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ABSTRACT: According to the National Crime Victimization Survey, approximately 39.6 million victimizations occurred in the United States in 1995, 9.9 million of which were violent crimes (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1996). Criminal victimization can be an extremely stressful event, leaving many victims with significant levels of psychological distress. Naturally occurring social support systems may be relatively ineffective in alleviating such emotional trauma (Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer, 1990).

The Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) conducted a study funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to determine how well the needs of violent crime victims are met. This report presents the results of surveys and interviews of victims, service providers, and law enforcement officers, as well as a review of the relevant literature. In addition to assessing the needs of violent crime victims, the goals of the research included documenting services available to victims, assessing the level of service utilization by different segments of the population, determining how coping ability varies across victims, and documenting factors related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system.
Results demonstrated that certain segments of the population are more likely to receive services than others and that reactions to victimization do vary. In addition, while having a network of family and friends may be helpful in coping with the incident, more formal assistance may be required in some cases. Victims who receive information regarding case status and feel that their opinions have been heard are more likely to be satisfied with the criminal justice system. Recommendations for how service delivery may be improved are made and future areas of research are identified, based upon these results.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

While victim retaliation was the earliest form of social control, by the early 1800s, societies came to view crime as an offense against the state, rather than the victim (Elias, 1986; McLeod, 1987). However, during the first half of the twentieth century, attention was returning back to the needs of victims and, in 1964, the first victim compensation program was established in California (McDonald, 1976). During the 1970s and 1980s, concern for crime victims continued to grow, with more research and legislation geared toward victims.

During 1995, 39.6 million individuals were victims of crime in the United States, with one-quarter of these involving violence (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1996). While previous research has examined how victimization can change an individual's life, less is known about how well the needs of victims are met (Skogan, Lurgio, and Davis, 1990). Funded by the National Institute of Justice, the Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments investigated the needs of victims of violence, how these needs are met or unmet, and the criminal justice response. This summary presents the highlights from the full report. Following a description of the research methodology, the sample of victims surveyed and interviewed is described. The major findings are then presented, including a discussion of victim characteristics, how individuals react and cope with victimization, which services are received and utilized by which victims, other sources of support available to individuals, and the nature of contacts between the criminal justice and victims. Finally, recommendations are made based upon these findings.

METHODOLOGY

The original design for this study was based upon a comparison of various service delivery models to victims of violence. With the primary goals of determining if the needs of victims are met and how crisis intervention may influence the nature of victim involvement with the criminal justice system, three different models were to be evaluated: a volunteer crisis-intervention team operated by law enforcement; a volunteer crisis intervention program operated by a community-based agency that intervenes at the time of the incident and also provides on-going assistance; and the traditional police response, in which the patrol officers provide information and referral services, with follow-up by the District Attorney's Victim-Witness Program.
However, unforeseen circumstances necessitated changes in the study's focus. Specifically, while 200 victims who received crisis intervention (100 through the San Diego Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) within the San Diego Police Department, and 100 through the EYE Counseling and Crisis Services, a community-based agency) were to be compared to an equal number of matched individuals who received the traditional police response, analyses of cases through official records showed that only nine individuals who returned an initial victims' survey were assisted by the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT), and only nine individuals were assisted by the EYE (three at the crime scene and six afterward). It is unknown if this is due to severe underreporting or actual program operations.

The revised research design includes four of the original objectives, as well as two additional ones. The four original objectives include assessing the needs of violent crime victims, documenting what services are available to violent crime victims in the San Diego region, assessing the level of service utilization by different segments of the population, and recommending improvements in the delivery of services to victims and identifying issues for future research. Additionally, coping ability was explored relative to victim and crime characteristics, and the factors related to victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system were documented.

The project began with a literature review to identify key issues to be addressed in an initial survey with victims, follow-up interview, and collection of data from official records. In addition, a panel of local experts was convened to gain the insight of victims, law enforcement, and service providers from the community. CIT and EYE program meetings were attended, and ride-alongs with police and crisis teams took place to gain a better understanding of the different service delivery models.

Violent crime victims in the San Diego region were surveyed initially during 1993, and follow-up interviews were conducted the following year. Victims were asked questions about the incident, their interactions with service providers and members of the criminal justice system, and how victimization affected their lives. In addition, the cases of these individuals were tracked as they progressed through the system to determine final case outcome and to supplement victim self-report information. Members of the CIT, EYE, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, as well as other service providers in the San Diego region, were also surveyed regarding assistance available through their programs and their perceptions of the needs of victims. Law enforcement officers were also surveyed regarding their knowledge of services available to victims, frequency of referrals, and their perceptions of victim needs.

**SAMPLE DESCRIPTION**

During July through October 1993, 3,138 individuals, over the age of 16, were victims of sexual assault, assault, or domestic violence incidents reported to the police in the cities of San Diego, Escondido, San Marcos, and Vista. An additional 64 people were homicide survivors or witnesses in San Diego. All individuals were mailed an English/Spanish survey, accompanied by a letter from the San Diego County District Attorney, four weeks after their victimization occurred. A follow-up mailing was sent two weeks later to improve the response rate.
Seven-hundred eighteen (718), or 22 percent, of these victims returned surveys to SANDAG researchers, 330 of whom were recontacted six months later. Females outnumbered males in all samples by approximately two to one, but the response rate did not vary by gender. Caucasians represented the greatest percentage of crime victims and witnesses sent surveys and also had the highest response rate for both the initial survey and the follow-up interview.

While homicide survivors and sexual assault victims comprised the smallest percentage of individuals sent surveys, they were most likely to respond. Domestic violence victims were least likely to return the survey, but because they represented almost three-quarters of the individuals sent surveys, they continued to comprise more than one-half of the initial and follow-up samples. The impact of the violence and resulting needs discovered through this study may have been influenced by these characteristics.

MAJOR FINDINGS

This project revealed the following findings regarding violent victimization which may be of interest to individuals working in victim assistance programs, as well as members of the criminal justice system, as improvements are made in the response to victims of violence.

Characteristics of Victims and Incidents

- **Repeat victimization is common.** Almost one-half of the respondents reported they had experienced victimization in the past, 58 percent of whom said the suspect in the current case was the same person responsible for prior offenses against them. In addition, four in five victims reported they knew their assailant before the incident. These statistics reflect the fact that a high percentage of individuals were domestic violence victims.

- **Violence affects individuals regardless of socio-economic status and other demographic characteristics.** Self-report data showed that the characteristics of victims were fairly evenly distributed, such as educational level, employment status, marital status, and household income, suggesting that violence can affect anyone.

- **Financial loss is frequently associated with violence.** Over one-half of the follow-up sample experienced some type of financial loss (e.g., lost wages, lost property, medical expenses).

- **The impact of violence on the lives of victims is significant.** Victims moved due to fear of continued victimization, missed work, changed their lifestyle (e.g., avoided certain people, stayed home more often, spent more time with family, avoided going out alone or at night), and experienced negative emotional reactions (e.g., painful memories, depression, distress).
Reaction and Ability to Cope with Victimization

Criminal victimization and the realization that one has been deliberately selected for harm may lead to long-term problems for some individuals. In an attempt to better understand how the consequences of victimization may vary among individuals, and within the same individual over time, statistical analyses were conducted to determine the nature of the relationship between measures of coping ability (change of residence, absence from work, lifestyle changes, and emotional reactions) and a variety of predictive factors. While a number of these were significantly related to one or more measures, these findings are presented more for their potential applied usefulness, than their theoretical content. Thus, any conclusions regarding mechanisms or direction of causality are not made at this time.

• **Women tend to be more affected by violence than men.** Maguire (1992) suggested that females may be negatively impacted by victimization more than males. Supporting these findings, the current research project found that females were more likely than males to report absence from work, a change in their residence, lifestyle changes, and negative emotional reactions.

• **Individuals who comprise lower socio-economic groups seem to be those most in need for special attention from service providers.** Lurgio and Resick (1990) have suggested that individuals in lower economic groups may be negatively impacted by victimization more than those with higher household incomes. Individuals in lower socio-economic groups were more likely than those with a higher socio-economic status to make more lifestyle changes and experience more emotional reactions. However, the influence of other possible intervening variables (e.g., family support) is unknown.

• **Victims with injuries and/or those perceiving that their life was threatened during the incident also seem to have a high level of needs requiring the services of victim assistance programs.** Victims who were injured and perceived that their life had been threatened appeared to react more strongly to their victimization. Though individuals with these two factors were more likely to receive offers of assistance from others, they were also more likely to have unmet needs.

• **Victimization by strangers, perhaps because of perceived arbitrary nature of the violent act, may have a greater effect on the long-term emotional reactions of victims than violence committed by acquaintances, friends, or relatives.** Initially, individuals who were accosted by someone they knew reported more emotional problems immediately after the crime, but as time passed, those who did not know the suspect reported a greater number of problems over the six-month period following the incident.

• **The long-term effects of victimization vary over time.** For the follow-up sample, the type of violence was related to the ability to cope, though this was not true for the same measures on the initial survey.
• Victims of sexual assault appeared to be the most greatly affected by their victimization. Specifically, these individuals were more likely to miss work, make a greater number of lifestyle changes, and experience a greater number of emotional reactions than victims of other types of violence. These findings are consistent with previous studies (i.e., Burgess and Holmstrom, 1974) which have suggested that an attack of this sort seriously taxes an individual's adaptive resources.

• Survivors and witnesses of homicide are directly affected by the crime to an equal, if not greater, degree than other victims of violence. Consistent with the research of Riggs and Kilpatrick (1990), a higher percentage of homicide survivors and witnesses, compared to domestic violence and other assault victims, missed work, made lifestyle changes, and experienced emotional reactions.

• The response by the criminal justice system did not significantly influence the ability to cope with the violent incident. Suspect arrest, satisfaction with the prosecutor, and satisfaction with the judge did not predict coping ability.

Service Utilization and Needs

While a variety of services are available to crime victims in the San Diego region, a question of interest pertains to whether individuals take advantage of these resources, if needs are met, and if any characteristic of the victim or crime was associated with utilization.

• The effects of violent victimization can be long-lasting, supporting the need for follow-up counseling. Approximately three-quarters of the initial sample respondents reported receiving services because of the crime. The potentially long-lasting effects of victimization were apparent, with approximately one in five victims continuing to receive services six months after the original incident.

• The needs of victims change over time due to the long-term detrimental emotional and psychological impact of violence. As time passed, the type of assistance most appreciated varied. Protection was most important on the day of the incident, while information and referrals were more helpful one month following the crime, and emotional support was most important more than one month after the violence.

• Over one-half of all victims indicated that all of their needs had been fulfilled. Though a large proportion of the sample received some type of service, unmet needs remained, particularly for minority groups. While the majority of victims seem to be receiving some services, it also appeared that some needs continued to go unmet, with 38 percent reporting unmet needs six months after the crime. Hispanic victims and victims of "other" ethnic groups were most likely to report that they had needs which were not met.

• While case information was among the most frequently received services, it was also the most frequently cited need. This finding could be the result of no information received or the view that the amount received was insufficient.
Repeat victimization was associated with unmet needs, indicating that there may be some additive effect of continuing victimization or that individuals who are victims of repeated violence are less likely to seek or receive needed assistance. Individuals with a prior history of victimization were more likely to report that needed services were not received.

Use of Other Sources of Support

The issue of whether formal assistance and services are required by victims has been discussed in the literature. Some have argued that social support available through one's immediate circle of family and/or friends is sufficient (Lurgio and Resick, 1990), while others feel that more highly-trained individuals are required to guide a victim through the aftermath of victimization (Coates and Winston, 1983; cited in Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer, 1990). Overall, the results of the current study seemed to provide more evidence for the second hypothesis than the first.

Having some form of social support system in place may be required for recovery following a violent incident. However, it may not be sufficient; assistance from victim service providers is necessary. As one victim shared, though friends were supportive and talking about the incident with them was helpful, "professional guidance may have been preferable."

Victim Involvement with the Criminal Justice System

Victim involvement with the criminal justice system has been of interest to researchers concerned with secondary victimization, as well as those seeking to improve victim cooperation so the justice system will function optimally. Analyses were done to determine which factors were predictive of satisfaction with law enforcement, a Deputy District Attorney, the judge, as well as the criminal justice system as a whole. While a number of factors outside the control of the system were correlated with improved satisfaction, those which the system can change are more useful for their applied significance.

