



Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

December 2007, NCJ 219414

Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003

Sexual Victimization in State and Federal Prisons Reported by Inmates, 2007

By Allen J. Beck, Ph.D.
and Paige M. Harrison,
BJS Statisticians

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-79) requires the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to *carry out, for each calendar year, a comprehensive statistical review and analysis of the incidence and effects of prison rape.* This report fulfills the requirement under Sec. 4(c)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act to provide a listing of State and Federal prisons ranked according to the incidence of prison rape.

Between April and August 2007, BJS completed the first National Inmate Survey (NIS) of 146 State and Federal prisons. The survey, conducted by RTI International (Research Triangle Park, NC), was restricted to adult confinement facilities, including prisons, penitentiaries, prison hospitals, prison farms, boot camps, and centers for reception, classification, or alcohol and drug treatment. The NIS excluded community-based facilities, such as halfway houses, group homes, and work release centers. The sample was designed in accordance with the requirement that BJS draw a random sample, or other scientifically appropriate sample, of not less than 10% of prison facilities. (See *Methodology* for sample description.)

Unlike previous BJS surveys of sexual violence that were based on administrative records, the NIS collected reports of sexual violence directly from inmates. The NIS 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. A small number of inmates (2% of all participants in the survey) completed a short paper form. These were inmates housed primarily in administrative or disciplinary segregation or considered too violent to be interviewed.

State and Federal prisoners reporting sexual victimization, 2007

Type*	National estimate	
	Number	Percent
Total	60,500	4.5%
Inmate-on-inmate	27,500	2.1%
Nonconsensual sexual acts	16,800	1.3
Abusive sexual contacts only	10,600	0.8
Staff sexual misconduct	38,600	2.9%
Unwilling activity	22,600	1.7%
Excluding touching	16,900	1.3
Touching only	5,700	0.4
Willing activity	22,700	1.7%
Excluding touching	20,600	1.5
Touching only	2,100	0.2

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.

*See *Methodology* for definition of terms.

Inmate self-reports provide a basis for comparing and ranking facilities

Past surveys of administrative records could not provide reliable facility-level estimates of sexual violence because they were limited to incidents reported to correctional authorities. Some victims may be reluctant to report incidents to correctional authorities due to lack of trust in staff, fear of reprisal from perpetrators, a code of silence among inmates, or personal embarrassment. Moreover, administrative records may vary in the way incidents and allegations are defined, reported, and recorded, which further complicate facility-level comparisons.

The NIS is a self-administered survey which provides anonymity to respondents and encourages fuller reporting of victimization. The survey employs computer-assisted technology to provide more uniform conditions under which inmates complete the survey. Facility-level comparisons in

the NIS are further enhanced through the application of statistical methods that ensure that the estimates reflect the entire population of each facility, rather than only the inmates who participated in the survey. (See *Methodology* for sample description and non-response adjustments.)

For purposes of calculating comparative rates, the NIS limited the reports of sexual victimization to incidents that occurred at the sampled facilities during the 12 months prior to the date of the interview. Inmates who had served less than 12 months were asked about their experiences since they had arrived at the facility.

Despite efforts of survey staff to reassure inmates that their survey responses about sexual violence would be kept confidential, some inmates may not have felt confident to report experiences of sexual victimization since admission or in the past 12 months. At the same time, some inmates may have made false allegations. In 2006, about a quarter of the allegations brought to the attention of State and Federal correctional authorities, upon completion of an official investigation, were determined to have been unfounded (not to have occurred).¹ Although the effects may be offsetting, the relative extent of underreporting and false reporting in the NIS is unknown.

An estimated 60,500 inmates experienced one or more incidents of sexual victimization

Among the 23,398 inmates who participated in the 2007 survey, 1,109 reported one or more incidents of sexual victimization. Because the NIS is a sample survey, weights were applied for sampled facilities and inmates within facilities to produce national-level and facility-level estimates of sexual violence. The estimated number of State and Federal inmates experiencing sexual violence totaled 60,500 (or 4.5% of the Nation's prisoners).

Nationwide, about 2.1% of inmates (27,500) reported an incident involving another inmate, and 2.9% (38,600) reported an incident involving staff. Some inmates (0.5%) said they had been sexually victimized by both other inmates and staff.

The NIS screened for specific sexual activities. Using uniform definitions of sexual violence developed by BJS in 2004, reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence were classified as either nonconsensual sexual acts or abusive sexual contacts only. Approximately 1.3% of all inmates (16,800, nationwide) said they had nonconsensual sex with another inmate, including giving or receiving sexual gratification and oral, anal or vaginal sex. An additional 0.8% of all inmates (10,600) said they had only experienced an abusive sexual contact, that is, unwanted touching by another inmate of

specific body parts in a sexual way. (See *Methodology* for specific survey questions and definitions.)

Among inmates reporting experiences of sexual misconduct by staff, the number that reported they had sex or sexual contact willingly (22,700) was nearly identical to those who reported contact as a result of physical force, pressure, or offers of special favors or privileges (22,600). A majority of victims of staff misconduct reported activity beyond simple touching in a sexual way.

10 facilities had prevalence rates of 9.3% or greater; 6 facilities had no reported incidents

Among the 146 prison facilities in the 2007 NIS, 6 had no reports of sexual victimization from the sampled inmates; 10 had an overall victimization rate of at least 9.3% (table 1). Though other measures may be considered when comparing facilities, the overall victimization rate is a measure of prevalence that includes all experiences, regardless of the level of coercion and type of sexual activity.

Table 1. Prison facilities with highest and lowest prevalence of sexual victimization, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Number of respondents ^b	Response rate	Percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization ^a	
			Weighted percent ^c	Standard error ^d
U.S. total	23,398	72%	4.5%	0.3%
10 highest				
Estelle Unit, TX	197	84	15.7	2.6
Clements Unit, TX	142	59	13.9	2.9
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst., NE	85	39	13.4	4.0
Charlotte Corr. Inst., FL	163	73	12.1	2.7
Great Meadow Corr. Fac., NY	144	62	11.3	2.7
Rockville Corr. Fac., IN ^e	169	79	10.8	2.4
Valley State Prison for Women, CA ^e	181	78	10.3	2.3
Allred Unit, TX	186	71	9.9	2.2
Mountain View Unit, TX ^e	154	80	9.5	1.9
Coffield Unit, TX	194	76	9.3	2.1
6 lowest^f				
Ironwood State Prison, CA	141	60%	0.0%	~
Penitentiary of New Mexico, NM	83	38	0.0	~
Gates Corr. Ctr., NC	52	74	0.0	~
Bennettsville-Camp, BOP	77	69	0.0	~
Big Spring Corr. Inst., BOP	155	66	0.0	~
Schuykill Fed. Corr. Inst., BOP	174	70	0.0	~

Note: BOP refers to the Bureau of Prisons.

~Not applicable.

^aPercent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

^bNumber of respondents selected for the NIS on sexual victimization.

^cWeights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on selected characteristics, including age, gender, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology* for details.)

^dStandard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the weighted survey estimates. For example, the 95% confidence intervals around the total percent is 4.5% plus or minus 1.96 times 0.3% (or 3.9% to 5.1%).

^eFemale facility.

^fFacilities in which no incidents of sexual victimization were reported by inmates.

¹See *Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2006*, at <<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/svcra06.htm>>.

Statistically, the NIS is unable to identify the facility with the highest prevalence rate. Since the estimates are based on a sample of inmates, rather than a complete enumeration, they are subject to sampling error. The precision of each facility-level estimate can be calculated based on the estimated standard error. For example, the victimization rate of 15.7% recorded for the Estelle Unit (Texas) has a precision of plus or minus 5.1% with a 95% level of confidence. This precision, based on the standard error of 2.6% multiplied by 1.96, implies that we are 95% confident that the true prevalence rate in the Estelle Unit is between 10.6% and 20.8%.

As a consequence of sampling error, the NIS cannot provide an exact ranking for all facilities as required under the Prison Rape Elimination Act. However, detailed tabulations of the survey results by facility and State are presented in Appendix tables 1 through 9. Facility prevalence rates vary by level and type of victimization, and observed differences between facilities will not always be statistically significant. Consequently, these measures cannot be used to reliably rank facilities from 1 (the highest) to 146 (the lowest).

Despite limitations of sampling errors, the NIS does provide the ability to statistically identify a small group of facilities with the highest rates of sexual victimization. Based on the confidence interval around the Estelle Unit (15.7% plus or minus 5.1%), 6 facilities would be included in the interval, but these facilities also have estimated rates with surrounding confidence intervals. By placing a 95%-confidence interval around the difference between the Estelle Unit and the Coffield Unit (Texas), we can identify a group of 10 facilities with the highest prevalence of sexual victimization. Since the confidence interval around the observed difference (6.4% plus or minus 6.5%) includes zero, the Coffield Unit is considered statistically similar to the Estelle Unit. However, facilities with rates lower than the Coffield Unit (9.3%) would be considered statistically different (assuming a standard error of 2.1%). (See *Methodology* for calculation of confidence intervals comparing facilities.)

Identification of the 3 facilities with the highest rates of sexual victimization depends on non-statistical judgments

Among the 10 facilities with the highest overall prevalence rates, 3 had prevalence rates of staff sexual misconduct that exceeded 10% (table 2). The rate was highest in Tecumseh State Correctional Institution (Nebraska), in which 12.2% of inmates reported one or more incidents of staff sexual misconduct. This rate was followed by a rate of 11.6% in the Clements Unit (Texas) and 11.4% in the Charlotte Correctional Institution (Florida). Among these 3 facilities, the Charlotte facility had the smallest standard error (2.6%); its 95%-confidence interval ranged from 6.3% to 16.5%.

Table 2. Prison facilities with the highest prevalence of sexual victimization, by another inmate or staff, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization ^a		
	Total ^b	Inmate-on-inmate	Staff-on-inmate
U.S. total	4.5%	2.1%	2.9%
Estelle Unit, TX	15.7	8.5	7.6
Clements Unit, TX	13.9	3.3	11.6
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst., NE	13.4	1.2	12.2
Charlotte Corr. Inst., FL	12.1	1.1	11.4
Great Meadow Corr. Fac., NY	11.3	3.0	9.6
Rockville Corr. Fac., IN ^c	10.8	10.2	2.0
Valley State Prison for Women, CA ^c	10.3	7.9	5.3
Allred Unit, TX	9.9	4.8	6.7
Mountain View Unit, TX ^c	9.5	8.7	3.4
Coffield Unit, TX	9.3	4.4	5.7

Note: Detail may add to more than total because respondents may report victimization by both another inmate and staff.

^aIncludes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, handjobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way, and other sexual acts. (See *Methodology* for survey items.)

^bPercent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter.

^cFemale facility.

Table 3. Prison facilities with the highest prevalence of sexual victimization, by type, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting sexual assault ^a		
	Total prevalence ^a	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^b	Abusive sexual contacts ^c
U.S. total	4.5%	3.3%	1.3%
Estelle Unit, TX	15.7	11.3	4.4
Clements Unit, TX	13.9	8.1	5.8
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst., NE	13.4	11.2	2.2
Charlotte Corr. Inst., FL	12.1	12.1	0.0
Great Meadow Corr. Fac., NY	11.3	6.1	5.3
Rockville Corr. Fac., IN ^d	10.8	6.6	4.2
Valley State Prison for Women, CA ^d	10.3	2.4	7.9
Allred Unit, TX	9.9	8.0	1.9
Mountain View Unit, TX ^d	9.5	3.4	6.2
Coffield Unit, TX	9.3	7.7	1.5

^aPercent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff in past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if shorter. (See *Methodology* for definitions.) Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on selected characteristics, including age, gender, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology* for nonresponse and post-stratification weighting procedures.)

^bIncludes allegations of oral, anal, and vaginal penetration, handjobs, and reports of other sexual acts.

^cIncludes allegations of unwanted touching only.

^dFemale facility.

Rockville Correctional Facility (Indiana) had the highest reported rate of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization; 10.2% of inmates reported one or more incidents. Its 95%-confidence interval ranged from 5.7% to 14.7%. Three other facilities had rates that exceeded 5%: Mountain View Unit (Texas), 8.7%; Estelle Unit (Texas), 8.5%; and Valley State Prison for Women (California), 7.9%.

For more serious types of sexual victimization (e.g., non-consensual acts among inmates and unwilling sexual contact with staff involving more than touching), 3 facilities had rates of 10% or higher (table 3). Charlotte Correctional Institution had the highest rate of nonconsensual sexual acts (12.1%), followed by Estelle Unit (11.3%) and Tecumseh State Correctional Institution (11.2%). The confidence interval for the Charlotte Correctional Institution was 6.8% to 17.4%.

Similar to types of sexual victimization, levels of coercion also varied among facilities. Among the 10 facilities with the highest overall prevalence of sexual victimization, 3 facilities had high levels of physical force in inmate-on-inmate victimization. The Mountain View Unit (Texas) had the highest percent of inmates reporting physical force by another inmate (7.5%), followed by the Rockville Correctional Facility (6.5%) and the Estelle Unit (5.1%). Inmates in 2 facilities reported high rates of physical force used by staff: Tecumseh State Correctional Institution (7.5%) and Great Meadow Correctional Facility (6.0%).

