts occurring in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

<sup>b</sup>Indicates that different samples in the same facility would yield prevalence rates falling between the lower and upper bound estimates 95 out of 100 times.

<sup>c</sup>Number of inmates in custody on day when the facility provided the sample roster.

<sup>d</sup>Number of respondents consenting to the sexual victimization survey on NIS. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>e</sup>Response rate is equal to the number of respondents divided by the number of eligible inmates sampled times 100 percent.

<sup>f</sup>Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on select characteristics, including age, sex, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology*.)

<sup>g</sup>Facility houses both males and females; both were sampled at this facility.

<sup>h</sup>Privately operated facility.

**APPENDIX TABLE 10.****Wald F statistics for inmate risk characteristics in the final multivariate logistic models of sexual victimization in prisons and jails, by type of incident, National Inmate Survey, 2008-09**

Inmate characteristic	Degrees of freedom	Wald F statistics for sexual victimization in prison		Wald F statistics for sexual victimization in jail	
	All models*	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff sexual misconduct
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>					
Sex	1	4.20	38.48	4.06	35.87
Race/Hispanic origin	4	4.17	3.16	--	7.27
Age	5	--	8.92	6.90	23.15
Education	3	--	3.89	8.55	17.52
Marital status	2	3.20	--	--	--
Weight	3	--	--	5.19	--
<b>Sexual orientation/history characteristics</b>					
Sexual orientation	1	104.60	14.32	61.21	--
Number of sexual partners	4	--	2.65	--	6.68
Prior sexual assault	1	319.00	135.70	345.60	247.20
<b>Criminal justice status/history characteristics</b>					
Most serious offense	4	15.04	3.96	2.61	--
Sentence length	5	3.78	6.20	--	--
Time in a correctional facility prior to current facility	4	--	4.23	--	6.30
Number of times arrested	3	--	--	2.98	5.06
Time since admission	4	--	--	7.35	5.42

Note: Wald-F tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of each inmate characteristic in the four final models presented in table 12. For each characteristic, the Wald-F tests the null hypothesis that all regression coefficients are equal to zero (i.e., the probability of experiencing a victimization is the same across all categories of the selected characteristic), conditional on all other inmate characteristics being included in the model. The Wald F statistic is calculated by comparing the maximum likelihood estimate for the characteristic to an estimate of its standard error. Though varying by the number of degrees of freedom, statistics greater than 2.0 (for 1 degree of freedom) are statistically significant at the 95%-confidence level.

--Characteristic deleted from model when Wald statistic was not significant at the 95%-confidence level.

\*For each inmate characteristic, the degrees of freedom represent the number of categories minus 1.



Office of Justic Programs  
Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods  
<http://www.ojp.usdog.gov>