Satisfaction with the criminal justice system was more related to being treated with dignity and respect than demographics or case outcome. Individuals who received services and case information, and who felt their needs had been met and that their opinions were heard, were more satisfied with law enforcement. Additionally, having one's needs met and feeling that one had been heard were associated with the other outcome measures, including satisfaction with the entire criminal justice system overall. Thus, merely keeping the victim informed and making him or her feel that his/her voice is heard is likely to prevent secondary victimization and ensure that the individual feels like a vital part of the criminal justice process. As one volunteer with a victim assistance program stated when asked about the needs of victims, they need "to have their own victimization validated, to be treated with dignity and respect, to be listened to." While some police officers surveyed did mention these factors as associated with victim satisfaction, the most frequent reason listed was a quick response time, suggesting a need for further officer training regarding the needs of victims.
RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations are offered, based upon the results of this study, to improve services for victims of violence.

- **Outreach efforts by victim assistance programs to victims are worthwhile and should be expanded.** Victims who did not receive services were significantly more likely to have unmet needs compared to those who received services. Further, one-half of those with unmet needs were unaware that programs existed to assist them. Thus, it appears that victims are not receiving the services they are in need of and creative methods of providing information to them should be developed to ensure that they are aware of available assistance.

- **Follow-up contact may be critical in delivering services to individuals who may not realize they have needs until time passes.** The difference was computed between the number of lifestyle changes reported during the initial survey and those mentioned during the follow-up interview and compared based upon met versus unmet needs. Those who reported unmet needs early (i.e., on the initial survey) were less likely to report making more lifestyle changes six months later. However, those who reported unmet needs on the follow-up interview were more likely to experience more lifestyle changes as time passed. Thus, identification of needs should not only occur immediately following the incident, but also many months later. As one victim shared, “any information I received was in the beginning, when I was in shock, numb, and in a state of confusion. Two weeks later, I couldn’t remember who, what, where, etc.”

- **It is important to provide information and referrals, regardless if a need is expressed.** In addition, assessment of receptivity prior to making referrals is key to ensuring that the information will be useful. For respondents indicating that some of their needs remain unmet, one-half reported not knowing that services were available to help them. Perhaps immediately after a violent incident, while a victim is still in shock, the victim is not in the best state of mind to utilize offered resources. For example, respondents indicated that information and referrals were helpful when received after the incident, suggesting that information may be most helpful after the victim receives the emotional support required through existing social circles.

- **Information on referrals and services available to assist victims should also be provided to family and friends.** Family and friends may be able to provide immediate emotional support, but not equipped to meet all the long-term needs of victims. After the initial shock and emotional trauma of the violence dissipates slightly, friends and family can relay referral information to the victim, who could be in a more receptive state than immediately following the incident. In addition, since a majority of victims moved following the incident, which limits the ability of service providers to follow-up at a later time, providing referrals to family and friends increases the chance that victims will receive the information when they are more receptive.
• Utilization of services could be improved by developing methods to follow-up rather than relying on the victim to call a number on a referral list which may have been misplaced since originally provided. The majority of victim assistance program members reported that initial contact with victims was initiated by the victims themselves. Relying upon victim initiation is probably one of the largest contributors to service underutilization, since victims frequently do not know about the services available and are hesitant to seek help from strangers. Obtaining address and phone information from family and friends may provide an additional way to contact victims following the violence, given that the majority move within six months after the incident. The benefit of offering services, regardless of a request from the victim, is best illustrated through the words of an actual victim. Though this victim did not utilize the referrals received, a positive feeling resulted which could assist in the coping process following violence. “It was good to know that there was help out there and that San Diego wanted to help victims, like a town that takes care of its victims.”

• Program utilization could also be improved through law enforcement training regarding the availability and purposes of local victim assistance programs. Law enforcement officers are in a unique position to provide victims with immediate support and referrals to meet later needs. Police officers were cited by the victims surveyed as most frequently providing services, illustrating the important role they can play in serving as the bridge to additional support and informational networks outside the victim’s immediate circle of family and friends who may not be able to meet long-term needs. As one victim noted, “I was amazed and relieved that the police were as helpful and supportive as they were. I did not feel interrogated or disbelieved. Rather, I felt supported and respected.” However, a survey of officers revealed that many are not aware of the existence of many service providers and that those who are knowledgeable and appreciate the helpfulness of the services do not regularly refer victims.

• Training for law enforcement should be provided during the academy and “line-up” briefings. According to the service providers participating in this study, officers are provided information regarding their programs through training bulletins, advanced officer training programs, on the job, “line-up,” and the academy. The largest proportion of officers surveyed indicated that information regarding victim assistance programs was provided during “line up” and the academy, suggesting that these types of communication are the most memorable and that officer knowledge and use of these programs may be increased through more frequent “in person” communication.

• Formal service providers faced with limited resources should consider targeting their outreach efforts to those most in need. Recruitment of staff and volunteers should focus on sub-groups of the population most in need. Further, methods should be developed to match characteristics of programs staff and volunteers with clients to reduce the proportion of individuals in various sub-groups of the population with unmet needs. The following sub-groups of victims were associated with unmet needs, more lifestyle changes, and negative emotional reactions six months following the violent crime incident:
1. women
2. Hispanics
3. those in "other" ethnic groups
4. victims with lower socio-economic backgrounds
5. injured victims
6. those who felt their life was threatened during the victimization
7. victims of sexual assault
8. individuals experiencing repeated victimization
9. those victimized by a stranger
10. victims who received services prior to the crime incident (i.e., those with a history of prior problems or victimization).

- **Methods for improving coordination between victim assistance programs and the criminal justice system should be implemented.** Some suggestions provided by members of victim assistance programs include the following: dedicate more staff and resources in the criminal justice system to assisting victims, improve communication, increase knowledge among criminal justice staff regarding services available, clearly define roles, and increase concern shown to victims.

- **Victim service providers should ensure that their information is always up-to-date with those in the criminal justice system who may be in contact with victims in need (e.g., police, prosecutors, etc.).** As one victim noted, the resource list given had numbers that had changed and others which were difficult to access.

- **To reduce secondary victimization, improvements are needed in the response and sensitivity by the criminal justice system to the needs of victims.** Though almost two-thirds of the follow-up interview respondents were satisfied with law enforcement contacts, almost one-quarter were dissatisfied. Further, while over one-half reported being satisfied with the criminal justice system as a whole, 30 percent were not satisfied. The importance of the positive interactions between victims and the criminal justice system was clearly illustrated through study findings. Satisfaction with the police and the criminal justice system was significantly related to fewer lifestyle changes and emotional reactions or problems resulting from the violence. The need for sensitivity was clearly expressed by one victim when asked to describe the nature of contact with the criminal justice system. I "felt like just another number, not a person whose case they were working on." This victim also noted that little time and consideration were provided.

- **Sensitivity should be a continual focus for victim assistance programs.** As one victim sadly reported, when she needed someone to listen to her, she spoke to a few agencies and "some of them paid no attention and others answered in an angry way," leaving her depressed and angry.
• Considering victims’ opinions and providing case information throughout the criminal justice process are relatively easy ways to decrease secondary victimization and gain victim cooperation. According to the victims surveyed, case information was frequently provided. However, victims also noted that they were unaware of the status of their case. Further, the perception that one’s opinions had been heard was related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system, while the presence of unmet needs was associated with dissatisfaction. The following quotes from surveys completed by victims in this study illustrate the critical need for considering victims’ opinions and keeping them informed.

“Remaining in the dark just made me even more scared.”

“Every time I talked to someone regarding this case, they made me feel like it was my fault...”

“It seemed like my case was just thrown in a pile.”

“...no matter what I did, the suspect came out ahead.”

• Survivors and witnesses of violence should be treated as victims, with dignity and respect. Crime type was related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Survivors and witnesses of homicide were generally less satisfied, highlighting the importance of treating survivors and witnesses, as well as victims, with appropriate compassion and sensitivity regarding their opinions and needs.

• Future research should seek to determine why victims receiving assistance or services seem to be more affected by the violence than those not receiving aid. Based upon the findings from this study, receipt of services from formal service providers, as opposed to services through informal channels or no services at all, was significantly associated with lifestyle changes and negative reactions resulting from the crime incident. Individuals who continued to receive services six months after the incident appeared to be more impacted by the victimization. Further, individuals who received assistance were among those most likely to report the presence of unmet needs. The reasons for these findings are unknown. Receipt of assistance could lead to a stronger reaction to the violence through having one’s hopes falsely raised. Victims more likely to react to the crime could be more likely to receive assistance. The services could provide victims with the tools necessary to make changes and articulate reactions to the violence. Further research is needed to discover the true relationship between cause and effect.

CONCLUSION

The findings from this study suggest that improvements are still needed in the response of the criminal justice system and service providers to victims of violence, as the following input from victims solicited during this study indicates.
"The... police officers were callous. I was crying and... they were talking and not being sensitive to me. They talked about other subjects like their personal life. There was no consoling. I felt more victimized by that than by [the crime]...

"...The police just handed me a piece of paper with numbers and that wasn’t good enough. I didn’t know what the numbers were about or what they could do for me."

"I didn’t know anything and wondered everyday whether I was going to have to go to court...

"...Just because there are laws doesn’t mean I’m protected... victims not only go through the trauma of the incident but also the more drawn out trauma of having to fight for... legal rights of having someone punished for their crime..."

"...I felt the judge did not listen to what I had to say. I was timid and the suspect knew what he was doing so he had the advantage...

"...I would like to know if this guy is still running around town... Has he been arrested? Did he post bail? Is he in county jail? Could he still try to run me down?

"A letter or phone call at the end of the case to know if there was a conviction and the sentence. I would like to know the end result.

"Victims should be well informed on the progress of the case... They should at least inform [the] victim of arraignments and trial dates and an explanation [of] why the [prosecutor] is not prosecuting the case.

"I asked for help and none came... there was no one to talk to about the problems. No one spoke Spanish.

"...all I got were phone numbers... when someone just went through what I went through, the last thing [I] want to be doing is calling all these numbers and telling my story over and over.

"They gave me a page of telephone numbers and I called and they kept telling me to call other places...

"The victim/witness program gave me referrals to different agencies that I felt would help my children and myself. But these agencies never returned my calls.

"Someone might periodically call the telephone numbers in the resource list that is distributed. Some numbers had changed. Others were difficult to access. With one telephone number regarding a temporary restraining order, I stayed on the line for 45 minutes waiting for assistance..."
However, the efforts to be more sensitive by victim assistance programs and the criminal justice system to the needs of victims have been appreciated, as the following quotes from victims illustrate.

“I was amazed and relieved that the police were as helpful and supportive as they were. I did not feel interrogated or disbelieved; rather, I felt supported and respected. I felt that the officers that took the initial report at the police station were wonderful in how they treated me. Both male officers said to me that I was doing the right thing in reporting the rape. I expected an awful, painful experience, but the opposite occurred. I am very grateful for their help.”

The most helpful thing was the “attitude of concern and sympathy on the part of the policewoman who interviewed me at the time of the incident and the opportunity to explain my views and opinions about the assailant and what sentencing I would recommend to the probation officer…”

“The detective was supportive. He followed-up, returned my calls. He tried to help me as a person. He cared.”

“The D.A.’s Office was helpful... considered my feelings and giving me advice.”

“...The system gave me phone numbers, [information about] how to get a restraining order, how to protect myself and my children, hotline numbers, and shelters. I knew I would be okay.”

“...now I have the information and the numbers to call and places to go before I get in that situation again... Before, I wasn’t aware of the numbers I could call or the shelters I could go [to], or my rights!”

“The crisis lines are a good idea. If I didn’t have the information available, I wouldn’t have known what to do... The victims’ assistance was helpful. They referred me to psychological counseling and to other services.”

“...I keep [this list of referrals] in my purse like a photo to remind me.”

“...I thought it was great that there were so many programs out there for victims. I knew I wouldn’t be alone. I felt everyone really cared, was concerned.”

Hopefully, previously discussed findings and recommendations of this research project will be helpful as the criminal justice system and service providers seek to improve the response to victims of violence.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

PROBLEM STATEMENT

According to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), an annual survey of American households, individuals 12 and over experienced a total of 39.6 million victimizations in 1995. Of these, 9.9 million were violent victimizations and 29.3 million were non-violent, personal or property crimes (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1996). Such statistics suggest that the average American is more likely to become a victim of a violent crime during his or her lifetime than to become involved in an automobile accident (Lurgio and Resick, 1990).