An estimated 0.8% of inmates nationwide reported being injured as a result of the sexual victimization. Approximately 0.5% of the inmates had been injured by another inmate, and 0.3% had been injured by staff. Injuries included anal or vaginal tearing, knife or stab wounds, broken bones, chipped or knocked out teeth, internal injuries, bruises, black eyes, sprains, cuts, scratches, swelling, or welts.

Although injury rates from sexual victimization were generally low, 2 facilities among the 10 with the highest prevalence of overall victimization had rates of injury by other inmates that exceeded 3% (table 4). Rockville Correctional Facility (3.7%) and Allred Unit (3.3%) had the highest rates of inmate-on-inmate injury. Tecumseh State Correctional Institution (3.9%) and Clements Unit (3.1%) had the highest rates of injury resulting from staff sexual misconduct.

Using these different measures of sexual victimization, comparisons among the 10 facilities with the highest overall rates may be made. The 3 highest facilities may be selected based on one or more of these measures.

Table 4. Prison facilities with the highest prevalence of sexual assault, by another inmate or staff and by level of force and injury, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Total prevalence ^a	Inmate-on-inmate sexual assault			Staff-on-inmate sexual assault			
		Physically forced	Pressured	Injured ^b	Physically forced	Pressured	Reported as willing	Injured ^b
U.S. total	4.5%	1.3%	1.7%	0.5%	0.9%	1.5%	1.7%	0.3%
Estelle Unit, TX	15.7	5.1	7.9	2.0	0.9	4.4	5.2	0.4
Clements Unit, TX	13.9	1.7	3.3	1.0	4.1	6.8	5.6	3.1
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst., NE	13.4	0.0	1.2	0.0	7.5	11.8	5.9	3.9
Charlotte Corr. Inst., FL	12.1	0.6	1.1	0.0	2.6	6.1	5.7	0.0
Great Meadow Corr. Fac., NY	11.3	1.0	2.8	0.0	6.0	6.3	2.8	2.0
Rockville Corr. Fac., IN ^c	10.8	6.5	7.5	3.7	0.5	1.1	0.9	0.6
Valley State Prison for Women, CA ^c	10.3	4.7	5.9	1.5	1.5	3.3	3.3	0.9
Allred Unit, TX	9.9	3.6	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.2	2.3	0.9
Mountain View Unit, TX ^c	9.5	7.5	6.8	2.7	0.7	3.0	1.4	2.1
Coffield Unit, TX	9.3	2.1	3.9	0.0	0.4	1.4	4.3	0.0

Note: Detail may add to more than totals because victims may report more than one type of victimization, injury, and type of force.

^aPercent 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 shorter. (See *Methodology* for definitions.) Weights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on selected characteristics, including age, gender, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology* for nonresponse and post-stratification weighting procedures.)

^bInjuries included knife or stab wounds, broken bones, anal or rectal tearing, teeth chipped or knocked out, internal injuries, knocked unconscious, bruises, black eyes, sprains, cuts, scratches, swelling, or welts.

^cFemale facility.

Inmates reported an estimated 165,400 incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts with other inmates or staff

In the 2007 NIS inmates were also asked the number of times they had experienced each type of sexual victimization. For each type, inmates were asked to select one of four pre-coded categories: 1 time, 2 times, 3 to 10 times, or 11 times or more. Categories containing ranges were provided, rather than more detailed categories, because of concerns that (1) some inmates would be unable to accurately report exact counts and (2) some inmates would be re-traumatized by a request to recount each incident. The total number of incidents by type in each facility was estimated by assigning the value 5 to the category of 3 to 10 times and 12 to the category of 11 times or more. (See *Methodology* for additional details.)

Based on these measures, the 1,109 inmates participating in the NIS who reported one or more allegations of sexual victimization said they had experienced a total of 1,205 incidents of nonconsensual sexual activity with another inmate and 1,794 incidents of unwilling sexual contact with staff. Taking into account weights for sampling facilities and inmates within facilities, the estimated number of incidents nationwide totaled 165,400 (65,100 nonconsensual sexual acts with other inmates and 100,300 incidents of unwilling sexual contact with staff).

Expressed as a rate, nationwide an estimated 123 incidents of sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates held in State and Federal prisons were reported by inmates. This excludes unwanted touching by other inmates and willing sexual contacts with staff. By type of incident, an estimated 49 incidents of inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts per 1,000 inmates and 75 incidents of unwilling sexual contacts with staff per 1,000 inmates were reported.

Table 5. Prison facilities with the highest number of incidents of nonconsensual sexual acts per 1,000 inmates, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Number of incidents per 1,000 inmates		
	Total	Inmate-on-inmate ^a	Staff-on-inmate ^b
U.S. total	123	49	75
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst., NE	928	62	866
Charlotte Corr. Inst., FL	476	18	458
Clements Unit, TX	430	118	311
Estelle Unit, TX	373	244	129
Great Meadow Corr. Fac., NY	365	31	334
Mule Creek State Prison, CA	353	251	102
Utah State Prison, UT ^c	346	259	87
R.J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mtn., CA	325	192	133
Dixon Corr. Inst., LA	311	211	100
Allred Unit, TX	305	115	190
Julia Tutwiler, AL ^d	304	189	115

^aIncludes all incidents of unwanted contacts with another inmate that involved oral sex, anal sex, vaginal sex, handjobs, and other sexual acts.

^bIncludes all incidents of unwilling sexual contacts with staff.

^cFacility houses both males and females.

^dFemale facility.

11 facilities had nonconsensual sex rates of 300 or more incidents per 1,000 inmates

Among the 146 prison facilities in the 2007 NIS, 11 had incident rates of nonconsensual sex that exceeded 300 incidents per 1,000 inmates (table 5). The 5 facilities recording the highest prevalence rates also recorded the highest incident rates. Tecumseh State Correctional Institution (with 928 incidents of nonconsensual sex per 1,000 inmates) had the highest rate, followed by the Charlotte Correctional Institution (476 per 1,000) and the Clements Unit (430 per 1,000). In each of these facilities, unwilling sexual contact with staff was the most frequently reported type of sexual victimization.

An estimated 94,900 incidents nationwide involved "willing" sexual contacts with staff. These incidents of staff sexual misconduct, though reported as willing by inmates, are considered nonconsensual by law. A total of 71 such incidents of staff sexual misconduct per 1,000 inmates were reported as willing (see Appendix table 9).

Further analyses of sexual victimization and facility variations underway

In response to other provisions of the Prison Rape Elimination Act, BJS will conduct further analyses of sexual victimization and facility variations. Expected to be completed by June 30, 2008, these analyses will examine victim characteristics and provide detailed descriptions of the circumstances surrounding reported incidents. They will include items on characteristics of perpetrators, reporting of incidents to staff or others, reasons for not reporting, and subsequent actions taken by administrators. In addition, BJS will examine characteristics of facilities that may correlate with sexual victimization, such as size, crowding, types of inmates held, security level, staff-to-inmate ratios, staff characteristics, and rates of assault on inmates and staff. Facility characteristics are based on data from the 2005 *Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities* and other items included in the 2007 NIS.

BJS is conducting a survey of sexual victimization in local jails, using the same sampling procedures and ACASI collection methodologies. Data collection in local jails is expected to be completed in January 2008. A report listing the 302 sampled local jail facilities ranked according to the incidence of sexual victimization is expected to be issued in April 2008.

Methodology

The National Inmate Survey (NIS) was conducted in 146 State and Federal prisons between April and August 2007, by RTI International under a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). The NIS comprised two questionnaires — a survey of sexual victimization and a survey of past drug and alcohol use and abuse. Inmates were randomly assigned one of the questionnaires so that at the time of the interview the content of the survey remained unknown to facility staff and the survey interviewers. A total of 23,398 inmates participated in the survey.

The interviews, which averaged 27 minutes in length, used computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) and audio computer-assisted self interviewing (ACASI) collection methods. For approximately the first 5 minutes, survey interviewers conducted a personal interview using CAPI to obtain background data, date of admission to the facility, conviction status, and current offense. 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. The paper form was completed by 530 inmates (2.3% of all interviews), housed primarily in administrative or disciplinary segregation or considered too violent to be interviewed.

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 (95%) or Spanish (5%).

Selection of State and Federal prisons

A sample of 130 State prisons was drawn to produce a 10% sample of the 1,267 adult State 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 2007 NIS 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 2007 NIS excluded community-based facilities, such as halfway houses, group homes, and work release centers.

State confinement facilities were systematically sampled with probabilities of selection proportionate to size (as measured by the number of inmates held on December 31, 2005). Facilities on the sampling frame were first sorted by public or private operation, gender housed, region, and State. Prior to selection, the size measures for facilities housing female inmates were doubled to ensure a sufficient number of women to allow for meaningful analyses of sexual victimization by gender. Facilities were sampled ensuring that at least one facility in every State was selected. The remaining facilities were selected from each region with probabilities proportionate to size.

Overall, these procedures resulted in the selection of 114 male facilities and 16 female facilities. Based on 2005 census data, these 130 facilities held 250,873 inmates (or 20% of inmates held in State confinement facilities nationwide on December 31, 2005).

Somewhat different sampling procedures were used to select Federal prisons. Facilities were selected based on data reported in the Bureau of Prisons' (BOP) *Weekly Population Report* on September 28, 2006. At that time the Federal system had 176 BOP-operated facilities and 13 privately-managed facilities. Combined, these facilities held 180,152 inmates. Contract juveniles, long-term boarders, and offenders held in halfway houses, home confinement, and jail/short term detention were excluded.

Facilities on the sampling frame were sorted by population size, region, and public or private operation. They were selected based on probabilities proportionate to the inmate count, regardless of gender of inmate housed. The sample resulted in the selection of 17 BOP-operated facilities and 3 private facilities.

Of the 150 selected State and Federal facilities, 4 were excluded from the survey for the following reasons:

- Federal Transfer Facility (Oklahoma City, OK) – Inmates moved through this facility too quickly (within 24 hours) to permit data collection.
- Huron Valley Complex — Women (Ypsilanti, MI) – Interviewing was terminated early due to concerns regarding data quality as many of the inmates were involved in a class action lawsuit against the facility.
- Taft Correctional Institute (Taft, CA) — The facility was selected twice, once as a State prison and once as a Federal facility. (It was excluded from the State sample, but left in the sample as a Federal facility.)
- Southern Michigan Correctional Facility (Jackson, MI) — The facility was scheduled to be closed prior to data collection.

All other selected prison facilities participated fully in the survey.

Selection of inmates

The number of inmates sampled in each facility varied based on 5 criteria:

- an expected prevalence rate of sexual victimization of 4%.
- a desired level of precision based on a standard error of 1.75%.
- a projected 70% response rate among selected inmates.
- a 10% chance among participating inmates of not receiving the sexual victimization questionnaire.
- 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 the date of 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 37,362 inmates were selected. (See Appendix table 1 for the number of inmates sampled in each facility.)

Overall, 26,157 inmates participated in the survey, yielding a response rate of 72% (after an additional 1,017 ineligible inmates were excluded). Approximately 90% of the participating inmates (23,398) received the sexual assault survey.

Weighting and non-response adjustments

Responses from sampled 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 were 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. First, in each facility, bias could result if the random sample did not accurately represent the facility population. Second, bias could 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:

- 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 characteristics. These characteristics included distribu-

tions by inmate age, gender, race, date of admission, and sentence length. This adjustment ensures that the estimates accurately reflect the entire population of the facility and not just the inmates who were randomly sampled.

- calibration of the weights so that the weight from a non-responding inmate is assigned to a responding inmate with similar 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.²

Survey estimates and accuracy

Survey estimates are subject to sampling error arising from the fact that the estimates 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. Estimates of the standard errors for selected measures of sexual victimization are presented in Appendix tables 2 through 5 and 8.

These standard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around survey estimates (e.g., numbers, percents, and rates), as well as differences in these estimates.

For example, the 95% confidence interval around the percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization in the Julia Tutwiler Prison (Alabama) is approximately 6.3% plus or minus 1.96 times 1.5% (or 3.4% to 9.2%). Based on similarly constructed samples, 95% of the intervals would be expected to contain the true (but unknown) percentage.

The standard errors may also be used to construct confidence intervals around differences between facility estimates. For example, the 95% confidence interval comparing the percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization in the Julia Tutwiler Prison (Alabama), 6.3%, with the Estelle Unit (Texas), 15.7%, may be calculated. The confidence interval around the difference of 9.4% is approximately 1.96 times 3.0% (the square root of the pooled variance estimate, 9.01%). The pooled variance estimate is calculated by taking the square root of the sum of each standard error squared, e.g., the square root of $(1.5)^2$ plus $(2.6)^2$. Since the interval (3.5% to 15.3%) does not contain zero, the difference between the Tutwiler prison and the Estelle Unit is statistically significant.

²R.E. Folsom, Jr. and A.C. Singh, *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, 598-603, 2002.

Exposure period

For purposes of calculating 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. Overall, the average exposure period of inmates participating in the sexual victimization survey was 8.5 months.

Measuring sexual victimization

The survey of sexual victimization relied on the reporting of the direct experience of each inmate, rather than inmates reporting on the experience of other inmates. Questions were asked related to inmate-on-inmate sexual activity separately from questions related to staff sexual misconduct. (See pages 9 and 10 for specific survey items.)