Because victimization steals one's sense of personal control, victimization can produce psychological repercussions that enhance one's fear and sense of vulnerability, alter attitudes about the environment, and transform behavior (Elias, 1986). Crime victims are often dissatisfied and resentful of the criminal justice system, plagued by feelings of shame and guilt, and transfer a sense of disorder, powerlessness and fear to other areas in their life (McLeod, 1987). However, as Steinmetz (1984) has pointed out, not all victims cope with crime equally, with some seriously affected and others recovering from the trauma relatively quickly. A better understanding of why individuals react differently to violent victimization was the primary goal of this project. Funded by the National Institute of Justice, the Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments conducted mailed surveys with violent crime victims to assess their needs, document the services available to them, determine service utilization by victim subgroups, examine coping ability, and discover factors related to victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system. This report presents the results from this assessment of the needs of those victimized by violence, particularly as impacted by services received. Before discussing the research findings, the historical development of victims assistance programs is briefly outlined to provide a context for interpretation of the data.

HISTORY OF THE VICTIMS MOVEMENT

According to Elias (1986), victim retaliation was the earliest form of social control, from tribal systems of retribution, to the Code of Hammurabi, and across cultures as diverse as the Greeks, early Hebrews, Indian Hindus, and the Turkish Empire. During the Middle Ages, resolving offenses by compensation became a formalized process, but continuing through the colonial period, the victim continued to make key decisions and receive direct benefits from the offender. Eventually, however, societies came to view crime as an offense against the state, rather than the victim, and restitution was abandoned by the early 1800s (McDonald, 1976). At this time, new institutions, including the "work-house" and the "correctional asylum," were created as places to reform the criminal. As a practical matter, this movement essentially broke any link between the victim and the offender.
In the United States, attention was returned back to the ways victims were treated by the criminal justice system in 1931 when the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement noted the importance of victims as witnesses for the criminal justice system and the factors necessary to encourage their participation (McDonald, 1976). Internationally, the field of victimology traces back to 1937, when Benjamin Mendelsohn coined the term and began gathering information about victims for his law firm (Elias, 1986). In 1938, the American Bar Association reported that "witness fees were deplorably low, courthouse accommodations were inadequate and uncomfortable, witnesses were being intimidated, and frequently witnesses were summoned to court numerous times only to wait around all day and eventually be informed that the case was continued again or dismissed" (p. 29; McDonald, 1976). In 1951, Margery Fry, a social reformer, published a widely-read and influential book in which she argued that victims of crime should be compensated by the state because the government has a duty to protect its citizens and that, when they are harmed, they deserved to be compensated. The first victim compensation program was established in New Zealand in 1963 and was followed one year later by programs in Great Britain and California. In 1973, the first international conference on victimology was held in Jerusalem.

In the 1970s, concern for crime victims continued to grow, due in part to the development of National Crime Surveys, the feminist movement, the fact that a greater number of people were affected by crime in the 1960s, and the implementation of compensation programs (McCormack, 1993). In 1974, the National District Attorney's Association, with aid of a one million dollar grant from the Department of Justice, created the Commission on Victim-Witness Assistance (Lynch, 1976). With the goals of conducting research, piloting assistance programs, and creating Victim-Witness Research Centers, this was the only program at the time operating on a nationwide basis. By 1979, more than 400 federally-funded units had been organized in district attorney's offices around the nation (Blomberg, Waldo, and Bullock, 1989).

According to Maguire (1992), while a great deal was accomplished by voluntary groups and government agencies during the 1970s, the majority of voluntary initiatives suffered from limited funding, limited official support or encouragement, and limited public awareness. During the 1980s, by contrast, victim issues had become much more prominent in the criminal justice policy agenda, "attracting more effective agency initiatives, new legislation, greater financial support for service programs, and continuing attention from the media and academic world" (p. 367; Maguire, 1992). According to Greenberg and Ruback (1992), the fact that a number of U.S. Supreme Court decisions were made which were perceived as benefiting the accused rather than the victim may have contributed to this trend.

In particular, the victims movement gained further momentum at the federal level. In 1981, then-President Reagan proclaimed Annual National Victims of Crime Week to focus attention on the problems of victims. In 1982, the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime was implemented and the Omnibus Victim and Witness Protection Act was passed, which required the use of victim impact statements at sentencing in federal criminal cases, greater protection of federal victims and witnesses from intimidation by defendants or their associates, restitution by offenders to victims of federal crime, guidelines for the fair treatment of victims and witnesses in federal crime cases, and more stringent bail laws (Davis, 1987a). In California, in the same
year, voters enacted Proposition 8, called the Victims' Bill of Rights, which included the provision that the victim or the victim's surviving kin would be permitted to address the court before any felony sentencing occurred (Villmoare and Neto, 1987). In 1983, the Department of Justice created the Office for Victims of Crime to serve as the federal focal point for victims' issues and to promote improved treatment of victims of crime. In 1984, the Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence presented 63 recommendations for combating violence within the family and aiding its victims, and the United State Congress passed the first major piece of crime victim legislation, the Victim of Crime Act (VOCA), which created the Crime Victims Fund, using money obtained from convicted federal defendants to induce states to establish victim compensation programs and to adopt comparable basic services such as victim outreach services. The Act was amended and improved in 1986 and 1988, and was funded through 1994 at $150 million per year.

Efforts to meet the needs of victims continue to grow. According to statistics, by 1988, there were approximately 5,000 separate victim assistance programs and over 5,000 separate pieces of legislation passed by local or federal governments that gave more rights to victims nationwide (Maguire, 1992), and one-third of police departments in a 1988 National Institute of Justice survey reported having a victims' assistance program (Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, 1991). By 1992, every state had enacted crime victim compensation programs entitling victims to financial compensation (Parent, Auerback, and Carlson, 1992) and, in California, the Victims of Crime Fund paid out 91.7 million dollars in fiscal year 1992 to victims in need (Cantalupe, 1994).

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

According to Skogan, Lurgio, and Davis (1990), although many victim programs are built upon research, knowledge regarding the effects of criminal victimization and victim service programs is limited. Specifically, much of the research on the psychological consequences of crime has been restricted largely to victims of rape, and there has been a failure to measure concepts adequately or to include multiple impact variables. Further, while the majority of published research in the victims area has been of immense political value to the victims movement, the empirical basis for many conclusions is relatively thin and has been conducted by people strongly committed to this ideology, possibly leading to a lack of objectivity (Maguire, 1992).

This study seeks to fill some of the gaps in the research literature by focusing on a wider range of violence (i.e., homicide, rape, and assault). Though the project has been grounded in prior research and was conducted under the advisement of local experts in the field, the methods used were designed to allow victims to speak for themselves through mailed surveys and telephone interviews. Specifically, this research project sought to identify the needs of violent crime victims, determine the match between needs and services received, and isolate the factors predicting coping ability and service utilization. The research findings outlined in this report provide valuable data for criminal justice and victims service providers as they seek to reach and be responsive to victims in need.
ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Before discussing research findings, the methodology for the research project is outlined in Chapter 2. To provide a foundation for interpreting study results, Chapter 3 describes the services available to violent crime victims in the San Diego region, including an assessment of the match to victim needs. The sample of victims surveyed for the study is described in Chapter 4. Specifically, data regarding response rates, demographic characteristics, and self-reported information regarding the crime incident are presented. In Chapter 5, reactions to victimization are examined, including an analysis of the relationship between coping ability and characteristics of the crime, victim needs and assistance received, and interactions with the criminal justice system. Chapter 6 discusses the nature and helpfulness of the assistance and services victims received and examines which factors are associated with the receipt of services by victims. Factors facilitating and impeding service delivery, potential reasons for underutilization of services by victims, and the availability of social support through informal channels are included in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 examines victim involvement with the criminal justice system, including case outcome, victim satisfaction, and correlates of satisfaction and involvement. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are discussed in Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 2
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INTRODUCTION

The original research design for this project intended to compare various methods for providing services to victims of violent crime, based upon three program models: a crisis intervention program operated by law enforcement that dispatches volunteers to crime scenes to provide support, advocacy, and referrals (San Diego Crisis Intervention Team); a community-based crisis team that responds to crime scenes and assists victims throughout the criminal justice process (EYE Crisis and Advocacy Team); and the traditional law enforcement model of referral by officers at the time of the incident.

However, due to the fact that an extremely small percentage of victims who responded to the initial survey were assisted through the first two models, the focus of the evaluation changed. Specifically, while a number of research objectives were still feasible, some of the original questions of interest could no longer be answered and some new ones were added. The current chapter includes a review of the original and revised research objectives, as well as a summary of the data collection procedures and elements and relevant statistical procedures.

ORIGINAL RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research objectives outlined in the original proposal included:

I. assessing the needs of violent crime victims

II. documenting the services available to violent crime victims in the San Diego region

III. determining the effectiveness of the three intervention models for ensuring service delivery to violent crime victims

IV. assessing the level of utilization of services by different subgroups by crime type and victim characteristics

V. evaluating the impact of early intervention on victim and witness involvement in the criminal justice system and case outcome

VI. recommending improvements in the delivery of services to victims, and identifying issues for future research.
To fulfill the third and fifth research objectives, 100 victims who received assistance from the San Diego Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) and 100 assisted by the EYE were going to be compared on a number of outcome measures with 200 matched individuals who did not receive crisis assistance. During the beginning of the project, the possibility of sampling directly from CIT and EYE files was explored to ensure that the individuals responding to the survey would have received CIT or EYE services. Issues of confidentiality precluded this method of sample selection. In the alternative, all cases potentially receiving services were sent surveys in the hope that victims receiving services would reply in sufficient numbers. Unfortunately, however, only 18 of the 718 victims who returned the initial survey were assisted by one of these two programs (nine by the CIT, nine by the EYE). Thus, the planned analyses were no longer appropriate and changes were made in the research objectives.

REVISED RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Objectives

The following four objectives remained feasible, despite the fact that very few members of the initial sample received crisis intervention:

I. assessing the needs of violent crime victims

II. documenting the services available to violent crime victims in the San Diego region

III. assessing the level of utilization of services by different subgroups by crime type and victim characteristics

IV. recommending improvements in the delivery of services to victims and identifying issues for future research.

In addition, the following objectives were added:

V. determining how individuals cope with victimization and how coping ability varies as a function of victim and crime characteristics

VI. documenting which factors are related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system

Data Collection Procedures

A number of different methodologies were used to answer the questions addressed in this study.

Literature Review. The literature on victim needs, victim services, and evaluations of victim assistance programs was reviewed in the initial stages of the research to identify key issues to be addressed in surveys, interviews, and data collection forms. Topical searches were continued throughout the project and a summary of relevant literature is included throughout the report to place the current research findings within the context of other work in the field.
Ride-Alongs and Program Meetings. Ride-alongs were conducted with interventionists and police in the areas served by the CIT and EYE to gain a better understanding of the different service delivery models, and to obtain information useful in developing data collection forms, surveys, and interviews. In addition, researchers attended crisis intervention staff meetings and training sessions to achieve similar objectives. Because of the necessary change in the study's focus, detailed comparisons of program strategies and changes in program implementation during the study period have not been done, as originally planned.

Panel of Local Experts. A panel of 13 local experts was formed at the beginning of the project, which included representatives from law enforcement, victim groups, and other service providers. The role of this advisory committee included assisting throughout the research by identifying key issues and sharing their insight.

CIT, EYE, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program Surveys. Thirty-nine members of the CIT, 17 members of the EYE, and 21 participants in the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program were surveyed in 1993. Questions were asked regarding the purposes of the programs, the needs of victims, referrals and services provided to victims, training received, method of outreach, level of coordination with other agencies, the duplication of services, and suggestions for improving service delivery. In addition, respondents also provided information about their backgrounds, reasons for their involvement, perception of program use, quality of training, and satisfaction with the program. Due to a large staff and volunteer turnover at the EYE, a modified version of this survey was administered to 39 CIT members and 18 EYE members in 1994. When identical questions were asked, data from the most recent administration of the instrument are provided. Since no direct comparisons to the CIT or EYE programs were intended, the members of the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program were only surveyed once. A copy of the original survey is provided in Appendix H.

The assessment of these survey results is qualitative in nature and has been primarily used in Chapter 3 to provide information regarding the variety of services available to victims in the San Diego region. In addition, more detailed information regarding the CIT, EYE, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program is provided in Appendix B.

Initial Victims' Survey. Surveys were sent to all violent crime victims over the age of 16 in the San Diego region for a four-month period (July to October 1993). In addition, homicide survivors and witnesses in the City of San Diego were also contacted. These surveys were mailed four-weeks after the incident and were accompanied by a cover letter from the District Attorney which explained the purpose of the survey and assured the victim or witness that their input was voluntary, confidential, and anonymous. The instrument was double-sided, with an English version on the front, and a Spanish version on the back. Follow-up mailings were sent two weeks after the initial mailing to increase response rates. Additional information regarding the sample of individuals who returned this survey is provided in Chapter 4.
Respondents were asked questions regarding their demographic characteristics, the crime incident, their satisfaction with the police and detectives involved with the case, assistance and services they received related to the crime, the existence of unmet needs, lifestyle changes, emotional reactions, the most helpful person/service in dealing with the incident, and their prior history of victimization. The survey was developed using questions that had been tested in prior research and original questions focusing on the research objectives. This approach ensured that critical issues were included, that questions had validity based upon prior research, and that findings could be compared to previous work. Analysis of the responses is provided throughout the report, including statistical tests to determine which factors are related to receiving services and coping ability. A copy of the survey instrument is available in Appendix E.

**Follow-Up Victims' Interview.** A page at the end of the initial survey asked respondents for their permission to be contacted again in the future, either over the phone or through the mail, to provide more input regarding the effects of victimization. Of the 718 victims who returned the initial survey, 330 were recontacted six months later and were either interviewed by phone or surveyed through the mail. Characteristics of this follow-up sample are provided in Chapter 4.

As with the initial survey, the interview included both tested and original questions. Also, some items from the initial survey were repeated to measure changes in needs, attitudes, coping behavior, and services received. Statistical tests were used to assess changes in these variables over time and examine satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Specific questions were asked regarding case outcome, and victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system was explored more fully (compared to the initial survey), with questions directly relating to different members of the system (i.e., police, deputy district attorneys, judge), as well as the system as a whole. In addition, questions were included regarding services received, unmet needs, and social support provided through family and friends. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix F.

**Review of Police and Court Files.** Police and court case files were reviewed six months after the incident occurred for each initial sample case to determine characteristics of victims and suspects, circumstances of the incidents, initial custody status of suspects, involvement of victims and witnesses at hearings, and case outcomes, including dispositions and sentences. Data were collected from original arrest reports, jail booking screens, District Attorney and court computer screens, and court dockets which document witness appearances. A copy of the case tracking form is provided in Appendix G.

**Service Provider Surveys.** Surveys were mailed to 53 referral agencies used by police and interventionists to measure the level of satisfaction with referral procedures, coordination among agencies, extent of duplication of services, types of services provided to victims, and suggestions for improving service delivery models. Twenty-nine surveys were returned, for a response rate of 58 percent. The information collected from these surveys, which is presented in Chapter 3, has been primarily used to determine the variety of services available to victims in the San Diego region. A copy of this survey instrument is provided in Appendix I.
Law Enforcement Surveys. Law enforcement officers in the three agencies served by CIT and EYE programs (Escondido, San Diego, and Vista Sheriff’s station) were surveyed at line-up to determine familiarity with intervention programs, how they learned about the program in their department, the extent to which officers use intervention services (frequency, types of calls), appropriate circumstances for calling or not calling in interventionists, opinions regarding the program, their interactions with interventionists at crime scenes, and suggestions for improving the delivery of services to victims.

Overall, 1,090 surveys were distributed. The overall response rate was 49 percent, with a total of 529 returned. By agency, the response rate varied considerably, however, with 45 percent of San Diego police surveys returned (447), 95 percent of Escondido police (71), and 73 percent of Vista Sheriff’s deputies (11). A copy of this survey is provided in Appendix J.

SUMMARY

The original objectives for the current study were modified due to the fact that a small percentage of individuals received assistance from two of the three service delivery models initially intended for evaluation.

The goals of the revised research design include assessing the needs of violent crime victims, documenting services available to victims, assessing the level of utilization by different subgroups of the population, determining ability to cope with victimization, and documenting factors related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system. To fulfill these objectives, a number of different methodologies were used, including surveys (to service providers, program staff, law enforcement officers, and victims), telephone interviews with victims six months following the incident, literature reviews, ride-alongs and program meeting attendance, and tracking cases through the criminal justice system.
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INTRODUCTION

According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance (1985), the goal of every community should be the development of a comprehensive system of services for victims of crime. The establishment of services can only be comprehensive if they are designed with knowledge of victims' needs. To expand upon the literature regarding the needs of violent crime victims, victims and service providers were solicited for input. This chapter examines the needs discovered and compares them with the services available to crime victims in the San Diego region.

To determine the match between services available and needs, members of the San Diego Crisis Intervention Team (CIT), EYE Crisis and Advocacy Team, the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, and 29 other programs (see Appendix A for a comprehensive list of these 29 service providers) were contacted and asked to complete a written survey which included questions regarding the goals of their agency, services available through their agency, and perceptions regarding the needs of crime victims, as well as how well these needs are met. Immediately after victimization, the CIT offers crisis assistance to individuals in the City of San Diego. In North County, the EYE offers crisis assistance, as well as additional services to meet the ongoing needs of victims. The DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program contacts all violent crime victims in the San Diego region after the original incident.

The CIT and the EYE were surveyed twice during 1993 and 1994. The latter survey included a subset of the questions asked on the original version and was conducted because of large staff and volunteer turnover at the EYE around the time of the first survey. When identical questions were included on both surveys, data are presented from the most recent set of responses. More detailed program characteristics for the CIT, EYE, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, as well as other local agencies providing assistance to victims, are available in Appendix B.

TARGET POPULATION

When asked to specify their target population (a closed-ended question), respondents unanimously agreed that violent crime victims are included (Table 3.1). Thus, according to the organizations surveyed, the sample of victims chosen for this study is targeted for services. In addition, witnesses to violent crimes, victims of other crimes, accident victims, and natural death survivors were specified as members of the target population. Other groups targeted by these programs, as reported by staff and volunteers, included suicide survivors, accident witnesses, witnesses to other crimes, hostage victims, and others involved in the hostage situation.
Table 3.1

POPBULATION SERVED
Victim Assistance Program Staff and Volunteer Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Victims</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnesses to Violent Crimes</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Other Crimes</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Victims</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Death Survivors</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Survivors</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Witnesses</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnesses to Other Crimes</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostage Victims</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Involved in Hostage Situations</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 103

NOTE: “Don't know” and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

PROGRAM GOALS

Staff and volunteers in CIT, EYE, DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, and other programs available to victims in the San Diego region were asked a question regarding the goals of their program. As Table 3.2 shows, the most frequently cited responses were the provision of crisis assistance, referrals and information, and emotional support. Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer (1990) have suggested that crisis intervention may play its most valuable role as a link between the victim and on-going support services in the community. These results are impacted by the large number of respondents working in the CIT and EYE programs (57) who respond to the crime scene and are primarily concerned with meeting the needs of victims through one-time contact and linking victims to support services by providing referral information.

Other goals included counseling, assisting the police, giving explanations of police procedures, and providing advocacy. In addition, assistance with the court process was mentioned by one-quarter of the respondents.
Table 3.2

PROGRAM GOALS
Victim Assistance Program Staff and Volunteer Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Assistance</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals and Information</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist Police</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Police Procedures</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with Court Process</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assistance</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Groups</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Necessities</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Assistance</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 104

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

SERVICES AND REFERRALS PROVIDED TO VICTIMS

In addition to describing program goals, respondents were also asked to specify services directly provided by their agency based upon a list predetermined by the advisory committee for this research project, and the services provided through referrals. Respondents could state that their agency provides a given service themselves, that a referral is given, that both are true, or that neither is true.
Consistent with the goals previously discussed, a variety of services are provided to victims in the San Diego region. Over one-half of the respondents indicated that they provide crisis intervention (55%). In addition, approximately one in four also reported that they assist victims with the court process (e.g., court accompaniment), act as advocates for victims, and provide emergency shelter, basic necessities (e.g., food and clothing), and education. Approximately one-third of the respondents indicated that follow-up counseling, hotline information, and psychological services are available through their program. One-quarter or less stated that other services were provided, including claims assistance, child care, referrals, drug/alcohol treatment, counseling, funeral/burial services, support groups, financial assistance, medical assistance, conflict resolution, explanation of police procedures, other services, translation services, explanation of medical procedures, case information, transportation, public awareness, and job assistance.

With respect to referrals to other agencies for services, the most frequent responses included referrals for alcohol and other drug treatment (80%), psychological services (79%), financial assistance (77%), medical assistance (74%), basic necessities (72%), and emergency shelter (70%).

**CONSISTENCY BETWEEN SERVICES PROVIDED TO VICTIMS WITH NEEDS**

Volunteers and staff in local victim service programs were also asked to specify the needs of violent crime victims. Based upon the six categories with the highest proportion of respondents, the needs of victims are fairly consistent with the services directly provided by the respondents and other organizations through referrals. Specifically, the need for assistance with the court process, advocacy, emergency shelter, psychological services, financial help, and medical assistance were frequently mentioned as needs for victims and either provided directly by the service providers surveyed or through referrals. However, there were a few types of services provided by the respondents, even though a low proportion believed that the assistance was needed by victims. Crisis intervention (e.g., immediate, one-time counseling and support, in contrast to follow-up counseling and psychological services), basic necessities (e.g., food and clothing), education, and drug/alcohol treatment are provided through the programs surveyed or through referrals, though few noted that these were needs for victims. In addition, counseling was one of the top six needs listed for victims, but it did not fall within the top six for services provided or referrals.
Table 3.3

CONSISTENCY BETWEEN SERVICES PROVIDED AND VICTIMS' NEEDS
Victim Assistance Program Staff and Volunteer Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Referrals Made</th>
<th>Needs Perceived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Scene Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with Court Process</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Necessities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Counseling</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline Information</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Services</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims Assistance</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alcohol Treatment</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral/Burial Services</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Groups</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Police Procedures</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Medical Procedures</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Assistance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 102 96 76

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
The Experiences of Victims

Another measure of the consistency between the services provided by local victim assistance programs and those actually received by victims is based upon responses from victims when asked to specify the services received both on the initial survey completed within one month of the incident and through the follow-up interview administered about six months following the crime. Both the initial survey and follow-up interview listed the services available to victims and asked respondents to specify the ones received. These findings will be discussed further in Chapter 6, which focuses on the use of formal assistance and services by victims.

Table 3.4
SERVICES RECEIVED
Initial Victims’ Survey and Follow-Up Victims’ Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Initial Survey</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanations From Police</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 323

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses. Only the top responses are shown.

Many victims either did not remember receiving any services or could not conceptualize and articulate services received. Approximately one-half of those responding to the initial survey and over one-third of those interviewed six months following the incident reported no service receipt (not shown). As Table 3.4 shows, of those reporting receipt of assistance, the most frequently mentioned types of services received included explanation of police procedures, referrals, and case information. The smaller proportion of victims, during the follow-up interview, reporting no services received is understandable because many received case information which becomes more available as the case progresses. None of these services were among the top items mentioned by staff and volunteers in victim assistance programs as needs for victims. However, several victims mentioned specific programs that were helpful, and the following quotes illustrate.
"The CIT [Crisis Intervention Team]... [provided] emotional help... they had gone through this with other ones. [They] let you know you'll be okay, you are loved, and not the only one. They were great support."

"[The EYE]... made me less uncomfortable in court and during the rape exam."

"I was panicked and frightened and concerned about my health and the women [on the crisis line] were helpful, helped me to take action and to get help."

The DA's Victim-Witness program was helpful. "... I had someone I could turn to... They also listed resources to go to..."

To examine the match between needs and services provided further, victims were asked to specify any services needed though not received. The same list of services used in the question regarding services received was used. Volunteers and staff in victim assistance programs were also asked to note any unmet needs remaining for victims based upon current services available in the San Diego region. The top five responses are highlighted in Table 3.5. Volunteers and staff correctly noted that more financial assistance and help with the court process (e.g., court accompaniment) are needed. However, victims were more interested in counseling, explanation of police procedures, and case information than advocacy or basic necessities (e.g., food and clothing). To probe further into reasons why needed services were not received, victims were asked on the follow-up interview if they know that these services were available. One-half of the respondents were unaware of the programs available (not shown).
Table 3.5
SERVICES NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED
Victim Assistance Program Staff and Volunteer Survey,
Initial Victims’ Survey, and Follow-Up Victims’ Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Staff/ Volunteer Sample</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample Initial Survey</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample Follow-Up Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy with Outside Agencies</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with Court Proceedings</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Necessities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Groups</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations From Police</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESPONDENTS** 29 134 125

*NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses. Only the top responses are shown.*

On the initial survey, many victims noted family, friends, neighbors, and themselves as more helpful than anyone else (Table 3.6). The ability of victim assistance programs to reach victims and augment previously existing social support systems is challenging. One opportunity worth utilizing more fully is through law enforcement. Almost one-half of respondents to the follow-up interview mentioned that the police were the most helpful individuals. By making contact with victims through law enforcement, perhaps the proportion of needy victims served by victim assistance programs can increase. The CIT, EYE, and District Attorney’s Victim/Witness programs initially interact with victims due to a police referral. Follow-up through police may be another way to ensure that referrals to a variety of victim assistance programs are appropriate to the specific needs of the victim, understood, and not forgotten over time. Further, a focus on obtaining emotional support for victims may increase service utilization. Approximately one in four of the follow-up interview respondents indicated that receiving emotional support was more helpful than anything else (Table 3.7).
### Table 3.6

**WHO MOST HELPFUL**

*Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview*

*Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993 and 1994*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Survey</td>
<td>Follow-Up Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Neighbors</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/Own Actions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer/Detective</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESPONDENTS** 191 271

*NOTE:* "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses. Only the top responses are shown.