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

Once the types of sexual activity and the nature of coercion were established, inmates were asked to report on the number of times they had experienced each form of sexual victimization. Incidents were separated into two categories: nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts. (See *Definition of terms* on this page.) In reporting the number of times for each type of incident, inmates could select one of four pre-coded categories: 1 time, 2 times, 3 to 10 times, and 11 times or more.

ACASI survey items related to staff sexual misconduct were asked in a different order from inmate-on-inmate activity. Inmates were first asked about being pressured or being made to feel they had to have sex or sexual contact 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 were included in the total sexual victimization classification, regardless of level of coercion.

Inmates were also asked to report on the number of times they had experienced each form of staff sexual misconduct, willing or unwilling. The same pre-coded categories were provided: 1 time, 2 times, 3 to 10 times, and 11 times or more.

The ACASI survey included additional questions related to both inmate-on-inmate and staff-on-inmate sexual victimization. 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 page 11 for specific survey items.)

The entire ACASI questionnaire and the shorter paper and pencil survey form (PAPI) are available on the BJS web site at <<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/quest.htm#nis>>.

Definition of terms

Sexual victimization - all types of sexual activity, e.g., oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, handjobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way and other sexual acts. Includes nonconsensual sexual acts, abusive sexual contacts, and both willing and unwilling sexual activity with staff.

Nonconsensual sexual acts - unwanted contacts with another inmate or unwilling contacts with staff that involved oral sex, anal sex, vaginal sex, handjobs, and other sexual acts.

Abusive sexual contacts only - unwanted contacts with another inmates or unwilling contacts with staff that involved touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, 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 inmate as willing; however, all sexual contacts between inmates and staff are legally nonconsensual.

Survey items related to inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization

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 handjob?

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 handjob?

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, handjobs, 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, handjobs, oral sex or blowjobs, 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?

Survey items related to staff sexual misconduct

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 = 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 handjob.

G11c. You gave or received oral sex or a blowjob.

G11d. You had vaginal sex.

G11e. You had anal sex.

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?

LCM4a [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 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 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?

LCM8b How long has it been since you had oral or anal sex with any staff at this facility whether you wanted to or not?



Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Jeffrey Sedgwick is Director.

Allen J. Beck and Paige M. Harrison wrote this report. RTI International statisticians, under the direction of Marcus Berzofsky, produced tables in the appendix. Allen J. Beck, Paige M. Harrison, and RTI staff provided statistical review and verification. Doris J. James and Tina Dorsey produced and edited the report. Jayne Robinson prepared the report for publication.

Paige M. Harrison, under the supervision of Allen J. Beck, was project manager for the National Inmate

Survey. RTI staff, under a cooperative agreement and in collaboration with BJS, designed the survey, developed the questionnaires, and monitored data collection and data processing: 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, Protection of Human Subjects Task Leader; David Forvendel, Research Computing Task Leader; Ralph Folsom, Senior Statistician; and Marcus Berzofsky, Sampling and Statistical Analysis Task Leader.

December 2007 NCJ 219414

This report in portable document format and in ASCII and its related statistical data and tables are available at the BJS World Wide Web Internet site: <<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/svsfpri07.htm>>.

Office of Justice Programs

Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>

Appendix table 1. Characteristics of State and Federal facilities selected in the National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody ^a	Number of inmates sampled	Number of ineligible inmates ^b	Number of respondents		Response rate ^c
				Total	Sexual victimization survey	
Total	264,251	37,362	1,017	26,157	23,398	72%
Alabama						
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^d	959	251	6	228	212	93
Limestone Corr. Fac.	2,044	274	2	210	191	77
Alaska						
Wildwood Corr. Complex	361	199	4	130	121	67
Arizona						
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	4,702	288	3	206	188	72
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	3,938	286	6	228	205	81
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	3,528	284	10	213	193	78
Arkansas						
Diagnostic Unit	383	205	13	154	132	80
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	358	205	8	157	138	80
California						
Avenal State Prison	7,510	292	9	240	210	85
California Inst. for Men	5,515	290	41	139	129	56
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	5,484	289	6	188	173	66
California Men's Colony	6,496	291	7	211	180	74
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	3,842	285	8	209	192	75
Calipatria State Prison	4,169	286	0	162	146	57
Central California Women's Fac. ^d	3,211	283	8	194	170	71
Corr. Training Fac.	7,025	291	5	175	153	61
Ironwood State Prison	4,612	288	11	165	141	60
Mule Creek State Prison	3,762	285	6	219	190	78
North Kern State Prison	5,044	289	13	206	193	75
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	4,166	287	16	163	147	60
San Quentin State Prison	4,729	367	22	188	171	54
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	3,937	286	5	202	173	72
Valley State Prison for Women ^d	2,867	282	26	200	181	78
Colorado						
Fremont Corr. Fac.	1,466	265	2	183	166	70
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{d,f}	220	161	0	90	81	56
Connecticut						
Osborn Corr. Inst.	1,919	273	5	220	193	82
Delaware						
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^e	1,627	310	6	256	231	84
Florida						
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	2,184	279	49	143	125	62
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	1,052	254	1	184	163	73
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	1,215	260	6	216	195	85
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	2,660	280	23	201	180	78
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^d	2,350	278	9	180	155	67
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	1,839	272	6	231	210	87
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	2,064	274	0	184	169	67
Georgia						
Hays State Prison	868	247	7	201	190	84
Men's Corr. State Prison	650	233	15	198	189	91
Metro State Prison ^d	888	248	7	180	163	75
Walker Corr. Inst.	617	230	0	191	173	83
Wilcox State Prison	1,487	266	6	236	206	91
Hawaii						
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	298	184	2	143	126	79
Idaho						
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	723	237	0	172	153	73
Illinois						
Danville Corr. Ctr.	1,802	271	1	213	193	79
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	2,164	275	7	211	189	79
Logan Corr. Ctr.	1,854	272	3	228	211	85
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	1,362	267	28	157	133	66
Indiana						
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	1,484	266	9	184	162	72
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^d	1,145	258	7	198	169	79
Iowa						
Anamosa State Penitentiary	1,291	261	0	163	147	62

Appendix table 1. Characteristics of State and Federal facilities selected in the National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody ^a	Number of inmates sampled	Number of ineligible inmates ^b	Number of respondents		Response rate ^c
				Total	Sexual victimization survey	
Kansas						
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	1,681	269	1	217	195	81%
Kentucky						
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	624	234	12	112	100	50
Louisiana						
Dixon Corr. Inst.	1,549	267	3	208	184	79
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	629	231	7	162	146	72
Maine						
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^e	690	237	8	189	173	83
Maryland						
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^d	120	123	3	66	64	55
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	2,773	280	4	177	160	64
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	1,733	270	4	207	189	78
Massachusetts						
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	932	250	3	137	119	55
Michigan						
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	1,746	271	6	190	170	72
Marquette Branch Prison	1,155	258	9	196	174	79
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	1,060	255	2	188	168	74
Minnesota						
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	1,388	264	5	189	163	73
Mississippi						
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	98	99	1	87	80	89
Missouri						
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	1,947	273	6	236	215	88
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	1,872	272	5	246	225	92
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	1,445	265	1	191	171	72
Montana						
Montana State Prison	1,447	265	3	203	189	77
Nebraska						
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	885	245	2	94	85	39
Nevada						
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^d	618	230	3	181	160	80
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	1,579	268	7	218	203	84
New Hampshire						
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	1,498	266	2	190	173	72
New Jersey						
Northern State Prison	2,775	280	4	163	148	59
South Woods State Prison	3,331	283	3	203	179	73
New Mexico						
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^f	1,215	259	2	166	148	65
Penitentiary of New Mexico	858	246	4	92	83	38
New York						
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	923	249	8	186	168	77
Elmira Corr. Fac.	1,610	270	22	141	126	57
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	1,604	268	5	164	144	62
Greene Corr. Fac.	1,672	270	7	209	189	79
Wende Corr. Fac.	870	247	11	156	140	66
North Carolina						
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	803	243	5	186	164	78
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^d	458	214	6	144	129	69
Gates Corr. Ctr.	91	92	1	67	52	74
Harnett Corr. Inst.	866	247	3	178	163	73
Odom Corr. Inst.	381	204	9	119	103	61
North Dakota						
North Dakota State Penitentiary	388	205	15	137	124	72
Ohio						
Belmont Corr. Inst.	2,720	280	5	195	177	71
Grafton Corr. Inst.	1,435	265	2	145	133	55
North Central Corr. Inst.	2,321	277	4	174	147	64
Oklahoma						
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	1,328	263	19	209	195	86
Oregon						
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	867	247	9	200	177	84

Appendix table 1. Characteristics of State and Federal facilities selected in the National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody ^a	Number of inmates sampled	Number of ineligible inmates ^b	Number of respondents		
				Total	Sexual victimization survey	Response rate ^c
Pennsylvania						
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^d	995	252	2	225	208	90%
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	2,031	274	2	235	215	86
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	1,977	273	5	223	196	83
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	2,848	281	11	128	117	47
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	2,037	274	3	235	204	87
Rhode Island						
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	881	247	1	150	132	61
Women's Division ^d	248	214	15	141	128	71
South Carolina						
Allendale Corr. Inst.	1,282	261	9	153	138	61
Lee Corr. Inst.	1,690	270	11	180	154	70
South Dakota						
South Dakota State Penitentiary	1,406	265	15	186	158	74
Tennessee						
Northwest Corr. Complex	2,233	276	8	184	161	69
Tennessee Prison for Women ^d	722	238	3	169	152	72
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^f	1,477	265	2	200	179	76
Texas						
Allred Unit	3,623	284	1	200	186	71
Clements Unit	3,636	285	10	161	142	59
Coffield Unit	4,085	286	1	217	194	76
Dawson State Jail ^{e,f}	2,111	275	5	188	165	70
Estelle Unit	2,760	280	14	223	197	84
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	577	227	6	184	163	83
Hilltop Unit ^d	624	230	1	219	197	96
Holliday Transfer Fac.	1,873	275	27	220	195	89
Lockhart Unit ^{e,f}	995	252	2	160	132	64
Lopez State Jail	1,049	254	1	170	148	67
McConnell Unit	2,819	281	8	187	162	69
Mountain View Unit ^d	566	227	11	172	154	80
Polunsky Unit	2,848	281	1	256	236	91
Ramsey Unit #2	1,148	257	3	217	197	85
Wynne Unit	2,590	279	3	217	200	79
Utah						
Utah State Prison ^e	3,786	285	5	228	196	81
Vermont						
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	167	175	25	94	82	63
Virginia						
Red Onion State Prison ^g	257	173	1	97	87	56
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	380	200	0	75	67	38
Washington						
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	1,953	273	1	147	134	54
West Virginia						
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	249	171	1	121	106	71
Wisconsin						
Stanley Corr. Inst.	1,499	266	13	171	157	68
Waupun Corr. Inst.	1,233	260	1	189	172	73
Wyoming						
Wyoming State Penitentiary	620	231	7	153	138	68

Appendix table 1. Characteristics of State and Federal facilities selected in the National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Number of inmates in custody ^a	Number of inmates sampled	Number of ineligible inmates ^b	Number of respondents		Response rate ^c
				Total	Sexual victimization survey	
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)						
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,390	264	1	223	199	85%
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,767	271	1	219	194	81
Bennettsville-Camp	134	125	1	85	77	69
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	1,410	308	9	141	125	47
Big Spring Corr. Inst. [†]	2,757	280	4	182	155	66
Cibola County Corr. Inst. [‡]	1,091	256	3	154	139	61
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	2,416	278	5	213	192	78
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	375	200	1	155	133	78
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	1,454	266	8	185	166	72
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	1,104	256	5	128	112	51
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,142	257	3	152	134	60
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,169	258	5	198	175	78
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	817	248	27	67	55	30
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,055	254	4	143	130	57
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,328	283	2	196	174	70
Taft Corr. Inst. [‡]	1,729	270	7	251	227	95
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,006	253	8	172	153	70
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,442	265	4	133	123	51
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	1,604	268	9	217	190	84

^aNumber of inmates in custody on day when the facility provided the sample roster.

^bInmates were considered ineligible if (1) under age 18, (2) mentally or physically incapacitated, or (3) transferred or released after sample selection but before data collection period. (See *Methodology* for sample selection criteria.)

^cResponse rate is equal to the total number of respondents divided by the number of inmates sampled minus the number of ineligible inmates times 100 percent.

^dFemale facility.

^eFacility houses both males and females.

^fPrivately operated facility.

^gExcludes inmates designated as supermax inmates.