### Table 3.7

**REASONS FOR HELPFULNESS MORE THAN ONE MONTH AFTER INCIDENT**

*Follow-Up Victims' Interview*

*Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Referrals</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful/Needed Service</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESPONDENTS** 77

*NOTE:* "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses. Only the top responses are shown.
SUMMARY

During 1993 and 1994, members of two crisis assistance programs, the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, and 29 additional service providers in the San Diego region were surveyed. In addition, surveys approximately one month following an incident of violence and follow-up interviews six months later with victims included questions regarding services received and unmet needs remaining. The results from these surveys and interviews were analyzed to determine the match between the needs of violent crime victims and services available.

According to staff and volunteers in victim assistance programs, victims of violence are targeted for services, as well as witnesses to violent crimes, victims of other crimes, accident victims, and natural death survivors.

The goals of these programs include crisis assistance, provision of referrals, and emotional support. The specific services provided are consistent with these goals (e.g., crisis intervention).

The consistency between these services and the needs of victims was explored by comparing survey responses by members of victim assistance programs with input received from victims through surveys administered within one month of the incident and follow-up interviews.

The majority of victims either did not remember receiving any services or could not conceptualize and articulate services received. Those who did specify receiving assistance most frequently noted explanation of police procedures, referrals, and case information as the services provided. None of these services were among the top items mentioned by victim assistance program staff/volunteers.

When asked to specify needs not met by existing programs, staff and volunteers accurately mentioned the need for more financial assistance and help with the court process (e.g., court accompaniment). However, victims were more interested in counseling, explanation of police procedures, and case information than advocacy or provision of food and clothing, as listed by service providers. One-half of the victims participating in the follow-up interview did not know that the services were available to meet their needs.

Examination of the responses of victims, when asked what was most helpful and why, suggests ways to improve service utilization by victims of violence. Police officers were mentioned as most helpful by more victims during the follow-up interview than anyone else. Family and friends were the next most frequently mentioned people as helpful, followed by no one other than self. Using law enforcement as the referral point may be a way to increase service utilization by victims in need of assistance.

Finally, emotional support received was the most frequently listed reason for why someone was helpful. Focusing services on emotional needs may be another way to increase utilization.
CHAPTER 4
SAMPLE DESCRIPTION
SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

The sample of crime victims for this study was selected from July through October 1993. The Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) was used as the source of cases. ARJIS is a countywide computer database containing information on violent crimes reported to law enforcement. The samples were selected based upon the population served by the two primary programs under evaluation. The San Diego Police Department Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) serves sexual assault, domestic violence, and other assault victims within the City of San Diego, as well as homicide survivors. The Crisis Team in North County, operated by the EYE Counseling and Crisis Services (the EYE), provides services to victims of sexual assault in Escondido, San Marcos, and Vista, and domestic violence victims in Escondido. Names and addresses of victims of sexual assault (in Escondido, San Diego, San Marcos, and Vista), domestic violence (in Escondido and San Diego), and non-domestic assault (in San Diego) were obtained through weekly inquiries from ARJIS. Due to extreme data entry delays in homicide cases, similar information for witnesses and survivors of homicide were collected directly from homicide detectives at the San Diego Police Department.

During July through October 1993, 3,131 individuals, over the age of 16, were victims of a sexual assault, assault, or domestic violence reported to the police in the cities of San Diego and Escondido. An additional 64 people were homicide survivors or witnesses in San Diego, and seven were sexual assault victims in the cities of San Marcos and Vista.

These individuals were mailed surveys, accompanied by a letter from the San Diego County District Attorney, four weeks after their victimization occurred. The cover letter asked for their voluntary, anonymous, and confidential participation in a study regarding the needs of crime victims. Two weeks later, a reminder survey was sent in an effort to increase the response rate. To ensure a diverse sample, surveys included an English version of the questions on one side, and a Spanish version on the reverse. Individuals were included in the sample only once, regardless of the number of times they reported victimizations to the police during the four-month sampling period. Appendix C provides a list and description of the California Penal Codes used to categorize members of the initial sample into one of the four crime categories. This chapter describes the response rate and characteristics of the victims participating in the study.
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND RESPONSE RATES

Seven-hundred eighteen (718) or 22 percent of these victims returned completed surveys. A question on this initial survey asked respondents for their permission to be contacted again to answer more questions regarding their victimization. Of those individuals who agreed to be contacted, 330 were actually interviewed over the phone or completed a written follow-up survey, in either English or Spanish. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 offer comparisons of those individuals who were sent surveys, those who returned the initial survey, and those who were contacted six months later for follow-up. These data suggest that the type of crime, as well as a victim's ethnicity, may have had some effect on survey response rates.

Table 4.1 presents statistics regarding the characteristics of all victims sent surveys, those who completed an initial survey (referred to as the initial sample), and those members of the initial sample who completed a follow-up interview or survey (referred to as the follow-up sample). Specifically, the proportion of each sample by crime type (i.e., homicide, sexual assault, assault, or domestic violence), gender, and ethnicity (i.e., Black, Asian, White, Hispanic, or “other”), as well as the mean age for each sample, is shown. Table 4.2 presents the total number of initial surveys sent to victims by crime type, gender, and ethnicity, as well as the response rates for the initial and follow-up sample by the same categorizations.

Of the 3,202 individuals sent surveys, two percent (64) were homicide survivors or witnesses, three percent (88) were sexual assault victims, 23 percent (740) were non-domestic related assault victims, and 72 percent (2,310) were domestic violence victims (Tables 4.1 and 4.2). While the overall response rate for the initial survey was 22 percent, homicide survivors and witnesses and sexual assault victims were most likely to return the initial survey (Table 4.2). Forty-two percent (42%) of homicide survivors and witnesses returned surveys, representing four percent (27) of the initial survey sample, and 43 percent of sexual assault victims returned surveys, representing five percent (38) of the initial survey sample. The initial survey was returned by 206 assault victims, which represented a 28 percent response rate, and 29 percent of the initial survey sample. Domestic violence victims were least likely to return a survey. Only 447, or 19 percent, of domestic violence victims returned surveys. This finding is most likely attributed to the fact that the suspect may be living with the victim, preventing study participation through intimidation or fear. Nevertheless, due to the large numbers of domestic violence victims sent surveys, this subsample represented 62 percent of the initial survey sample.

Slightly less than one-half (46%) of the initial sample were successfully contacted six months later. Again, homicide survivors and sexual assault and assault victims had higher response rates compared to domestic violence victims. At six months, 52 percent (14) of homicide survivors, 53 percent (20) of sexual assault victims, and 53 percent (110) of assault victims who returned initial surveys were recontacted, while only 42 percent (186) of domestic violence victims were reached for follow-up interviews. Overall, homicide survivors represented four percent, sexual assault victims six percent, assault victims 33 percent, and domestic violence victims 56 percent of the follow-up interview sample (Table 4.1). Despite differential response rates by crime type, the range for the follow-up interviews was smaller. The range was from 42 percent to 53 percent, compared to a response rate of 19 percent to 43 percent for the initial
surveys. Based upon the smaller variation in response rates at follow-up, bias in the responses may have been minimized. This issue will be discussed further as study findings are presented.

Both male and female victims were equally likely to respond to the initial survey. Males represented 29 percent of the victims or witnesses sent initial surveys, 28 percent of those returning initial surveys (22% response rate), and 29 percent (48% response rate) of those completing follow-up interviews. Females represented 71 percent of victims or witnesses sent initial surveys, 72 percent of those returning initial surveys (23% response rate) and 71 percent (45% response rate) of those completing follow-up interviews. Therefore, the responses should not be biased by gender.

### Table 4.1

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY SAMPLE**

**Original Crime Report Information**

**Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Victims</th>
<th>Sent Surveys</th>
<th>Initial Sample</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2

**RESPONSE RATES BY SAMPLE**  
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Surveys Sent</th>
<th>Initial Sample</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42% (27)</td>
<td>52% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43% (38)</td>
<td>53% (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>28% (206)</td>
<td>53% (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>19% (447)</td>
<td>42% (186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>22% (204)</td>
<td>48% (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>23% (514)</td>
<td>45% (233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>16% (130)</td>
<td>39% (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>22% (34)</td>
<td>44% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>29% (361)</td>
<td>49% (177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>20% (177)</td>
<td>46% (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24% (16)</td>
<td>38% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Number in parentheses represents the actual number of individuals.*

White individuals represented the greatest percentage of crime victims and witnesses sent surveys (40%), and also had the highest response rate for both the initial survey (29%) and the follow-up interview (49%). White victims represented 50 percent of the initial survey sample and 54 percent of the follow-up interview sample (Table 4.1). Of the four primary ethnic categories, victims classified as Black had the lowest response rate for the initial survey (16%) (Table 4.2). These individuals represented 25 percent of all victims sent surveys, 18 percent of those returning the initial survey, and 15 percent of those completing a follow-up interview (Table 4.1). As Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show, Hispanic victims represented 28 percent of the original sample, and 25 percent of the initial survey and follow-up interview samples; Asian victims, five percent of each sample; and members of "other" ethnicities, two percent of each sample. Response rates by ethnicity ranged from 16 percent to 29 percent for the initial survey and from 38 percent to 49 percent for the follow-up interviews. These relatively small ranges indicate that the samples are fairly represented by ethnicity.
For both the initial survey and the follow-up interview, 88 percent were completed in English, and 12 percent in Spanish (not shown). The average age of victims in the original sample was 30, for the initial survey sample 31, and for the follow-up survey 33. Therefore, the samples are similar based upon age.

VICTIM SELF-REPORTED CHARACTERISTICS

In addition to the demographic information available from the original crime report, additional information was collected regarding the victim and the crime incident from the initial survey and the follow-up interviews. Descriptive statistics will be shared in the current section, while more detailed analysis of how these factors may be related to the needs of crime victims is included in Chapter 5.

As Table 4.3 shows, the percentage of victims who did not complete high school, completed high school, and pursued higher education were approximately equal for both the initial survey and follow-up interview samples. It should be noted that a question regarding educational level was not included on the follow-up interview. Therefore, percentages for the follow-up interview sample reflect responses to the initial survey for only the follow-up sample of individuals.

On the initial survey, respondents were asked if they were currently employed, and on the follow-up interview, they were asked if they had been employed at the time of the crime. Fifty percent (50%) of respondents to the initial survey stated they were currently employed, approximately four weeks after the crime incident, while 57 percent of the follow-up interview sample stated that they were employed at the time of the crime. Of these employed individuals, 86 percent of initial survey respondents, and 97 percent of those interviewed for the follow-up period, described their positions (Table 4.4). For both samples, the highest proportion of individuals classified their job as professional specialists (20% and 22%, respectively), such as teachers, nurses, or counselors. Other types of workers, such as laborers, were the next most frequent professions (18% and 21%, respectively). Waiters, nursing aides, hair dressers, and other types of service providers accounted for 14 percent of initial survey respondents and 12 percent of those completing the follow-up interview.

Individuals involved in sales accounted for 12 percent of the initial survey sample and 11 percent of the follow-up interview sample, and those providing administrative support represented nine percent of the first sample, and 15 percent of the second. San Diego is home to a number of military installations, and military personnel represented eight percent of the employed initial survey sample and three percent of the follow-up sample. Others were employed in private household positions (i.e., maid, nanny), worked as executives or managers, or provided precision production. Based upon this analysis, it seems as though the victims in this sample represent a wide variety of employment backgrounds.
Table 4.3

VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS
Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Sample</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 years</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Higher Education</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree or Higher</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, Never Married</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or Divorced</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>713</td>
<td>327-328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A question regarding educational level was not included on the follow-up interview. The analysis here reflects the information reported during the initial survey for those also completing a follow-up interview.

2 For the initial survey, the question asked for current employment. For the follow-up interview, the question asked about employment at the time of the incident.

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included.