Appendix table 2. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and estimated standard error, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization since admission to facility or in past 12 months, if shorter ^a		
	Reported	Weighted ^b	Standard error ^c
Total	4.8%	4.5%	0.3%
Alabama			
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^d	6.6	6.3	1.5
Limestone Corr. Fac.	3.1	3.3	1.3
Alaska			
Wildwood Corr. Complex	5.0	4.9	1.6
Arizona			
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	5.3	7.5	2.5
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	1.0	0.8	0.5
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	1.0	0.9	0.6
Arkansas			
Diagnostic Unit	0.8	0.9	0.7
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	2.2	3.5	1.8
California			
Avenal State Prison	1.4	1.4	0.8
California Inst. for Men	3.1	2.6	1.3
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	6.9	7.2	2.0
California Men's Colony	2.2	2.3	1.2
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	3.1	3.1	1.2
Calipatria State Prison	1.4	1.3	0.9
Central California Women's Fac. ^d	7.1	7.0	2.1
Corr. Training Fac.	1.3	1.1	0.9
Ironwood State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mule Creek State Prison	6.3	6.8	1.9
North Kern State Prison	0.5	0.7	0.7
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	6.1	5.9	1.9
San Quentin State Prison	5.3	4.1	1.4
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	5.2	4.7	1.5
Valley State Prison for Women ^d	9.9	10.3	2.3
Colorado			
Fremont Corr. Fac.	6.0	5.2	1.6
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{d,f}	4.9	5.9	2.7
Connecticut			
Osborn Corr. Inst.	2.1	1.7	0.8
Delaware			
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^e	3.0	4.1	1.6
Florida			
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	0.8	0.4	0.4
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	10.4	12.1	2.7
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	5.1	5.5	1.6
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	5.0	5.1	1.6
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^d	7.7	7.0	2.1
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	5.2	5.9	1.8
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	3.0	2.7	1.2
Georgia			
Hays State Prison	9.0	9.1	1.9
Men's Corr. State Prison	7.9	7.0	1.7
Metro State Prison ^d	7.4	8.0	2.2
Walker Corr. Inst.	1.7	2.3	1.2
Wilcox State Prison	2.9	2.8	1.1
Hawaii			
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	1.6	1.6	0.9
Idaho			
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	2.0	1.8	1.0
Illinois			
Danville Corr. Ctr.	1.6	1.6	0.9
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	6.9	6.7	1.9
Logan Corr. Ctr.	2.8	3.3	1.3
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	3.0	2.9	1.4
Indiana			
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	8.0	7.8	2.1
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^d	11.2	10.8	2.4

Appendix table 2. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and estimated standard error, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization since admission to facility or in past 12 months, if shorter ^a		
	Reported	Weighted ^b	Standard error ^c
Iowa			
Anamosa State Penitentiary	4.8%	4.1%	1.5%
Kansas			
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	5.1	5.4	1.6
Kentucky			
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	2.0	2.0	1.3
Louisiana			
Dixon Corr. Inst.	4.9	5.4	1.7
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	1.4	1.5	0.9
Maine			
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^e	5.8	5.6	1.6
Maryland			
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^d	4.7	6.0	2.5
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	7.5	8.5	2.4
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	7.4	8.2	2.0
Massachusetts			
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	6.7	6.6	2.2
Michigan			
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	8.2	7.9	2.1
Marquette Branch Prison	7.5	6.8	1.7
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	4.8	4.6	1.5
Minnesota			
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	3.1	2.2	1.0
Mississippi			
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	1.2	0.9	0.4
Missouri			
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	7.9	7.9	1.7
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	4.0	3.7	1.2
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	7.0	7.1	1.9
Montana			
Montana State Prison	7.4	7.9	1.9
Nebraska			
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	11.8	13.4	4.0
Nevada			
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^d	9.4	7.7	1.8
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	4.9	5.8	1.7
New Hampshire			
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	6.4	6.2	1.7
New Jersey			
Northern State Prison	4.0	3.7	1.6
South Woods State Prison	3.4	4.4	2.1
New Mexico			
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^f	4.0	5.0	1.9
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York			
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	4.2	3.4	1.1
Elmira Corr. Fac.	4.8	5.1	2.2
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	11.8	11.3	2.7
Greene Corr. Fac.	2.1	1.9	0.9
Wende Corr. Fac.	6.4	6.2	1.9
North Carolina			
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	3.7	3.6	1.4
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^d	5.4	4.3	1.4
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	6.1	5.5	1.6
Odom Corr. Inst.	4.8	4.7	1.8
North Dakota			
North Dakota State Penitentiary	5.6	5.6	1.8
Ohio			
Belmont Corr. Inst.	3.4	3.6	1.4
Grafton Corr. Inst.	3.8	4.8	2.0
North Central Corr. Inst.	4.8	3.8	1.4

Appendix table 2. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and estimated standard error, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization since admission to facility or in past 12 months, if shorter ^a		
	Reported	Weighted ^b	Standard error ^c
Oklahoma			
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	6.2%	6.3%	1.7%
Oregon			
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	5.1	4.2	1.3
Pennsylvania			
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^d	4.3	4.4	1.3
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	2.3	2.5	1.1
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	7.1	8.1	2.0
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	4.3	3.8	1.9
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	2.0	1.9	1.0
Rhode Island			
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	3.8	3.5	1.4
Women's Division ^d	8.6	7.5	1.6
South Carolina			
Allendale Corr. Inst.	5.1	4.7	1.7
Lee Corr. Inst.	9.1	8.7	2.2
South Dakota			
South Dakota State Penitentiary	7.0	7.2	2.2
Tennessee			
Northwest Corr. Complex	4.4	3.5	1.4
Tennessee Prison for Women ^d	5.3	4.8	1.5
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^f	7.3	7.1	1.9
Texas			
Allred Unit	10.2	9.9	2.2
Clements Unit	14.1	13.9	2.9
Coffield Unit	9.3	9.3	2.1
Dawson State Jail ^{e,f}	3.0	2.9	1.3
Estelle Unit	15.2	15.7	2.6
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	1.2	1.3	0.8
Hilltop Unit ^d	3.6	3.4	1.1
Holiday Transfer Fac.	1.0	1.1	0.7
Lockhart Unit ^{e,f}	5.3	7.3	2.7
Lopez State Jail	1.4	1.3	0.8
McConnell Unit	8.6	8.0	2.1
Mountain View Unit ^d	12.3	9.5	1.9
Polunsky Unit	5.5	5.3	1.4
Ramsey Unit #2	4.1	4.5	1.4
Wynne Unit	5.0	5.5	1.7
Utah			
Utah State Prison ^e	8.7	7.7	1.9
Vermont			
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	4.9	5.3	1.8
Virginia			
Red Onion State Prison ^g	3.4	3.6	1.7
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	4.5	4.2	2.2
Washington			
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	5.2	6.5	2.6
West Virginia			
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	4.7	4.3	1.5
Wisconsin			
Stanley Corr. Inst.	4.5	3.8	1.4
Waupun Corr. Inst.	7.0	6.8	1.8
Wyoming			
Wyoming State Penitentiary	8.0	7.0	1.9

Appendix table 2. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and estimated standard error, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Percent of inmates reporting sexual victimization since admission to facility or in past 12 months, if shorter ^a		
	Reported	Weighted ^b	Standard error ^c
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)			
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.5%	1.3%	0.7%
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	1.6	0.9
Bennettsville-Camp	0.0	0.0	0.0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	2.4	2.4	1.4
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^f	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^f	1.4	0.7	0.5
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.8	0.5
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	1.5	1.0	0.6
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	2.4	2.3	1.1
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	0.9	0.8	0.7
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	2.2	1.8	1.0
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.8	0.7
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	1.8	2.7	2.6
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	6.2	4.8	1.8
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^f	0.4	0.3	0.3
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.3	1.0	0.7
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	3.2	3.5	1.7
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	3.2	3.1	1.3

^aPercent of inmates reporting one or more incidents of sexual victimization involving another inmate or facility staff since admission to the facility or in last 12 months, if shorter.

^bWeights were applied so that inmates who responded accurately reflected the entire population of each facility on selected characteristics, including age, gender, race, time served, and sentence length. (See *Methodology* for weighting and nonresponse adjustments.)

^cStandard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the weighted survey estimates. For example, the 95% confidence intervals around the total percent is 4.5% plus or minus 1.96 times 0.3% (or 3.9% to 5.1%).

^dFemale facility.

^eFacility houses both males and females.

^fPrivately operated facility.

^gExcludes inmates designated as supermax inmates.

Appendix table 3. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c
Total	3.3%	0.2%	1.3%	0.1%
Alabama				
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^d	5.3	1.4	1.0	0.5
Limestone Corr. Fac.	2.6	1.2	0.7	0.7
Alaska				
Wildwood Corr. Complex	4.0	1.4	0.9	0.7
Arizona				
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	4.7	2.3	2.8	1.2
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.5
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	0.9	0.6	0.0	0.0
Arkansas				
Diagnostic Unit	0.9	0.7	0.0	0.0
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	2.9	1.8	0.6	0.4
California				
Avenal State Prison	1.0	0.7	0.4	0.4
California Inst. for Men	1.8	1.0	0.8	0.8
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	5.7	1.9	1.5	0.9
California Men's Colony	2.3	1.2	0.0	0.0
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	2.7	1.2	0.4	0.4
Calipatria State Prison	1.3	0.9	0.0	0.0
Central California Women's Fac. ^d	4.2	1.5	2.8	1.5
Corr. Training Fac.	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.9
Ironwood State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mule Creek State Prison	4.7	1.6	2.2	1.1
North Kern State Prison	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	4.8	1.8	1.1	0.8
San Quentin State Prison	2.8	1.1	1.3	0.8
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	4.1	1.4	0.6	0.6
Valley State Prison for Women ^d	2.4	1.1	7.9	2.1
Colorado				
Fremont Corr. Fac.	3.2	1.3	2.0	1.0
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{d,f}	4.5	2.6	1.5	0.8
Connecticut				
Osborn Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.6
Delaware				
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^e	2.8	1.0	1.4	1.2
Florida				
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	12.1	2.7	0.0	0.0
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	4.0	1.4	1.5	0.9
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	4.3	1.5	0.8	0.8
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^d	3.7	1.6	3.3	1.3
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	4.5	1.6	1.4	0.8
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	1.7	0.9	1.0	0.7
Georgia				
Hays State Prison	5.4	1.5	3.7	1.3
Men's Corr. State Prison	4.3	1.2	2.7	1.2
Metro State Prison ^d	4.3	1.5	3.7	1.7
Walker Corr. Inst.	1.1	0.7	1.2	1.0
Wilcox State Prison	2.8	1.1	0.0	0.0
Hawaii				
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	1.6	0.9	0.0	0.0
Idaho				
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.7
Illinois				
Danville Corr. Ctr.	0.5	0.5	1.1	0.8
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	6.0	1.7	0.7	0.7
Logan Corr. Ctr.	2.2	0.9	1.0	1.0
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	2.9	1.4	0.0	0.0
Indiana				
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	6.4	1.9	1.4	1.0
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^d	6.6	2.0	4.2	1.4

Appendix table 3. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c
Iowa				
Anamosa State Penitentiary	1.7%	0.9%	2.4%	1.2%
Kansas				
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	4.8	1.5	0.5	0.5
Kentucky				
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	2.0	1.3	0.0	0.0
Louisiana				
Dixon Corr. Inst.	4.7	1.6	0.6	0.6
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
Maine				
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^e	2.1	0.9	3.5	1.4
Maryland				
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^d	2.8	1.9	3.2	1.7
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	6.6	2.2	1.9	1.0
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	5.7	1.7	2.5	1.2
Massachusetts				
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	2.7	1.5	3.9	1.6
Michigan				
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	6.6	1.9	1.4	1.0
Marquette Branch Prison	5.7	1.6	1.1	0.7
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	3.9	1.4	0.7	0.6
Minnesota				
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	1.3	0.7	1.0	0.6
Mississippi				
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0
Missouri				
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	3.8	1.3	4.1	1.3
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	3.1	1.1	0.6	0.4
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	5.8	1.7	1.4	0.9
Montana				
Montana State Prison	5.3	1.7	2.6	1.1
Nebraska				
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	11.2	3.6	2.2	2.1
Nevada				
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^d	4.4	1.3	3.2	1.3
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	2.3	1.1	3.5	1.3
New Hampshire				
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	5.3	1.6	0.9	0.8
New Jersey				
Northern State Prison	2.5	1.3	1.2	0.8
South Woods State Prison	3.9	2.1	0.5	0.5
New Mexico				
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^f	4.1	1.7	0.9	0.9
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York				
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	2.9	1.1	0.4	0.4
Elmira Corr. Fac.	5.1	2.2	0.0	0.0
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	6.1	2.1	5.3	1.7
Greene Corr. Fac.	1.6	0.9	0.3	0.3
Wende Corr. Fac.	3.5	1.5	2.7	1.3
North Carolina				
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	3.0	1.2	0.6	0.5
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^d	2.4	1.0	1.9	0.9
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	3.7	1.3	1.7	0.9
Odom Corr. Inst.	4.7	1.8	0.0	0.0
North Dakota				
North Dakota State Penitentiary	3.2	1.2	2.5	1.4