Of the 330 follow-up interview respondents, 304 were willing to share their average household income with the interviewer (not shown). Twenty-three percent (23%) stated that their average annual household income was less than $10,000, 23 percent stated it was between $10,000 and $14,999, 19 percent between $15,000 and $24,999, 12 percent between $25,000 and $34,999, and 22 percent over $35,000. This relatively even distribution illustrates the variability among victims. Violence can affect any individual regardless of socioeconomic status (i.e., employment and income).
Table 4.4

VICTIMS' EMPLOYMENT POSITION\(^1\)
Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview

Initial Sample  Follow-Up Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Specialty</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Service Provider</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/Managerial</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^2)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 306 178

\(^1\) For the initial survey, the question asked for current employment. For the follow-up interview, the question asked about employment at the time of the incident.

\(^2\) "Other" includes technical related support, protective service, farming/fishing, machine operators, transportation, laborers, and self-employed, each of which accounted for six percent or less of responses.

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

As Table 4.3 reflects, for the initial survey sample, 40 percent of respondents stated that they were single and had never been married, 30 percent were currently married, 28 percent were separated or divorced, and two percent were widowed. For the follow-up interview sample, 35 percent categorized themselves as single, 30 percent as married, 34 percent as separated or divorced, and one percent as widowed. As an additional analysis, marital status reported during the follow-up interview was compared to responses on the initial survey. Overall, a high proportion of the sample reported a different marital status during follow-up than on the initial survey.
While the percentage of individuals whose marital status changed in the six months following a violent incident provides an interesting statistic, contradictory answers (i.e., married on the initial survey and single, never married on the follow-up interview) provide useful information regarding the validity of such self-reported measures. As these data suggest, there was some unreliability in these responses. One possible explanation for this is that respondents did not clearly understand what the categorizations implied. That is, perhaps a victim might have been single, but was separated from his or her significant other, and categorized him/herself as separated, rather than single, never married. In addition, a "cohabitation, but not married" choice was not provided, possibly confusing respondents who could not remember how they categorized themselves six months earlier. Because an objective measure of marital status was not immediately available, when contradictions occurred, it was not possible to determine the correct categorization or reasons for this unreliability.

The initial survey included a question regarding previous victimization (not shown). Forty-six percent (46%) of 709 survey respondents stated that the current victimization was not their first. Of these, 86 percent stated that they had previously been victims of assault, 18 percent victims of sexual assault, and 16 percent victims of robbery or other theft. Partly explained by the large percentage of domestic violence cases in the initial sample, 58 percent of respondents stated that the suspect in the current case was the same person responsible for prior offenses against them. Nationally, about one million violent crimes committed during 1993 were against victims related to the offender, and in more than one-half, the offender was the victim's spouse or former spouse (Perkins, Klaus, Bastian, and Cohen, 1996).

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE CRIME INCIDENT

Victims were asked about the crime incident on the initial survey. Questions were included which asked about the victims' perceptions of injury, ability to stop the crime from occurring, and their life being threatened, as well as the victims' relationship to the suspect(s). Additional information regarding the crime incident was collected from police reports.

Sixty-four percent (64%) of initial survey respondents said that they were injured as a direct result of the crime incident (not shown). Of these individuals, approximately one-half (52%) received medical treatment for their injuries. Of these 222 victims, 62 percent required emergency room treatment, 31 percent visited a doctor, 25 percent received first aid, 17 percent were hospitalized, and ten percent reported receiving a sexual assault exam.

According to police reports, eight percent of the crime incidents were mutually combative, and the victim was injured in 67 percent of the cases. Police reports also stated that the victim did not receive any form of treatment in 76 percent of the incidents, suggesting either that victims' definition of "treatment" differed from law enforcement's, that victims received treatment without law enforcement knowledge, or that some police reports contained incomplete information.
Almost two out of three (65%) victims felt that their life was threatened during the crime incident (not shown), and approximately one in three of the victims (39%) felt that they were able to do something to stop the crime from occurring (Table 4.5). Of these individuals who felt they were able to do something, 71 percent felt that their actions were successful. Table 4.5 lists ways the actions both helped and hindered the situation.

The majority of victims reported that they knew their assailant; the suspect was a stranger for only 21 percent of initial survey respondents (not shown). Thirty-one percent (31%) of respondents reported that the current suspect was a spouse, 30 percent a boyfriend or girlfriend, eleven percent a friend, four percent another relative, and three percent an individual with whom the victim had been previously involved.

According to the police report, the suspect was a significant other (but not spouse) in 37 percent of the incidents, a spouse in 28 percent, an acquaintance in ten percent, another relative in three percent, and a stranger in 21 percent. The greatest discrepancies between victim self-report and police reports was found for this measure, with agreement ranging from only zero to 39 percent. In 39 percent of the cases in which the victim said the suspect was a significant other, the police reports agreed. Similarly, police reports showed that the suspect was a spouse for 28 percent of victims who reported this same relationship, that the suspect was a stranger for 13 percent of the cases in which the victim said the suspect was a stranger, and that the suspect was a friend or acquaintance in five percent of the cases in which the victim reported the same relationship. Twenty-seven of initial sample respondents reported the suspect was another type of relative, and in none of these instances did the police reports concur. Overall, it appeared that the categorization of "significant other" may have been overused by law enforcement, with this categorization being the modal response for each level of victim self-categorization.

Additional information from police reports includes suspect characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age), where the incident took place, whether alcohol or other drugs were involved in the incident, and whether a suspect was immediately arrested.

The ethnicity for the suspect in the crime was known to police for 98 percent (795 of 810) of the suspects (there was more than one suspect in 91 cases). The suspect was White in 41 percent of the incidents, Hispanic in 28 percent, Black in 25 percent, and another ethnicity in seven percent. Gender information was available for 99 percent (801 of 810) of the suspects, with the suspect being a male 87 percent of the time. The age of the suspect was known for 91 percent (741 of 810). The suspect was under the age of 18 in six percent of the cases, between the ages of 18 and 24 for 26 percent, between 25 and 35 for 47 percent, and over the age of 35 for 21 percent.
### Table 4.5

**HOW VICTIMS' ACTIONS AFFECTED THE SITUATION**

Initial Victims' Survey  
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, able to try to stop crime</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, actions helped the situation</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### How actions helped the situation

- Called police | 22%
- Escaped situation | 17%
- Protected myself/my family | 10%
- Third person intervened | 9%
- Regained control of situation | 9%
- Other ways | 8%
- Assailant stopped/left | 5%
- Suspect's behavior changed after incident | 4%
- Suspect arrested | 4%
- Talked it out | 4%

#### How actions did not help the situation

- Should not argue with each other | 6%
- No opportunity to act | 6%
- Still got hurt | 5%
- Actions only made situation worst | 5%
- Abuse still happens | 2%
- Other ways | 2%

**TOTAL RESPONDENTS** | **208**

*NOTE:* “Don’t know” and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
Information from police reports for the initial sample shows that 67 percent of the incidents took place in a structure, 16 percent in a street or alley, nine percent in a lot, park, or yard, and six percent in a vehicle. Alcohol was noted by police in 22 percent, illegal drugs in two percent, and both in less than one percent of the cases. Injury was not significantly related to the presence or absence of alcohol or other drugs. A suspect was immediately arrested in 40 percent of the incidents.

The findings which were previously described regarding level of injury, relationship to the suspect, perceived threat to life, and beliefs regarding control over violence could influence the ability to cope with victimization. The effect of these variables will be discussed in Chapter 5.

SUMMARY

Even though victims and witnesses of particular crimes, as well as certain ethnicities, were somewhat over represented, the initial survey and follow-up interview samples represented the diversity of crime victims in the general population. Homicide survivors, witnesses and sexual assault victims were most likely to return the initial survey, while domestic violence victims were least likely. However, because almost three-quarters of the individuals originally surveyed were victims of domestic violence, these individuals still made up over one-half (62%) of the initial sample. The response rate pattern for the follow-up interviews was very similar, with domestic violence victims having the lowest response rate but still representing over one-half (56%) of the sample. Approximately seven of every ten victims were female, and there was little difference in response rates between males and females. White individuals represented the greatest percentage of crime victims and witnesses surveyed, and also had the highest response rate for both the initial survey and the follow-up interview. In addition, victim self-report suggested that violence can affect any individual, regardless of socio-economic status.

The self-reported information regarding the crime incident suggests that victimization is a serious event in the lives of victims. Sixty-four percent (64%) of victims reported they had been physically injured during the crime, with approximately one-half (52%) of these individuals requiring medical treatment to some degree. In addition, almost two out of three (65%) victims felt their life had been threatened during the crime and only 39 percent felt that they were able to do something to stop the crime from occurring.

More detailed analyses, presented later in this report, will explore how these sample characteristics relate to the needs of crime victims, and how these needs were fulfilled by the criminal justice system, CIT, EYE and other service providers.
CHAPTER 5
REACTION AND ABILITY TO COPE WITH VICTIMIZATION
REACTION AND ABILITY TO COPE WITH VICTIMIZATION

INTRODUCTION

In 1964, Caplan applied the concept of homeostasis to describe an individual's emotional well-being. For Caplan, a person exists in a state of balance between demands and coping abilities until a hazard is encountered of such magnitude that it cannot be met with available coping mechanisms. Criminal victimization is one such hazard which can stress a person's coping capabilities. Unlike a victim of a natural disaster, a crime victim may come to the realization that he or she was personally chosen for attack. This targeting can shatter the individual's assumptions about the world, especially his or her invulnerability to harm (Janoff-Bulman, 1989; cited in Greenberg and Ruback, 1992). According to Elias (1986), being a victim of a crime can produce psychological repercussions that enhance one's fear and sense of vulnerability, alter one's attitudes about the environment, and even change one's way of behaving.

Over the years, researchers have attempted to determine how the consequences of victimization are qualitatively and quantitatively impacted by crime incident and victim characteristics. According to Lurgio and Resick (1990), prior research has found that variability in victim recovery is often a function of victim characteristics and predispositions, the nature of the incident, victims' perceptions and interpretations of the occurrence, and events that transpire in the aftermath of the crime.

The sample of victims in this study was surveyed regarding how victimization affected them. Initial survey and follow-up interview questions were asked regarding change in residence, attendance record at work, changes in lifestyle, and feelings and emotional reactions. Analyses were done to determine how these consequences and reactions were related to one another, as well as to victim characteristics, characteristics of the crime, need and/or assistance received, and the nature of the interactions between the victim and the criminal justice system (Table 5.1). Statistically significant findings from initial surveys of 718 victims and 330 follow-up interviews are described and related to previous research. (A more detailed discussion of the statistical tests used is provided in Appendix D.)
Table 5.1

CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION REACTION MEASURES AND POSSIBLE PREDICTIVE FACTORS

MEASURES OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION REACTION
- Change of Residence (Yes/No)
- Absence from Work (Yes/No)
- Changes in Lifestyle (Number and Type)
- Emotional Problems and Reactions (Number and Type)

POSSIBLE PREDICTIVE FACTORS
- Victim Gender
- Victim Ethnicity
- Victim Age
- Victim Educational Level
- Victim Household Income
- Prior Victimization
- Services Received Prior to Incident
- Crime Type
- Relation to Suspect
- Victim Injury
- Perception that Life was Threatened
- Assistance at Time of Crime
- Assistance After Crime
- Services Received At and After the Crime
- Current Receipt of Services
- Presence of Unmet Needs
- Satisfaction with Police
- Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System
- Perception that Opinions were Heard

Several qualifications regarding these data are appropriate. First, it should be noted that these data reflect victim self-report whose validity was not verified with objective measures. However, previous research (Leymann, 1985; cited in Maguire, 1992) has shown strong correlations between subjective data regarding the effect of victimization and data from objective physiological measures of stress, such as hormone secretions and cardiac activity. Second, the number of individuals in each group differed for each comparison. For instance, when analyzing how absence from work differed as a function of a victim's gender, one group consisted of 199 males and the other consisted of 497 females. For the same sample and measure, the comparison included 336 victims who continued their education after high school, and 355 who either never completed their high school education, or ended their education with a
high school diploma. In addition, because data were initially collected using the survey method, respondents could choose which questions to answer. Thus, because an experimental design was not used, and the numbers of individuals in comparison groups were often unequal, all interpretations of the data are tentative and are offered more for further thought and study than any firm conclusions. To aid the reader, the number of total individuals in any given group is provided in parentheses. Lastly, comparison between responses given by the initial and follow-up samples should be limited because the initial and follow-up data were gathered in different ways (surveys vs. interviews), and because the follow-up group was a self-selecting sample of the initial group. According to Maguire and Corbett (1987; cited in Maguire, 1992), the survey technique will normally produce fewer admissions or assertions of adverse effects than an interview in which people are more likely to focus on their thoughts and memories.