Appendix table 3. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c
Ohio				
Belmont Corr. Inst.	3.6%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Grafton Corr. Inst.	4.8	2.0	0.0	0.0
North Central Corr. Inst.	2.1	1.0	1.6	0.9
Oklahoma				
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	3.6	1.3	2.6	1.2
Oregon				
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	2.7	1.0	1.5	0.8
Pennsylvania				
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^d	2.3	1.0	2.2	0.9
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.9	0.9	0.6
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	6.1	1.7	2.0	1.1
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	3.2	1.8	0.6	0.5
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	1.9	1.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island				
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	2.7	1.2	0.8	0.7
Women's Division ^d	5.3	1.3	2.2	0.9
South Carolina				
Allendale Corr. Inst.	4.7	1.7	0.0	0.0
Lee Corr. Inst.	7.6	2.1	1.1	0.8
South Dakota				
South Dakota State Penitentiary	5.2	1.8	2.1	1.3
Tennessee				
Northwest Corr. Complex	2.6	1.1	0.9	0.9
Tennessee Prison for Women ^d	3.7	1.3	1.1	0.7
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^f	6.3	1.7	0.8	0.8
Texas				
Allred Unit	8.0	2.0	1.9	1.0
Clements Unit	8.1	2.3	5.8	2.0
Coffield Unit	7.7	1.9	1.5	0.9
Dawson State Jail ^{e,f}	0.7	0.6	2.2	1.2
Estelle Unit	11.3	2.3	4.4	1.5
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5
Hilltop Unit ^d	1.9	0.8	1.5	0.7
Holliday Transfer Fac.	1.1	0.7	0.0	0.0
Lockhart Unit ^{e,f}	3.6	2.0	3.7	1.8
Lopez State Jail	1.3	0.8	0.0	0.0
McConnell Unit	5.6	1.7	2.4	1.3
Mountain View Unit ^d	3.4	1.1	6.2	1.6
Polunsky Unit	3.2	1.1	2.1	0.9
Ramsey Unit #2	3.4	1.3	1.1	0.7
Wynne Unit	3.2	1.3	2.4	1.2
Utah				
Utah State Prison ^e	5.0	1.6	2.8	1.1
Vermont				
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	4.0	1.6	1.3	0.9
Virginia				
Red Onion State Prison ^g	3.6	1.7	0.0	0.0
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	4.2	2.2	0.0	0.0
Washington				
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	4.6	2.3	1.9	1.3
West Virginia				
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	1.8	1.0	2.6	1.1
Wisconsin				
Stanley Corr. Inst.	3.1	1.2	0.7	0.6
Waupun Corr. Inst.	5.2	1.6	1.6	0.9
Wyoming				
Wyoming State Penitentiary	4.2	1.4	2.8	1.3

Appendix table 3. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts and abusive sexual contacts only, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c	Percent victimized	Standard error ^c
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)				
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.9	0.0	0.0
Bennettsville-Camp	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	2.4	1.4	0.0	0.0
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^f	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.0
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.2
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	1.7	0.9	0.6	0.6
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.7
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.5	1.2	0.8
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.7
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	2.7	2.6	0.0	0.0
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.3	0.8	3.5	1.6
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^f	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.7
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	3.5	1.7	0.0	0.0
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	2.2	1.0	0.9	0.9

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

^aIncludes 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. (See *Methodology* for specific questions.)

^bIncludes 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.

^cStandard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the weighted survey estimates. (See *Methodology*.)

^dFemale facility.

^eFacility houses both males and females.

^fPrivately operated facility.

^gExcludes inmates designated as supermax inmates.

Appendix table 4. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate ^a		Staff-on-inmate ^a	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b
Total	2.1%	0.1%	2.9%	0.2%
Alabama				
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^c	5.0	1.4	1.7	0.8
Limestone Corr. Fac.	2.6	1.1	0.8	0.7
Alaska				
Wildwood Corr. Complex	2.5	1.2	3.1	1.3
Arizona				
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	1.9	1.1	5.6	2.3
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3
Arkansas				
Diagnostic Unit	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.7
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	1.3	0.7	2.2	1.7
California				
Avenal State Prison	0.9	0.6	1.0	0.7
California Inst. for Men	0.8	0.8	1.8	1.0
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	2.9	1.3	4.2	1.6
California Men's Colony	0.9	0.6	1.8	1.1
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	1.0	0.7	2.1	1.0
Calipatria State Prison	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.9
Central California Women's Fac. ^c	5.7	2.0	1.7	0.8
Corr. Training Fac.	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.9
Ironwood State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mule Creek State Prison	5.3	1.7	2.2	1.1
North Kern State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	3.9	1.6	3.3	1.5
San Quentin State Prison	2.0	0.9	2.2	1.1
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	1.9	1.0	3.7	1.4
Valley State Prison for Women ^c	7.9	2.0	5.3	1.8
Colorado				
Fremont Corr. Fac.	3.6	1.3	2.2	1.1
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{c,e}	2.2	1.2	3.8	2.5
Connecticut				
Osborn Corr. Inst.	0.4	0.4	1.3	0.7
Delaware				
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^d	1.4	0.7	3.8	1.6
Florida				
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	1.1	0.7	11.4	2.6
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	2.0	1.1	3.5	1.2
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	3.3	1.3	2.8	1.2
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^c	5.7	1.9	1.8	0.9
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	2.4	1.2	3.5	1.4
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	0.4	0.4	2.3	1.1
Georgia				
Hays State Prison	4.1	1.4	6.6	1.7
Men's Corr. State Prison	5.1	1.5	2.9	1.0
Metro State Prison ^c	7.6	2.2	1.6	0.9
Walker Corr. Inst.	1.6	1.1	0.6	0.5
Wilcox State Prison	1.4	0.7	2.0	0.9
Hawaii				
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.5	1.6	0.9
Idaho				
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.0
Illinois				
Danville Corr. Ctr.	1.6	0.9	0.0	0.0
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	4.2	1.5	3.9	1.4
Logan Corr. Ctr.	1.4	1.0	1.8	0.9
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	0.6	0.5	2.3	1.3
Indiana				
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	4.1	1.5	4.0	1.5
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^c	10.2	2.3	2.0	1.1

Appendix table 4. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate ^a		Staff-on-inmate ^a	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b
Iowa				
Anamosa State Penitentiary	3.4%	1.4%	0.7%	0.5%
Kansas				
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	1.2	0.8	5.4	1.6
Kentucky				
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.3
Louisiana				
Dixon Corr. Inst.	3.9	1.4	3.7	1.4
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	1.5	0.9	0.0	0.0
Maine				
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^d	4.4	1.5	1.5	0.7
Maryland				
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^c	6.0	2.5	0.0	0.0
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	4.2	1.8	4.2	1.6
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	3.9	1.4	5.4	1.7
Massachusetts				
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	3.5	1.6	3.2	1.5
Michigan				
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	3.1	1.3	5.2	1.8
Marquette Branch Prison	3.3	1.1	5.8	1.6
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	1.3	0.9	3.3	1.2
Minnesota				
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	1.4	0.8	0.8	0.6
Mississippi				
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.4
Missouri				
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	2.9	1.1	5.8	1.5
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	2.1	1.0	1.6	0.7
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	3.2	1.3	4.0	1.4
Montana				
Montana State Prison	4.0	1.4	4.7	1.6
Nebraska				
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	1.2	1.2	12.2	3.9
Nevada				
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^c	6.6	1.7	1.7	0.9
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	3.2	1.3	3.9	1.4
New Hampshire				
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	4.6	1.5	2.2	1.0
New Jersey				
Northern State Prison	1.2	0.9	3.7	1.6
South Woods State Prison	0.9	0.6	3.5	2.0
New Mexico				
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^e	0.9	0.9	4.1	1.7
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York				
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	1.0	0.6	2.9	1.1
Elmira Corr. Fac.	1.9	1.4	3.3	1.7
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	3.0	1.4	9.6	2.5
Greene Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.5	1.6	0.9
Wende Corr. Fac.	3.3	1.5	4.6	1.6
North Carolina				
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	2.5	1.2	2.0	0.9
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^c	3.8	1.3	0.4	0.4
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	3.6	1.3	3.0	1.1
Odom Corr. Inst.	0.9	0.8	3.7	1.6
North Dakota				
North Dakota State Penitentiary	1.5	1.0	4.1	1.6

Appendix table 4. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate ^a		Staff-on-inmate ^a	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b
Ohio				
Belmont Corr. Inst.	2.6%	1.3%	3.6%	1.4%
Grafton Corr. Inst.	2.7	1.5	2.1	1.4
North Central Corr. Inst.	2.2	1.1	2.2	1.1
Oklahoma				
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	6.3	1.7	0.0	0.0
Oregon				
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	1.7	0.7	2.9	1.1
Pennsylvania				
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^c	4.4	1.3	0.0	0.0
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	2.0	0.9	0.5	0.5
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	2.3	1.1	7.0	1.9
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.5	3.2	1.8
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	1.2	0.8	1.1	0.6
Rhode Island				
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	1.4	0.9	2.1	1.1
Women's Division ^c	4.4	1.2	3.1	1.1
South Carolina				
Allendale Corr. Inst.	1.5	0.8	3.1	1.5
Lee Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.7	7.7	2.1
South Dakota				
South Dakota State Penitentiary	2.2	1.1	5.6	2.0
Tennessee				
Northwest Corr. Complex	1.3	0.9	2.2	1.0
Tennessee Prison for Women ^c	1.1	0.7	4.3	1.4
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^e	1.4	1.0	7.1	1.9
Texas				
Allred Unit	4.8	1.5	6.7	1.9
Clements Unit	3.3	1.6	11.6	2.7
Coffield Unit	4.4	1.5	5.7	1.6
Dawson State Jail ^{d,e}	1.3	0.8	2.2	1.3
Estelle Unit	8.5	2.1	7.6	1.9
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.8
Hilltop Unit ^c	3.0	1.0	1.5	0.7
Holliday Transfer Fac.	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Lockhart Unit ^{d,e}	5.5	2.2	1.8	1.6
Lopez State Jail	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.8
McConnell Unit	3.5	1.5	5.4	1.8
Mountain View Unit ^c	8.7	1.8	3.4	1.1
Polunsky Unit	1.2	0.7	4.2	1.2
Ramsey Unit #2	1.9	1.0	2.7	1.1
Wynne Unit	1.5	0.9	4.0	1.5
Utah				
Utah State Prison ^d	6.6	1.8	2.4	1.0
Vermont				
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	2.7	1.4	2.6	1.3
Virginia				
Red Onion State Prison	1.3	1.1	3.6	1.7
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.2
Washington				
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	2.3	1.3	4.2	2.3
West Virginia				
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	3.3	1.2	1.8	1.0
Wisconsin				
Stanley Corr. Inst.	0.5	0.5	3.2	1.3
Waupun Corr. Inst.	0.5	0.5	6.3	1.8
Wyoming				
Wyoming State Penitentiary	1.2	0.7	6.6	1.9

Appendix table 4. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate ^a		Staff-on-inmate ^a	
	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b	Percent victimized	Standard error ^b
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)				
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.7%
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.7	1.0	0.7
Bennettsville-Camp	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	1.8	1.3	1.3	0.9
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^e	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^e	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.5
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.5
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.6
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	1.5	0.8	0.7	0.7
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.7
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.5	1.8	1.0
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.7
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	0.0	0.0	2.7	2.6
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.7	4.0	1.7
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^e	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	1.1	2.7	1.5
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.7	1.1	2.2	1.0

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

^aIncludes all types of sexual victimization, including oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, handjobs, touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way and other sexual acts.

^bStandard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the weighted survey estimates. (See *Methodology*.)

^cFemale facility.

^dFacility houses both males and females.

^ePrivately operated facility.

Appendix table 5. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Percent victimized ^a	Standard error ^b	Percent victimized ^c	Standard error ^b
Total	1.3%	0.1%	2.3%	0.2%
Alabama				
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^d	4.0	1.3	1.7	0.8
Limestone Corr. Fac.	1.9	0.9	0.8	0.7
Alaska				
Wildwood Corr. Complex	0.9	0.7	3.1	1.3
Arizona				
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	0.7	0.6	4.0	2.2
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3
Arkansas				
Diagnostic Unit	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.7
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.6	2.2	1.7
California				
Avenal State Prison	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.7
California Inst. for Men	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.0
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	1.9	1.1	3.8	1.6
California Men's Colony	0.9	0.6	1.8	1.1
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	0.6	0.6	2.1	1.0
Calipatria State Prison	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.9
Central California Women's Fac. ^d	3.5	1.5	1.1	0.6
Corr. Training Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ironwood State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mule Creek State Prison	3.8	1.5	1.6	0.9
North Kern State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	2.8	1.4	2.8	1.4
San Quentin State Prison	0.7	0.5	2.1	1.0
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	0.8	0.6	3.7	1.4
Valley State Prison for Women ^d	1.4	0.8	1.5	0.8
Colorado				
Fremont Corr. Fac.	1.3	0.8	1.8	1.0
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{d,f}	1.3	1.1	3.1	2.4
Connecticut				
Osborn Corr. Inst.	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Delaware				
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^e	0.9	0.6	2.4	1.0
Florida				
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	1.1	0.7	11.4	2.6
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	0.8	0.7	3.2	1.2
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	2.5	1.1	2.8	1.2
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^d	2.4	1.5	1.8	0.9
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	1.7	1.0	2.8	1.3
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	0.4	0.4	1.3	0.9
Georgia				
Hays State Prison	2.5	1.1	4.4	1.4
Men's Corr. State Prison	3.0	1.0	1.8	0.8
Metro State Prison ^d	3.6	1.3	1.2	0.8
Walker Corr. Inst.	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.5
Wilcox State Prison	1.4	0.7	2.0	0.9
Hawaii				
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.5	1.6	0.9
Idaho				
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.7
Illinois				
Danville Corr. Ctr.	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	3.1	1.3	3.9	1.4
Logan Corr. Ctr.	0.4	0.4	1.8	0.9
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	0.6	0.5	2.3	1.3