MEASURES OF REACTION AND COPING ABILITY

Change of Residence

At the time of the initial survey, 17 percent of initial sample respondents (and 17 percent of follow-up sample respondents to the initial survey) reported moving from where they had lived when the crime occurred. Six months later, 24 percent of the follow-up sample had changed residences. While a greater percentage of individuals had moved as time passed, moving was more likely due to the crime incident for individuals responding to the initial survey (86% of the initial sample; 88% of the follow-up sample) compared to the follow-up sample at the time of the follow-up interview (62%). Of those who moved because of the crime, the most common reason for both the initial (44%) and follow-up samples (23%) was a perceived lack of safety at the previous residence. For both samples, others reported moving because they had ended their relationship with the suspect, another person had offered assistance (i.e., shelter, financial) which enabled them to move, or for financial or psychological reasons.

Absence From Work

Previous research has examined how attendance at work is affected by criminal victimization. Knudten, Meade, Knudten, and Doerner (1976) reported that 62 percent of their sample of victims of personal and property offenses had lost one day or less from work or school, while 26 percent had lost between two to four days. More recently, findings from the 1993 National Victimization Survey (Perkins, Klaus, Bastian, and Cohen, 1996) showed that 12 percent of violent crime victims in incidents in which the violence was completed (and not merely attempted or threatened) missed work. Of these 390,470 individuals, 15 percent reported missing less than one day, 53 percent from one to five days, nine percent from six to ten days, and 15 percent eleven days or more.

At the time of the initial survey, approximately four weeks after victimization had occurred, 28 percent of the initial sample (and 27 percent of the follow-up sample responding to the initial survey) reported missing time from work because of the crime. For the follow-up interview, approximately six months after the crime, 57 percent reported missing time from work as a direct or indirect consequence of victimization.
Change in Lifestyle

A closed-ended question was included on the initial and follow-up survey instruments regarding the changes in lifestyle made as a result of the crime. On the initial survey, 77 percent of the follow-up sample reported making changes. This percentage remained fairly stable six months later for these individuals, with 78 percent of the follow-up sample reporting making changes.

Table 5.2 presents the frequency with which each lifestyle change was supposedly made by the follow-up sample as reported on the initial survey, and by the follow-up sample as reported on the follow-up survey, six months after the crime occurred. Because the most useful comparison is between the same group of individuals over time, data from the initial survey is only presented for the follow-up sample. Generally, there was no consistent pattern of differences between the members of the initial sample who were recontacted versus the initial sample as a whole. For this question, there were no differences greater than three percent.

As Table 5.2 shows, the most common change across both surveys was avoiding certain people (58% and 64%), reflecting the fact that the majority of the victims in their sample were acquainted with the crime suspect. Other frequently made changes included staying home more often, avoiding going out alone or at night, and spending more time with family. Others reported spending more time alone, avoiding the place where the incident occurred, calling family and friends more, avoiding places similar to where the incident occurred, spending more time with friends, avoiding crowds, avoiding going out during the day, and missing work more often. Each lifestyle change was mentioned by a greater percentage of individuals as time passed. As discussed previously, this change may be explained by the different surveying techniques used, or the fact that as time passed, more individuals had the opportunity or inclination to actually make the change.

In addition to determining what types of lifestyle changes victims made, the total number of changes reported by respondents on the initial survey and follow-up interview was calculated as an additional measure of reaction to victimization. For those members of the follow-up sample, the difference between the number of changes reported on the initial survey and follow-up interview was then calculated as a potential measure of improvement over time. Thus, while the number of changes reported on the initial survey and follow-up interview are used as two separate measures, the differences between the two were only calculated for those individuals who responded to both. Analyses were then done to determine if the possible predictor factors listed in Table 5.1 were related to these measures in any systematic way and if these findings replicated previous results. These findings are discussed later in the chapter.
Table 5.2
VICTIMS' SELF-REPORTED LIFESTYLE CHANGES
Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifestyle Change</th>
<th>Initial Survey</th>
<th>Follow-Up Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Certain People</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying Home More Often</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending More Time Alone</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending More Time With Family</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Going Out Alone</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Going Out at Night</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Incident Location</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling Family More</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling Friends More</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Similar Locations</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending More Time With Friends</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Crowds</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Going Out During the Day</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Work More Often</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Cautious</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Initial Sample: 241
Follow-Up Sample: 256

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

Emotional Reactions

On both the initial survey and the follow-up interview, victims were posed a close-ended question which asked if they experienced certain emotional problems and reactions due to the crime. Eighty-six percent (86%) of the follow-up sample reported problems and reactions on the initial survey and, six months later, 75 percent of those interviewed for follow-up reported experiencing problems associated with the crime.
Again, the initial survey data is presented for only those who later completed the follow-up interview for comparison purposes. As Table 5.3 shows, for both samples of responses, the four most common reactions included experiencing painful memories, depression, distress, and anger. Others reported jumpiness, having problems sleeping, physical pain, fear, being easily annoyed, having nightmares, experiencing family problems, having changes in appetite, experiencing physical illness, having difficulty concentrating, anxiousness, being confused, a loss of interest in usual activities, being uncomfortable with physical contact, experiencing work-related problems, finding grooming difficult, forgetfulness, and increasing their use of alcohol and other drugs. When the responses of the follow-up sample are compared over time, the percentage reporting that they experienced sleeping problems, physical pain, family problems, physical illness, work-related problems, or difficulty grooming decreased as time passed. Of the categories of emotional problems and reactions that increased over time, six categories rose seven percent or more: being uncomfortable with physical contact (12%), forgetfulness (11%), painful memories (9%), being easily annoyed (9%), anger (8%), and distress (7%).

The number of total problems and emotional reactions reported on the initial survey and follow-up interview was also calculated as two measures of how victimization affects individuals. If the validity of self-responses is assumed, or at least that those who are really suffering more are more likely to check more items than individuals not suffering, then these responses may be one of the more direct measures of the crime's impact. The total number of reactions and feelings reported by victims was significantly related to the greatest number of predictor variables listed in Table 5.2. Eleven reactions and feelings were related to the predictor variables for the initial sample, and ten were related for the follow-up. In addition, for the follow-up sample, the difference between the number of reactions reported on the initial survey and the follow-up interview was calculated as a measure of adaptation for these individuals. Analyses included determining whether the number of reactions increased, decreased, or stayed the same was related, in any meaningful way, to the predictive factors previously described. These data are reported later in this chapter.
Table 5.3

VICTIMS' SELF-REPORTED EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS AND REACTIONS
Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Survey</td>
<td>Follow-Up Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painful Memories</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumpiness</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping Problems</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Pain</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily Annoyed</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightmares</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Problems</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Appetite</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Illness</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty Concentrating</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiousness</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Interest in Usual Activities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable with Physical Contact</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Related Problems</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooming Difficult</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgetfulness</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Use of Alcohol/Drugs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 275 245

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VICTIM AS PREDICTIVE FACTORS

Gender

For the initial sample, victim gender was related to one measure of coping ability: absence from work (Figure 5.1). Specifically, males (199) were significantly more likely to report missing time from work (34%), compared to female victims (25%) (497). However, and rather interestingly, this pattern was reversed for the follow-up sample. Six months later, females (116) were significantly more likely to be absent (63%), compared to males (48%) (67). Without further analyses of the data, these apparent contradictory findings are difficult to resolve. One possible explanation is that male victims experienced more bodily injury immediately after the crime, requiring more time to recover, compared to female victims. However, initial sample males were not significantly more likely to be injured, compared to females in the sample. Another explanation is that females, in general, experience more negative psychological repercussions at longer retention intervals, compared to males. This second explanation is more consistent with the hypothesis that females are often more negatively affected by victimization, as suggested by Maguire and Benett (1982) and Norquay and Weiler (1981), both cited in Maguire (1992).

While males and females were almost equally likely to report having moved after the incident for the initial sample (16% of 197 vs. 17% of 498, respectively), females in the follow-up sample were significantly more likely to have moved compared to males (28% of 224 vs. 16% of 94) (Figure 5.2). This finding also appears to support the claim that females are more likely to be affected by victimization, if change of residence is assumed to be a valid measure of reaction. However, the current finding may also reflect the fact that more females were domestic violence victims (who potentially moved to escape an abusive relationship), and a greater percentage of assault victims were males, suggesting that a move may be a more appropriate response for the female victims in the sample.

Victim gender also became a significant predictor of lifestyle changes for the follow-up sample (Figure 5.3). Approximately six months after the crime occurred, female victims (233) reported making an average of 4.28 changes, significantly greater than the average of 3.12 changes reported by males (97). Again, while this finding could be interpreted as supporting previous research which suggests that females are affected to a greater degree by victimization, it could also be related to a third variable, such as relationship to the suspect or crime type.
Figure 5.1
ABSENCE FROM WORK BY VICTIM GENDER
Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview

Figure 5.2
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Lastly, for the follow-up sample, females (233) were significantly more likely to experience a greater number of emotional reactions (6.79) compared to males (3.26) (97) (Figure 5.3). Further, for the same sample, while only 24 percent of the males reported experiencing a greater number of emotional reactions and feelings from the initial survey to the follow-up interview, 52 percent of the females did. Five percent (5%) of females reported the same number and 43 percent reported less changes, compared to 18 percent of males who reported the same number and 59 percent who reported less changes (not shown).

Thus, the assumption that females may be affected to a greater degree by victimization than males was tentatively supported by these data, at least for the follow-up sample. Approximately six months after the crime had occurred, females were more likely to have moved, missed worked, made a greater number of lifestyle changes, and reported experiencing a greater number of emotional reactions than victims of the opposite sex.

**Ethnicity**

Victim ethnicity was not significantly related to any of the outcome measures for the initial sample, and was only related to absence from work for the follow-up sample. At approximately six months after the crime, 100 percent of Asians (5) missed work, compared to 67 percent of Hispanics (48), 56 percent of Whites (105), 50 percent of individuals of other ethnicities (4), and 33 percent of Blacks (21) (not shown). Because the number of individuals in some groups is so small, generalizations and conclusions from this finding should be limited.
Age

Victims were categorized into one of four categories on the basis of their age at the time of the crime incident: under the age of 25 (213), 25 to 34 (272), 35 to 49 (183), or 50 and over (39). These categorizations were made on the basis of keeping the number of individuals in each group as equal as possible, while still maintaining theoretical interest. There was a fairly consistent decrease in negative reactions as age increased for the initial sample. Those under 25 experienced 6.76 reactions, compared to 5.99 for those 25 to 34, 6.10 for those 35 to 49, and 3.62 for those over the age of 50 (not shown). Previous researchers have claimed that the elderly are more likely to be affected by a crime than their younger counterparts (Goldsmith and Tomas (1974); cited in McDonald, 1976). The attempt to test this claim is limited by the small number of individuals who could be categorized as senior citizens.

Educational Level

Researchers, such as Lurgio and Resick (1990), have suggested that individuals with less formal education are more likely to be negatively affected by victimization. When the initial sample victims were categorized on the basis of whether or not they continued their education after high school, a significantly greater percentage of individuals who received more than 12 years of education missed work (32%) (336), compared to those whose education ended before or at the time they received a high school diploma (24%) (355) (not shown). This finding may be explained by the fact that individuals who have received more years of education hold jobs with more flexibility (i.e., vacation days, etc.). Thus, three of the four current measures for coping ability were not significantly related to educational level, and one that was not related in the predicted direction, at least for the initial sample.

Household Income

Previous research has suggested that victims with low incomes are more traumatized than victims from higher socio-economic groups (Lurgio and Resick, 1990). Lurgio and Davis (1989; cited in Lurgio and Resick, 1990) found that immediately following the crime, victims reporting less income were more fearful and unemployed victims displayed more negative emotions. According to Ellison, Ganger, Quigley and Rosenberger (1986), "socio-economic status is, perhaps, the most important of all the factors affecting the consequences of victimization from the perspective of victim service programs" (p. 6). These assertions seem to be supported by responses from victims during follow-up interviews. For the follow-up sample, those individuals reporting smaller household incomes reported making a significantly greater number of lifestyle changes and experiencing a significantly greater number of emotional reactions and problems compared to those from higher socio-economic groups (Figure 5.4).
Individuals who were better off financially reported making less lifestyle changes. As Figure 5.4 shows, those who reported household incomes below $15,000 (139) made a mean of 4.60 changes, compared to 4.04 for those with incomes between $15,000 and $35,000 (94), and 2.48 for those with incomes over $35,000 (71). With respect to emotional reactions/problems related to the victimization, individuals who reported household incomes of less than $15,000 reported experiencing 6.56 reactions, compared to 6.47 for those with incomes of $15,000 to $35,000, and 3.83 for those with incomes over $35,000.