Appendix table 5. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Percent victimized ^a	Standard error	Percent victimized ^b	Standard error
Indiana				
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	2.7%	1.2%	3.6%	1.5%
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^d	4.6	1.8	2.0	1.1
Iowa				
Anamosa State Penitentiary	1.3	0.9	0.4	0.4
Kansas				
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	1.2	0.8	4.8	1.5
Kentucky				
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.3
Louisiana				
Dixon Corr. Inst.	3.9	1.4	2.4	1.2
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0
Maine				
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^e	0.9	0.6	1.3	0.6
Maryland				
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^d	2.8	1.9	0.0	0.0
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	3.6	1.7	3.0	1.3
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	2.1	1.0	4.3	1.5
Massachusetts				
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	2.1	1.4	0.6	0.6
Michigan				
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	2.6	1.2	4.3	1.6
Marquette Branch Prison	2.2	0.9	5.3	1.5
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	0.6	0.6	3.3	1.2
Minnesota				
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.6
Mississippi				
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.4
Missouri				
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	2.4	1.0	2.2	0.9
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	2.1	1.0	1.0	0.5
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	1.8	1.0	4.0	1.4
Montana				
Montana State Prison	1.5	1.0	3.8	1.4
Nebraska				
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	1.2	1.2	10.0	3.4
Nevada				
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^d	2.8	0.9	1.7	0.9
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	0.6	0.6	2.3	1.1
New Hampshire				
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	3.1	1.2	2.2	1.0
New Jersey				
Northern State Prison	1.2	0.9	2.5	1.3
South Woods State Prison	0.5	0.5	3.5	2.0
New Mexico				
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^f	0.0	0.0	4.1	1.7
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York				
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.5	2.4	1.0
Elmira Corr. Fac.	1.9	1.4	3.3	1.7
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	1.5	1.1	4.5	1.8
Greene Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.4	1.6	0.9
Wende Corr. Fac.	2.4	1.3	2.8	1.3
North Carolina				
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	2.5	1.2	1.4	0.7
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^d	1.9	1.0	0.4	0.4
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	2.0	1.0	2.5	1.0
Odom Corr. Inst.	0.9	0.8	3.7	1.6
North Dakota				
North Dakota State Penitentiary	0.5	0.4	2.7	1.1

Appendix table 5. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Percent victimized ^a	Standard error	Percent victimized ^b	Standard error
Ohio				
Belmont Corr. Inst.	2.1%	1.2%	3.6%	1.4%
Grafton Corr. Inst.	2.7	1.5	2.1	1.4
North Central Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.9	0.5	0.5
Oklahoma				
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	3.6	1.3	0.0	0.0
Oregon				
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.5	2.3	0.9
Pennsylvania				
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^d	2.3	1.0	0.0	0.0
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.9	0.0	0.0
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.9	5.6	1.7
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	3.2	1.8
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.7	1.1	0.6
Rhode Island				
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	0.6	0.5	2.1	1.1
Women's Division ^d	2.2	0.8	3.1	1.1
South Carolina				
Allendale Corr. Inst.	1.5	0.8	3.1	1.5
Lee Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.7	6.6	2.0
South Dakota				
South Dakota State Penitentiary	1.8	1.0	3.9	1.6
Tennessee				
Northwest Corr. Complex	0.4	0.4	2.2	1.0
Tennessee Prison for Women ^d	0.0	0.0	3.7	1.3
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^f	1.4	1.0	6.3	1.7
Texas				
Allred Unit	4.0	1.4	4.9	1.6
Clements Unit	1.6	1.1	6.5	2.0
Coffield Unit	3.3	1.3	5.3	1.5
Dawson State Jail ^{e,f}	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.6
Estelle Unit	5.1	1.6	6.6	1.7
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.6
Hilltop Unit ^d	1.0	0.6	1.0	0.6
Holliday Transfer Fac.	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Lockhart Unit ^{e,f}	1.9	1.3	1.8	1.6
Lopez State Jail	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.8
McConnell Unit	2.1	1.2	4.5	1.6
Mountain View Unit ^d	2.7	1.0	2.3	0.9
Polunsky Unit	0.7	0.5	2.5	1.0
Ramsey Unit #2	1.4	0.9	2.1	0.9
Wynne Unit	0.6	0.5	2.6	1.2
Utah				
Utah State Prison ^e	4.1	1.5	1.8	0.9
Vermont				
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	2.7	1.4	1.3	0.9
Virginia				
Red Onion State Prison	1.3	1.1	3.6	1.7
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.2
Washington				
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	1.4	1.0	3.1	2.1
West Virginia				
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.5	1.8	1.0
Wisconsin				
Stanley Corr. Inst.	0.5	0.5	2.5	1.1
Waupun Corr. Inst.	0.5	0.5	4.7	1.5
Wyoming				
Wyoming State Penitentiary	0.0	0.0	4.2	1.4

Appendix table 5. Percent of prison inmates reporting nonconsensual sexual acts, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Percent victimized ^a	Standard error	Percent victimized ^b	Standard error
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)				
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.7%
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.7	1.0	0.7
Bennettsville-Camp	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	1.2	1.1	1.3	0.9
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^f	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.5
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.4
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.7
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.5
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	0.0	0.0	2.7	2.6
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.3
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	1.1	2.7	1.5
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.7	0.7	2.2	1.0

^aIncludes only reports involving unwanted oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, handjobs, and other sexual acts by other inmates.

^bStandard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the weighted survey estimates. (See *Methodology*.)

^cIncludes all reports of staff sexual misconduct involving oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, handjobs, and other sexual acts.

^dFemale facility.

^eFacility houses both males and females.

^fPrivately operated facility.

Appendix table 6. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by type of incident and level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate		
	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Without force or pressure ^b
Total	1.3%	1.7%	0.9%	1.5%	1.7%
Alabama					
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^c	2.7	4.3	0.9	1.3	0.0
Limestone Corr. Fac.	1.0	2.6	0.8	0.8	0.8
Alaska					
Wildwood Corr. Complex	2.5	0.9	1.5	2.2	1.5
Arizona					
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	1.2	1.2	0.9	1.5	4.5
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.4
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3
Arkansas					
Diagnostic Unit	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	1.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.2
California					
Avenal State Prison	0.4	0.9	0.4	0.4	0.5
California Inst. for Men	0.8	0.0	1.3	1.1	1.2
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	2.4	2.3	1.6	2.0	2.8
California Men's Colony	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.7	1.0
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	1.0	0.6	1.1	1.5	1.7
Calipatria State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.3	0.0
Central California Women's Fac. ^c	4.1	3.9	0.8	1.3	0.4
Corr. Training Fac.	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0
Ironwood State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mule Creek State Prison	2.3	5.3	1.3	1.8	0.4
North Kern State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	1.9	3.9	0.8	3.3	0.0
San Quentin State Prison	2.0	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.0
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	1.4	1.4	1.7	2.8	1.4
Valley State Prison for Women ^c	4.7	5.9	1.5	3.3	3.3
Colorado					
Fremont Corr. Fac.	1.2	3.6	0.6	0.5	1.2
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{c,e}	0.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	3.8
Connecticut					
Osborn Corr. Inst.	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5
Delaware					
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^d	1.4	1.0	1.8	1.0	3.3
Florida					
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	0.6	1.1	2.6	6.1	5.7
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	1.3	2.0	1.4	1.4	1.9
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	2.0	2.9	0.0	0.5	2.3
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^c	1.5	5.7	0.3	1.0	0.5
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	1.8	1.7	0.3	1.3	2.2
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	0.4	0.4	0.7	1.2	1.7
Georgia					
Hays State Prison	2.4	3.4	1.0	2.7	5.4
Men's Corr. State Prison	2.7	4.2	1.7	1.8	2.2
Metro State Prison ^c	5.6	5.0	1.2	1.6	0.4
Walker Corr. Inst.	1.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.6
Wilcox State Prison	0.9	1.4	0.0	0.0	2.0
Hawaii					
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	0.7	0.7	1.6	1.6	0.0
Idaho					
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.1
Illinois					
Danville Corr. Ctr.	0.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	3.0	3.8	1.4	2.2	1.9
Logan Corr. Ctr.	0.4	1.4	0.5	1.4	1.0
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.6	2.3
Indiana					
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	2.8	4.1	0.0	2.0	3.0
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^c	6.5	7.5	0.5	1.1	0.9

Appendix table 6. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by type of incident and level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate		
	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Without force or pressure ^b
Iowa					
Anamosa State Penitentiary	0.7%	2.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
Kansas					
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	0.7	1.2	2.1	2.6	4.1
Kentucky					
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0
Louisiana					
Dixon Corr. Inst.	2.7	3.9	0.9	2.9	1.9
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maine					
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^d	1.8	3.7	1.3	1.5	0.5
Maryland					
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^c	3.2	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	0.7	4.2	1.2	1.9	3.0
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	3.5	2.8	0.5	1.6	4.5
Massachusetts					
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	2.7	3.5	2.3	2.5	0.0
Michigan					
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	2.5	2.2	0.9	0.9	5.2
Marquette Branch Prison	3.3	2.8	1.4	2.0	2.9
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	0.6	1.3	1.1	1.9	1.4
Minnesota					
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.2	0.8
Mississippi					
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9
Missouri					
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	2.4	2.9	1.2	3.9	2.2
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	2.1	2.1	0.7	0.6	0.9
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	2.5	2.5	1.6	1.7	4.0
Montana					
Montana State Prison	2.4	3.5	0.4	1.3	4.3
Nebraska					
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	0.0	1.2	7.5	11.8	5.9
Nevada					
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^c	5.6	4.7	0.4	1.7	0.0
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	3.2	0.6	1.6	2.6	2.4
New Hampshire					
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	2.1	4.2	0.5	1.1	1.1
New Jersey					
Northern State Prison	1.2	1.2	1.2	2.1	2.6
South Woods State Prison	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.1	3.5
New Mexico					
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^e	0.9	0.9	1.6	1.6	3.3
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York					
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.0
Elmira Corr. Fac.	1.9	1.4	1.6	2.5	0.8
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	1.0	2.8	6.0	6.3	2.8
Greene Corr. Fac.	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.1	0.8
Wende Corr. Fac.	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.8	1.4
North Carolina					
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	2.0	2.5	0.6	0.6	0.8
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^c	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.4	0.0
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	2.3	3.0	1.6	1.3	0.9
Odom Corr. Inst.	0.9	0.9	1.9	1.8	2.7
North Dakota					
North Dakota State Penitentiary	1.5	1.5	2.1	3.5	2.0
Ohio					
Belmont Corr. Inst.	1.2	2.1	1.9	3.6	3.1
Grafton Corr. Inst.	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.8	1.3
North Central Corr. Inst.	1.0	2.2	0.6	1.7	1.1

Appendix table 6. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by type of incident and level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate		
	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Without force or pressure ^b
Oklahoma					
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	3.8%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Oregon					
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	1.7	0.8	2.3	2.3	1.5
Pennsylvania					
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^c	2.6	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	1.4	2.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	1.0	2.3	2.7	3.5	4.1
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.6	0.7	2.0	1.2
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	0.8	1.2	0.3	0.7	0.8
Rhode Island					
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	0.6	0.8	0.0	1.4	0.7
Women's Division ^c	3.6	4.4	1.5	1.5	1.6
South Carolina					
Allendale Corr. Inst.	1.5	1.1	0.6	1.6	1.5
Lee Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.5	1.0	3.7	7.7
South Dakota					
South Dakota State Penitentiary	2.2	1.8	2.3	5.1	2.2
Tennessee					
Northwest Corr. Complex	0.0	1.3	0.2	0.2	2.0
Tennessee Prison for Women ^c	0.5	1.1	1.2	2.5	3.2
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^e	1.4	1.4	2.9	3.3	5.4
Texas					
Allred Unit	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.2	2.3
Clements Unit	1.7	3.3	4.1	6.8	5.6
Coffield Unit	2.1	3.9	0.4	1.4	4.3
Dawson State Jail ^{d,e}	1.3	1.0	0.5	0.7	1.0
Estelle Unit	5.1	7.9	0.9	4.4	5.2
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.7
Hilltop Unit ^c	1.4	2.0	0.0	1.1	0.5
Holliday Transfer Fac.	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
Lockhart Unit ^{d,e}	3.1	4.3	0.0	1.8	0.0
Lopez State Jail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.3
McConnell Unit	2.4	2.1	1.6	2.5	4.5
Mountain View Unit ^c	7.5	6.8	0.7	3.0	1.4
Polunsky Unit	0.3	1.2	1.2	2.1	2.4
Ramsey Unit #2	1.1	1.9	1.6	1.1	1.1
Wynne Unit	1.1	1.0	0.8	1.3	2.0
Utah					
Utah State Prison ^d	5.4	5.1	1.2	1.8	0.8
Vermont					
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	1.5	2.7	0.0	0.0	2.6
Virginia					
Red Onion State Prison	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.6	2.3
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	4.2
Washington					
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	1.7	2.3	1.6	1.6	2.6
West Virginia					
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	3.3	2.5	0.0	0.0	1.8
Wisconsin					
Stanley Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.5	0.9	2.1	1.3
Waupun Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.5	1.8	3.0	3.4
Wyoming					
Wyoming State Penitentiary	0.7	1.2	0.8	1.9	4.6

Appendix table 6. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization by type of incident and level of coercion, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate		
	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Physically forced	Pressured ^a	Without force or pressure ^b
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)					
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.4	1.0	1.0	0.4
Bennettsville-Camp	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.6
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^e	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^e	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.3
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.0
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	0.9	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.7
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.6	0.6	0.5	1.1	1.2
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.8
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.8	1.7	3.7	0.3
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^e	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	2.7
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	1.7	0.9	1.7	1.2

Note: Detail may sum to more than totals on table 4 because victims may report on more than one incident involving different levels of coercion.

^aIncludes incidents in which the perpetrator, without using force, pressured the inmate or made the inmate feel that they had to participate. (See *Methodology* for definitions.)

^bIncludes 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.

^cFemale facility.

^dFacility houses both males and females.

^ePrivately operated facility.

Appendix table 7. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and percent injured, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	All incidents		Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Victimized	Injured ^a	Victimized	Injured ^a	Victimized	Injured ^a
Total	4.5%	0.8%	2.1%	0.5%	2.9%	0.3%
Alabama						
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^b	6.3	1.1	5.0	1.1	1.7	0.0
Limestone Corr. Fac.	3.3	0.4	2.6	0.4	0.8	0.0
Alaska						
Wildwood Corr. Complex	4.9	0.6	2.5	0.0	3.1	0.6
Arizona						
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	7.5	0.6	1.9	0.6	5.6	0.0
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	0.9	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.0
Arkansas						
Diagnostic Unit	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	3.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.2	0.0
California						
Avenal State Prison	1.4	0.4	0.9	0.4	1.0	0.4
California Inst. for Men	2.6	0.7	0.8	0.0	1.8	0.7
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	7.2	2.8	2.9	1.3	4.2	1.5
California Men's Colony	2.3	0.5	0.9	0.5	1.8	0.0
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	3.1	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Calipatria State Prison	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
Central California Women's Fac. ^b	7.0	0.7	5.7	0.7	1.7	0.0
Corr. Training Fac.	1.1	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.9	0.9
Ironwood State Prison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mule Creek State Prison	6.8	1.3	5.3	1.3	2.2	0.0
North Kern State Prison	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	5.9	0.5	3.9	0.5	3.3	0.5
San Quentin State Prison	4.1	1.1	2.0	0.0	2.1	1.1
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	4.7	0.4	1.9	0.4	3.7	0.0
Valley State Prison for Women ^b	10.3	2.3	7.9	1.5	5.3	0.9
Colorado						
Fremont Corr. Fac.	5.2	0.0	3.6	0.0	2.2	0.0
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{b,d}	5.9	0.0	2.2	0.0	3.8	0.0
Connecticut						
Osborn Corr. Inst.	1.7	0.4	0.4	0.0	1.3	0.4
Delaware						
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^c	4.1	0.9	1.4	0.5	3.8	0.4
Florida						
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	12.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	11.4	0.0
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	5.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.5	0.0
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	5.1	2.0	3.3	1.5	2.8	0.5
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^b	7.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	1.8	0.0
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	5.9	0.0	2.4	0.0	3.5	0.0
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	2.7	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.3	0.0
Georgia						
Hays State Prison	9.1	2.9	4.1	2.1	6.6	0.8
Men's Corr. State Prison	7.0	0.3	5.1	0.3	2.9	0.0
Metro State Prison ^b	8.0	1.2	7.6	1.2	1.6	0.4
Walker Corr. Inst.	2.3	0.4	1.6	0.4	0.6	0.0
Wilcox State Prison	2.8	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.0	0.0
Hawaii						
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	1.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.6	0.0
Idaho						
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0
Illinois						
Danville Corr. Ctr.	1.6	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	6.7	1.7	4.2	0.8	3.9	0.9
Logan Corr. Ctr.	3.3	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.8	0.0
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	2.9	0.8	0.6	0.0	2.3	0.8
Indiana						
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	7.8	0.9	4.1	0.9	4.0	0.0
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^b	10.8	3.7	10.2	3.7	2.0	0.6

Appendix table 7. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and percent injured, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	All incidents		Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Victimized	Injured*	Victimized	Injured*	Victimized	Injured*
Iowa						
Anamosa State Penitentiary	4.1%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Kansas						
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	5.4	0.7	1.2	0.7	5.4	0.7
Kentucky						
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.0
Louisiana						
Dixon Corr. Inst.	5.4	2.4	3.9	2.4	3.7	0.6
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maine						
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^c	5.6	1.1	4.4	0.7	1.5	0.4
Maryland						
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^b	6.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	8.5	0.5	4.2	0.0	4.2	0.5
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	8.2	1.6	3.9	1.6	5.4	0.7
Massachusetts						
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	6.6	1.1	3.5	1.1	3.2	0.0
Michigan						
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	7.9	1.2	3.1	1.2	5.2	0.0
Marquette Branch Prison	6.8	3.5	3.3	1.8	5.8	2.0
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	4.6	0.0	1.3	0.0	3.3	0.0
Minnesota						
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	2.2	0.9	1.4	0.9	0.8	0.0
Mississippi						
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9
Missouri						
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	7.9	1.4	2.9	1.4	5.8	0.0
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	3.7	1.8	2.1	1.5	1.6	0.3
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	7.1	1.3	3.2	1.3	4.0	0.0
Montana						
Montana State Prison	7.9	1.3	4.0	0.9	4.7	0.4
Nebraska						
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	13.4	3.9	1.2	0.0	12.2	3.9
Nevada						
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^b	7.7	1.6	6.6	1.6	1.7	0.0
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	5.8	1.7	3.2	0.6	3.9	1.1
New Hampshire						
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	6.2	1.4	4.6	1.4	2.2	0.0
New Jersey						
Northern State Prison	3.7	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.7	0.0
South Woods State Prison	4.4	0.0	0.9	0.0	3.5	0.0
New Mexico						
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^d	5.0	1.7	0.9	0.9	4.1	0.8
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York						
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	3.4	0.6	1.0	0.0	2.9	0.6
Elmira Corr. Fac.	5.1	1.7	1.9	1.4	3.3	0.3
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	11.3	2.0	3.0	0.0	9.6	2.0
Greene Corr. Fac.	1.9	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.6	0.0
Wende Corr. Fac.	6.2	3.1	3.3	1.7	4.6	1.4
North Carolina						
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	3.6	1.9	2.5	1.3	2.0	0.6
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^b	4.3	0.8	3.8	0.8	0.4	0.0
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	5.5	1.1	3.6	1.1	3.0	0.0
Odom Corr. Inst.	4.7	0.9	0.9	0.9	3.7	0.0
North Dakota						
North Dakota State Penitentiary	5.6	0.7	1.5	0.0	4.1	0.7
Ohio						
Belmont Corr. Inst.	3.6	1.2	2.6	0.7	3.6	0.5
Grafton Corr. Inst.	4.8	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.1	0.0
North Central Corr. Inst.	3.8	0.6	2.2	0.6	2.2	0.0

Appendix table 7. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and percent injured, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	All incidents		Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Victimized	Injured*	Victimized	Injured*	Victimized	Injured*
Oklahoma						
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	6.3%	2.9%	6.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Oregon						
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	4.2	2.4	1.7	0.8	2.9	2.0
Pennsylvania						
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^b	4.4	1.0	4.4	1.0	0.0	0.0
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	2.5	0.5	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.0
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	8.1	1.6	2.3	1.1	7.0	0.5
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	3.8	0.7	0.6	0.0	3.2	0.7
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	1.9	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.4
Rhode Island						
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	3.5	1.4	1.4	0.0	2.1	1.4
Women's Division ^b	7.5	2.0	4.4	1.4	3.1	0.7
South Carolina						
Allendale Corr. Inst.	4.7	1.1	1.5	1.1	3.1	0.0
Lee Corr. Inst.	8.7	0.5	1.0	0.5	7.7	0.0
South Dakota						
South Dakota State Penitentiary	7.2	1.6	2.2	1.2	5.6	0.4
Tennessee						
Northwest Corr. Complex	3.5	0.9	1.3	0.9	2.2	0.0
Tennessee Prison for Women ^b	4.8	0.0	1.1	0.0	4.3	0.0
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^d	7.1	1.9	1.4	0.0	7.1	1.9
Texas						
Allred Unit	9.9	3.3	4.8	3.3	6.7	0.9
Clements Unit	13.9	4.0	3.3	1.0	11.6	3.1
Coffield Unit	9.3	0.0	4.4	0.0	5.7	0.0
Dawson State Jail ^{c,d}	2.9	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.2	0.0
Estelle Unit	15.7	2.5	8.5	2.0	7.6	0.4
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
Hilltop Unit ^b	3.4	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
Holliday Transfer Fac.	1.1	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0
Lockhart Unit ^{c,d}	7.3	0.0	5.5	0.0	1.8	0.0
Lopez State Jail	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
McConnell Unit	8.0	1.4	3.5	1.0	5.4	0.4
Mountain View Unit ^b	9.5	3.2	8.7	2.7	3.4	2.1
Polunsky Unit	5.3	0.8	1.2	0.5	4.2	0.3
Ramsey Unit #2	4.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	2.7	0.0
Wynne Unit	5.5	1.9	1.5	1.1	4.0	0.8
Utah						
Utah State Prison ^c	7.7	2.6	6.6	2.6	2.4	0.4
Vermont						
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	5.3	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.6	0.0
Virginia						
Red Onion State Prison	3.6	0.0	1.3	0.0	3.6	0.0
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0
Washington						
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	6.4	0.0	2.3	0.0	4.2	0.0
West Virginia						
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	4.3	0.7	3.3	0.7	1.8	0.0
Wisconsin						
Stanley Corr. Inst.	3.8	0.4	0.5	0.0	3.2	0.4
Waupun Corr. Inst.	6.8	1.3	0.5	0.0	6.3	1.3
Wyoming						
Wyoming State Penitentiary	7.0	0.8	1.2	0.0	6.6	0.8

Appendix table 7. Percent of prison inmates reporting sexual victimization and percent injured, by type of incident and facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	All incidents		Inmate-on-inmate		Staff-on-inmate	
	Victimized	Injured ^a	Victimized	Injured ^a	Victimized	Injured ^a
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)						
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.6	1.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Bennettsville-Camp	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	2.4	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.3	0.0
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^d	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^d	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.0
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	2.3	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.7	0.0
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.8	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.8	0.0
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	4.8	0.3	0.8	0.0	4.0	0.3
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^d	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	1.0	0.4	1.0	0.4	0.0	0.0
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	3.5	0.0	1.6	0.0	2.7	0.0
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	3.1	0.6	1.7	0.0	2.2	0.6

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

^aInjuries included knife or stab wounds, broken bones, anal or rectal tearing, teeth chipped or knocked out, internal injuries, knocked unconscious, bruises, black eyes, sprains, cuts, scratches, swelling, or welts.

^bFemale facility.

^cFacility houses both males and females.

^dPrivately operated facility.

Appendix table 8. Number of incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Total	49	5	77	7
Alabama				
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^e	189	91	166	63
Limestone Corr. Fac.	166	100	108	63
Alaska				
Wildwood Corr. Complex	9	7	60	37
Arizona				
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	13	13	114	75
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	0	0	20	19
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	62	60	62	60
Arkansas				
Diagnostic Unit	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	35	28	25	14
California				
Avenal State Prison	21	20	53	52
California Inst. for Men	0	0	8	8
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	94	54	112	56
California Men's Colony	22	17	22	17
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	11	11	21	21
Calipatria State Prison	0	0	0	0
Central California Women's Fac. ^e	82	48	89	44
Corr. Training Fac.	0	0	8	8
Ironwood State Prison	0	0	0	0
Mule Creek State Prison	251	115	175	86
North Kern State Prison	0	0	0	0
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	192	123	256	138
San Quentin State Prison	48	45	144	79
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	72	55	56	44
Valley State Prison for Women ^e	51	32	219	74
Colorado				
Fremont Corr. Fac.	30	17	149	72
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{e,9}	13	11	41	32
Connecticut				
Osborn Corr. Inst.	8	7	8	7
Delaware				
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^f	28	23	80	49
Florida				
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	4	4	0	0
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	18	13	32	29
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	15	14	64	42
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	68	34	190	96
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^e	51	30	176	85
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	58	36	56	41
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	21	20	21	20
Georgia				
Hays State Prison	86	42	89	37
Men's Corr. State Prison	60	24	141	60
Metro State Prison ^e	69	29	153	51
Walker Corr. Inst.	4	4	146	120
Wilcox State Prison	80	48	31	26
Hawaii				
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	80	61	80	61
Idaho				
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	0	0	0	0
Illinois				
Danville Corr. Ctr.	5	5	18	14
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	81	44	101	48
Logan Corr. Ctr.	21	20	31	22
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	6	5	6	5
Indiana				
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	106	60	151	74
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^e	218	101	386	120

Appendix table 8. Number of incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Iowa				
Anamosa State Penitentiary	65	43	139	62
Kansas				
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	88	79	84	79
Kentucky				
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	0	0	0	0
Louisiana				
Dixon Corr. Inst.	211	85	253	107
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	38	33	15	9
Maine				
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^f	11	7	138	60
Maryland				
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^e	55	38	40	20
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	165	113	223	135
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	153	94	111	61
Massachusetts				
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	31	22	184	123
Michigan				
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	73	36	99	63
Marquette Branch Prison	32	14	57	34
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	6	6	111	77
Minnesota				
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	23	22	107	65
Mississippi				
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	0	0	0	0
Missouri				
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	57	27	114	64
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	71	36	115	75
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	101	74	122	75
Montana				
Montana State Prison	56	43	118	65
Nebraska				
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	62	59	62	59
Nevada				
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^e	61	24	155	45
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	30	28	56	30
New Hampshire				
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	142	75	192	86
New Jersey				
Northern State Prison	106	97	106	97
South Woods State Prison	9	9	5	5
New Mexico				
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^g	0	0	46	43
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0	0	0	0
New York				
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	5	5	9	8
Elmira Corr. Fac.	73	66	69	66
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	31	22	21	10
Greene Corr. Fac.	24	22	26	22
Wende Corr. Fac.	69	39	65	39
North Carolina				
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	45	22	152	85
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^e	26	14	109	47
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0	0	0	0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	115	75	236	115
Odom Corr. Inst.	46	39	46	39
North Dakota				
North Dakota State Penitentiary	25	21	36	22
Ohio				
Belmont Corr. Inst.	91	74	146	95
Grafton Corr. Inst.	112	66	42	40
North Central Corr. Inst.	59	37	126	74

Appendix table 8. Number of incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Oklahoma				
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	161	68	330	132
Oregon				
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	26	20	42	22
Pennsylvania				
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^e	68	37	174	89
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	35	24	117	72
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	35	24	145	90
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	0	0	31	23
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	92	87	96	87
Rhode Island				
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	6	5	47	38
Women's Division ^e	26	9	101	31
South Carolina				
Allendale Corr. Inst.	91	60	91	60
Lee Corr. Inst.	88	65	32	26
South Dakota				
South Dakota State Penitentiary	93	50	85	66
Tennessee				
Northwest Corr. Complex	4	4	49	43
Tennessee Prison for Women ^e	0	0	22	13
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^g	28	20	44	29
Texas				
Allred Unit	115	57	106	56
Clements Unit	118	110	135	110
Coffield Unit	104	46	137	59
Dawson State Jail ^{f,g}	0	0	31	20
Estelle Unit	244	132	297	139
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	0	0	0	0
Hilltop Unit ^e	15	10	103	54
Holliday Transfer Fac.	11	10	5	5
Lockhart Unit ^{f,g}	19	13	62	29
Lopez State Jail	0	0	0	0
McConnell Unit	65	48	97	55
Mountain View Unit ^e	100	48	257	85
Polunsky Unit	36	31	83	58
Ramsey Unit #2	38	28	43	28
Wynne Unit	6	5	34	24
Utah				
Utah State Prison ^f	259	127	306	130
Vermont				
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	27	14	76	54
Virginia				
Red Onion State Prison	66	54	159	129
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	0	0	0	0
Washington				
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	14	10	60	44
West Virginia				
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	35	26	161	73
Wisconsin				
Stanley Corr. Inst.	27	26	27	26
Waupun Corr. Inst.	5	5	0	0
Wyoming				
Wyoming State Penitentiary	0	0	37	23

Appendix table 8. Number of incidents of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007

Facility name	Nonconsensual sexual acts ^a		Abusive sexual contacts only ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)				
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	0	0
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	27	21	21	20
Bennettsville-Camp	0	0	0	0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	12	11	79	75
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^g	0	0	0	0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^g	0	0	0	0
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	0	0
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	0	0	11	9
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	34	26	40	26
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	0	0	0	0
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	68	64	68	64
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	0	0
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	0	0	0	0
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	8	7	8	7
Schuykill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	0	0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^g	0	0	7	6
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	126	83
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	25	18	42	41
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	7	7	114	107

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

^aIncludes all incidents of unwanted contacts with another inmate that involved oral sex, anal sex, vaginal sex, handjobs, or other sexual acts.

^bIncludes all incidents of unwanted contacts with another inmate that involved only touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, penis, breasts, or vagina in a sexual way.

^cIncident rate represents that the number of incidents reported by inmates per 1,000 inmates.

^dStandard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the weighted survey estimates. (See *Methodology*.)

^eFemale facility.

^fFacility houses both males and females.

^gPrivately operated facility.

Facility name	Unwilling sexual contact ^a		Willing sexual contact ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Total	75	7	71	7
Alabama				
Julia Tutwiler Prison ^e	115	64	0	0
Limestone Corr. Fac.	38	36	38	36
Alaska				
Wildwood Corr. Complex	142	78	180	104
Arizona				
Arizona State Prison Complex - Eyman	64	36	111	60
Arizona State Prison Complex - Florence	4	4	4	4
Arizona State Prison Complex - Tucson	0	0	3	3
Arkansas				
Diagnostic Unit	0	0	9	7
Jefferson County Corr. Fac.	0	0	45	35
California				
Avenal State Prison	21	20	11	11
California Inst. for Men	102	86	96	85
California Sub. Abuse Treatment Fac. - Corcoran	152	94	98	56
California Men's Colony	15	15	24	18
California Rehabilitation Ctr.	45	32	65	39
Calipatria State Prison	68	60	0	0
Central California Women's Fac. ^e	33	20	47	46
Corr. Training Fac.	109	108	0	0
Ironwood State Prison	0	0	0	0
Mule Creek State Prison	102	78	18	18
North Kern State Prison	0	0	7	7
R. J. Donovan Corr. Fac. at Rock Mountain	133	98	0	0
San Quentin State Prison	132	91	31	25
Sierra Conservation Ctr.	185	96	119	80
Valley State Prison for Women ^e	105	52	122	62
Colorado				
Fremont Corr. Fac.	16	11	33	22
High Plains Corr. Fac. ^{e,9}	0	0	162	123
Connecticut				
Osborn Corr. Inst.	54	44	11	10
Delaware				
Howard R. Young Corr. Inst. ^f	48	27	121	63
Florida				
Central Florida Reception Ctr. East, South & Main	0	0	0	0
Charlotte Corr. Inst.	458	171	306	108
Cross City Corr. Inst. & Work Camp	38	17	26	15
Hamilton Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp	26	25	141	79
Lowell Corr. Inst., Annex & Work Camp ^e	49	28	10	10
Sumter Corr. Inst., Boot Camp & Work Camp	13	10	44	21
Taylor Corr. Inst. & Annex	50	32	23	14
Georgia				
Hays State Prison	143	62	237	75
Men's Corr. State Prison	66	39	43	20
Metro State Prison ^e	45	25	4	4
Walker Corr. Inst.	0	0	32	27
Wilcox State Prison	0	0	139	75
Hawaii				
Waiawa Corr. Fac.	144	88	0	0
Idaho				
South Idaho Corr. Inst.	119	85	38	26
Illinois				
Danville Corr. Ctr.	0	0	0	0
Dixon Corr. Ctr.	83	47	81	56
Logan Corr. Ctr.	55	35	27	21
Vienna Corr. Ctr.	48	38	62	40

Appendix table 9. Number of incidents of staff-on-inmate sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Unwilling sexual contact ^a		Willing sexual contact ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Indiana				
Plainfield Corr. Fac.	71	40	103	49
Rockville Corr. Fac. ^e	37	27	45	42
Iowa				
Anamosa State Penitentiary	46	43	16	15
Kansas				
Hutchinson Corr. Fac.	108	79	283	107
Kentucky				
Western Kentucky Corr. Complex	167	116	0	0
Louisiana				
Dixon Corr. Inst.	100	46	58	40
Forcht-Wade Corr. Ctr.	0	0	0	0
Maine				
Maine Corr. Ctr. ^f	107	58	9	8
Maryland				
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit - Women ^e	0	0	0	0
Maryland Corr. Training Ctr.	100	81	132	67
Roxbury Corr. Inst.	74	60	145	85
Massachusetts				
Old Colony Corr. Ctr.	229	127	0	0
Michigan				
Bellamy Creek Corr. Fac.	9	9	194	71
Marquette Branch Prison	133	74	69	32
Ojibway Corr. Fac.	118	71	52	28
Minnesota				
Minnesota Corr. Fac. - Stillwater	2	2	14	12
Mississippi				
Harrison Community Work Ctr.	9	4	9	4
Missouri				
Jefferson City Corr. Ctr.	108	58	87	58
Northeast Corr. Ctr.	11	6	19	13
Southeast Corr. Ctr.	57	32	190	89
Montana				
Montana State Prison	95	63	165	65
Nebraska				
Tecumseh State Corr. Inst.	866	372	384	235
Nevada				
Florence McClure Women's Corr. Ctr. ^e	65	33	0	0
Southern Desert Corr. Ctr.	164	89	183	98
New Hampshire				
New Hampshire State Prison for Men	31	25	55	37
New Jersey				
Northern State Prison	50	23	170	109
South Woods State Prison	130	90	204	105
New Mexico				
Lea County Corr. Fac. ^g	16	10	83	45
Penitentiary of New Mexico	0	0	0	0
New York				
Arthur Kill Corr. Fac.	119	69	30	23
Elmira Corr. Fac.	118	73	16	16
Great Meadow Corr. Fac.	334	125	232	131
Greene Corr. Fac.	99	87	17	11
Wende Corr. Fac.	133	63	50	35
North Carolina				
Avery Mitchell Corr. Inst.	78	65	8	5
Fountain Corr. Ctr. ^e	9	8	0	0
Gates Corr. Ctr.	0	0	0	0
Harnett Corr. Inst.	32	16	31	21
Odom Corr. Inst.	166	90	154	90
North Dakota				
North Dakota State Penitentiary	146	76	148	78

Appendix table 9. Number of incidents of staff-on-inmate sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Unwilling sexual contact ^a		Willing sexual contact ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Ohio				
Belmont Corr. Inst.	191	101	232	110
Grafton Corr. Inst.	16	15	63	60
North Central Corr. Inst.	46	32	57	39
Oklahoma				
Joseph Harp Corr. Ctr.	0	0	0	0
Oregon				
Oregon State Corr. Inst.	200	82	102	55
Pennsylvania				
Cambridge Springs State Corr. Inst. ^e	0	0	0	0
Dallas State Corr. Inst.	11	10	0	0
Fayette State Corr. Inst.	121	64	188	75
Graterford State Corr. Inst.	27	19	59	58
Rockview State Corr. Inst.	10	7	59	48
Rhode Island				
John Moran Medium Security Fac.	27	18	15	14
Women's Division ^e	22	11	50	25
South Carolina				
Allendale Corr. Inst.	88	56	120	83
Lee Corr. Inst.	66	28	216	73
South Dakota				
South Dakota State Penitentiary	179	92	134	74
Tennessee				
Northwest Corr. Complex	4	4	46	24
Tennessee Prison for Women ^e	60	35	119	53
Whiteville Corr. Fac. ^g	197	116	203	89
Texas				
Allred Unit	190	87	49	26
Clements Unit	311	104	213	97
Coffield Unit	70	51	204	83
Dawson State Jail ^{f,g}	12	8	51	49
Estelle Unit	129	58	251	90
Fort Stockton Transfer Fac.	6	5	14	12
Hilltop Unit ^e	11	6	9	8
Holliday Transfer Fac.	65	62	0	0
Lockhart Unit ^{f,g}	18	16	0	0
Lopez State Jail	6	5	13	8
McConnell Unit	45	24	122	52
Mountain View Unit ^e	162	74	72	45
Polunsky Unit	53	24	53	22
Ramsey Unit #2	27	15	22	14
Wynne Unit	107	92	66	45
Utah				
Utah State Prison ^f	87	68	8	6
Vermont				
Chittenden Regional Corr. Fac.	0	0	26	13
Virginia				
Red Onion State Prison	53	30	116	67
St. Brides Corr. Ctr.	183	154	408	223
Washington				
Stafford Creek Corr. Ctr.	32	23	46	39
West Virginia				
Northern Regional Corr. Fac.	0	0	56	31
Wisconsin				
Stanley Corr. Inst.	85	57	67	56
Waupun Corr. Inst.	269	122	151	61
Wyoming				
Wyoming State Penitentiary	56	33	196	84

Appendix table 9. Number of incidents of staff-on-inmate sexual victimization per 1,000 inmates, by facility, National Inmate Survey, 2007 (cont.)

Facility name	Unwilling sexual contact ^a		Willing sexual contact ^b	
	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d	Incident rate ^c	Standard error ^d
Federal Facilities (Bureau of Prisons)				
Allenwood Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	27	21	10	9
Beaumont Low Fed. Corr. Inst.	50	34	8	8
Bennettsville-Camp	0	0	0	0
Big Sandy U.S. Penitentiary	13	9	12	12
Big Spring Corr. Inst. ^g	0	0	0	0
Cibola County Corr. Inst. ^g	9	9	11	10
Fort Dix Fed. Corr. Inst.	5	3	16	16
La Tuna - Fed. Satellite Fac. (El Paso)	28	18	0	0
Lexington Fed. Medical Fac.	0	0	7	7
McCreary U.S. Penitentiary	39	37	0	0
Memphis Fed. Corr. Inst.	33	27	81	65
Milan Fed. Corr. Inst.	39	36	8	7
Oakdale Fed. Detention Fac.	0	0	27	26
Pekin Fed. Corr. Inst.	251	131	14	13
Schuylkill Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	0	0
Taft Corr. Inst. ^g	0	0	0	0
Terminal Island Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	0	0
Victorville Med. I Fed. Corr. Inst.	0	0	164	113
Yazoo City Med. Fed. Corr. Inst.	175	103	110	85

^aIncludes all incidents of reported unwilling sexual contacts with staff.

^bIncludes all incidents of willing sexual contacts with staff inmate.

^cIncident rate represents the number of incidents reported by inmates per 1,000 inmates.

^dStandard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around the weighted survey estimates. (See *Methodology*.)

^eFemale facility.

^fFacility houses both males and females.

^gPrivately operated facility.