In addition, victims of lower socio-economic status were also significantly more likely to make more lifestyle changes and experience more emotional problems as time passed. Specifically, while 60 percent of victims with incomes below $15,000 (139) made more lifestyle changes as time passed, 52 percent of those with incomes between $15,000 and $35,000 (94) made more changes, and only 31 percent of those with incomes over $35,000 (71) made more changes. Similarly, while 53 percent of those with incomes below $15,000 (139) experienced more emotional problems as time passed, only 43 percent of victims with incomes between $15,000 and $35,000 (94) experienced more problems, and 32 percent of victims with incomes over $35,000 (71) experienced more problems.
These results offer an additional criterion regarding the type of individuals to be targeted for assistance by formal resource entities: socio-economic status. While alternative explanations exist for these results, it appears that those individuals who comprise lower socio-economic groups are perhaps those most in need for special attention from service providers.

**Prior Victimization**

Those individuals who reported previous victimization on the initial survey experienced a significantly greater number of emotional reactions (7.08) (328) compared to those who were victims for the first time (5.41) (381) (not shown). However, when the change in reactions was calculated for the follow-up sample; those who had experienced victimization for the first time (172) were significantly more likely to report more reactions as time passed compared to other members of the sample (150). Of first-time victims, 46 percent reported more reactions, 12 percent the same number, and 42 percent less reactions as time passed. For those who had experienced victimization in the past, 39 percent reported more reactions, five percent the same number, and 57 percent less reactions as time passed. Obviously, there may be inherent differences between these two groups which allow for a number of possible explanations for this result (not shown).

**Prior Receipt of Services**

According to Davis (1987b), previous research by the Institute for Social Analysis has shown that prior life stress contributed significantly to the initial, most troubling stages of victims' psychological distress and was the strongest single determinant of victim distress. Similarly, Cook et al. (1987; cited in Maguire, 1992) report that individuals with prior emotional problems are also among those with the greatest likelihood of being affected by a crime. This claim was investigated through a follow-up interview question which asked if respondents had received services in the past. Services included counseling, psychological/psychiatric services, drug/alcohol treatment, hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone, and support group attendance. An affirmative response to any of these services was used to categorize individuals. Those who reported receiving services prior to the crime on the follow-up interview (17) were significantly more likely to move (47%), compared to those who had not received services in the past (23%) (301) (Figure 5.5). Further, prior receipt of services was also significantly related to the number of emotional responses reported by respondents. Those who had received services in the past (17) experienced an average of 8.94 reactions, compared to those who had not (313), who experienced an average of 5.58 reactions (Figure 5.6). It should be noted, however, that because of the unequal number of individuals in these two groups, caution should be used in interpreting these results.
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Follow-Up Victims' Interview
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CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CRIME AS PREDICTIVE FACTORS

Crime Type

While crime type was not significantly related to any of the coping measures for the initial sample, it did significantly predict three of the four coping measures for the follow-up sample, perhaps suggesting that the long-term effects of victimization vary across crime.

First, the type of crime significantly predicted whether or not a victim was absent from work within the first six months following the incident (Figure 5.7). Specifically, 100 percent of sexual assault victims reported missing work (11), 73 percent of homicide survivors or witnesses (11), 54 percent of domestic violence victims (91), and 53 percent of assault victims (70).

Second, crime type was also significantly associated with the number of lifestyle changes made by members of the follow-up sample (Figure 5.8). Sexual assault victims (20) were again most greatly affected by the crime, making an average of 5.83 lifestyle changes since the incident occurred. Homicide survivors and witnesses followed (14), making an average of 5.00 changes. Assault victims (110) and domestic violence victims (186) made an average of 3.87 and 3.70 changes, respectively.

Third, crime type was significantly related to a victim's emotional reactions (Figure 5.8). Specifically, sexual assault victims (20) appeared to be most affected, experiencing an average of 8.50 reactions, homicide survivors and witnesses (14) followed, experiencing an average of 7.14 reactions, domestic violence victims (186) had 6.16 reactions, and assault victims (110) had 4.39 reactions.
These data suggest several things. Sexual assault victims appeared to be among those most greatly affected by their victimization. They were more likely to report missing work, making more lifestyle changes, and experiencing a greater number of emotional problems and reactions. These findings are consistent with the classic research of Burgess and Holmstrom (1974 and 1976) who were among the first to study the effects of sexual assault victimization and concluded that, for almost all victims, this attack was something far out of the ordinary that seriously taxed their adaptive resources.

Also, the fact that a higher percentage of homicide survivors and witnesses, compared to domestic violence and other assault victims, missed work, made lifestyle changes, and experienced emotional reactions suggests that these individuals are directly affected by the crime to an equal, if not greater, degree than other victims. According to Riggs and Kilpatrick (1990), recent evidence suggests that surviving family members of homicide victims may in fact experience problems similar to those experienced by crime victims in general.
Relation to Suspect

The relationship between the victim and suspect (i.e., whether or not the suspect in the crime was a stranger, or someone with whom the victim was acquainted) was found to be a significant predictor of the number of emotional problems and reactions reported on the initial survey. Analyses showed that in those cases in which the suspect was a stranger (142), victims reported experiencing significantly less problems and emotional reactions (5.06) than those who did know their attacker (6.55) (532) (not shown) four weeks after their victimization. However, when the reported reactions by the follow-up sample on the initial survey were compared to the number of reactions reported on the follow-up interview, individuals victimized by a stranger appeared to be more influenced by the crime as time passed. Specifically, while 56 percent of individuals victimized by a stranger (55) reported a greater number of reactions as time passed, only 40 percent of those who knew their attacker (255) reacted more negatively over time. Eleven percent (11%) of victims attacked by a stranger reported the same number of reactions during the follow-up interview as on the initial survey and 33 percent reported less. Eight percent of victims attacked by someone they knew reported the same number of reactions and 52 percent reported less than six months earlier (not shown).

These data suggest that victimization by a stranger, perhaps because it is seen as more arbitrary, may have a greater impact on victim's long-term emotional reactions. This finding may also offer insight into which individuals are most likely to require long-term help from formal service providers faced with limited resources to offer victims in need. That is, those victimized by strangers may benefit the most from assistance as it relates to coping and emotional reactions to the incident.

Victim Injury and Perception that Life Was Threatened

Research regarding the effect of injury and the perception that one's life has been threatened has provided somewhat mixed conclusions. Sales et al. (1984; cited in Lurgio and Resick, 1990) found that physical injury and the perceived threat of violence or death during the crime episode were significant predictors of victim symptoms and that incident violence was most predictive of coping. On the other hand, Girelli, Resick, Marhoefer-Dvorak, and Hutter (1986; cited in Lurgio and Resick, 1990) reported that while subjective distress is predictive of later fear reactions, other assault variables, such as threats, weapons, and injuries, were not significantly predictive. Victim injury and the perception that one's life has been threatened are two of the most predictive variables of a victim's reaction to victimization for the initial sample.

For the measure of absenteeism from work (Figure 5.9), those victims who reported being injured during the crime (424) were significantly more likely to miss time from work (33%), compared to those individuals who were not injured (16%) (242). Further, those victims who perceived that their life had been threatened (421) were significantly more likely to miss work (32%) compared to those who did not share this perception (18%) (229).
Injury was also significantly related to the number of lifestyle changes a victim made (Figure 5.10). Specifically, those victims who were injured (440) reported making a mean of 3.45 changes, compared to those not injured (247), who made a mean of 2.06 changes, a significant difference. In addition, initial survey respondents who perceived that their life had been threatened in the incident (436) were significantly more likely to report making lifestyle changes (3.50) compared to those who did not share this perception (1.90) (235).

However, the perception that one's life was threatened may not have long lasting effects. The number of lifestyle changes reported on the initial survey and follow-up interview increased to a greater degree for those who did not perceive their life had been threatened (113) compared to those who felt it had (198). Specifically, of those who felt their life was threatened, 45 percent reported a greater number of changes as time passed, 14 percent reported the same, and 41 percent reported less. Of those who felt their life had not been threatened, 61 percent reported a greater number of changes, 17 percent stayed the same, and 22 percent reported less as time passed (not shown).
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Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

Injury and the perception that one's life was threatened were also found to be significantly related to the number of emotional reactions experienced by a victim (Figure 5.11). Those who reported injury on the initial survey (7.30) and those who perceived their life had been threatened (7.12) experienced a significantly greater number of reactions compared to those who were not injured (3.91) and those who did not feel their life had been threatened (4.14). Again, those who did not feel their life had been threatened (113) reported a greater number of emotional reactions six months after the crime compared to those who thought their life had been threatened (198). Of those who thought it was threatened, 38 percent reported a greater number of reactions as time passed, seven percent reported the same number, and 55 percent reported fewer reactions. Of those who thought it was not threatened, 54 percent reported a greater number of reactions as time passed, 13 percent stayed the same, and 33 percent reported fewer reactions (not shown).
VICTIM ASSISTANCE AND NEED AS PREDICTIVE FACTORS

Assistance at Time of Crime

In a survey of crime victims, Steinmetz (1987, 1989; cited in Maguire, 1992) found higher levels of anxiety and stress among victims "helped" by Dutch support schemes (similar to American victim assistance programs) than among a group of victims who had not been helped. He speculated that this was because many problems the victims had could not be resolved by support workers, and that the victims' hopes had been falsely raised. This claim was tested indirectly by examining differential reactions of victims receiving assistance at the time of the crime compared to those not receiving assistance.

Individuals assisted at the time of the crime were significantly more likely to report a greater number of lifestyle changes as well as emotional problems and reactions at the time of the initial survey (Figure 5.12). Assistance was defined as any offer by another person (other than police officers) to help the victim at the time the crime occurred. Specifically, individuals who received assistance (170) reported making an average of 3.76 changes and experiencing 7.09 reactions, compared to those who did not receive assistance (538) who reported 2.77 changes and 5.86 reactions.
While these results are consistent with Steinmetz's findings and conclusions, because individuals were not randomly assigned to receive offers of assistance in the present study, conclusions regarding causality are inappropriate. Further, assistance was broadly defined on the initial survey and was not limited to formal entities providing help. Thus, while the two are positively correlated, the reason for this finding cannot be explained. Perhaps the level of seriousness of the crime explains both why assistance or service was offered and why it had a greater effect on the lives of the victims.

**Assistance after the Crime**

Those who reported assistance after the crime on the initial survey were similarly more likely to miss time from work after the crime, make more lifestyle changes, and experience more emotional reactions and problems. Assistance was again defined as any offers of assistance by anyone other than police officers.

First, while approximately one in three (34%) of individuals who received assistance after the crime (189) missed work, only one in four (25%) of those who didn't receive similar offers (492) was absent (Figure 5.13). Similarly, while those who received assistance (193) reported making an average of 3.65 lifestyle changes, those who did not receive assistance (505) made an average of 2.82 changes (Figure 5.14). Lastly, those who received assistance after the crime (193) reported experiencing an average of 7.04 emotional problems, compared to an average of 5.82 reactions by those not receiving assistance (505) (Figure 5.14).
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LIFESTYLE CHANGES AND EMOTIONAL REACTIONS BY ASSISTANCE AFTER CRIME
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While the same concerns regarding direction of causality are appropriate here, these findings do suggest interesting questions regarding why individuals who are offered assistance, both at the time of the crime and after, show signs of being affected to a greater degree by their victimization.

**Receipt of Services**

On the initial survey, individuals who reported receiving services were more likely, in general, to be affected by criminal victimization. As discussed in the next chapter, services potentially provided to victims included:

- referrals
- interpreter assistance
- counseling
- psychological or psychiatric services
- financial aid
- explanation of police procedures
- explanation of medical procedures
- case information
- assistance with the court process
- advocacy with outside agencies
- assistance with financial claim forms
- education, emergency shelter
- receipt of basic necessities
- clean-up and repair services
- health care
- child care
- drug or alcohol treatment
- funeral or burial services
- transportation
- hotline information.

For the follow-up sample, those individuals who reported receiving services from formal service providers, as opposed to services through informal channels or no services at all, were also more likely to be affected. Again, such results suggest future research directions to clarify the mechanism responsible for greater reaction on the part of those who receive services.

For the initial survey sample, those individuals who received services (490) were significantly more likely to miss work, compared to those who did not receive help (190) (Figure 5.15). Thirty percent (30%) of those who received services missed work compared to 23 percent of those who did not receive services. More research is needed to determine the relationship between missed work and receipt of services. For example, maybe the services were received after work was missed.

Victims who received services (500) were also significantly more likely to report making lifestyle changes on the initial survey (3.28) compared to those not receiving any services (2.39) (198) (Figure 5.16). These individuals (500) were also significantly more likely to report experiencing emotional reactions and problems (6.81) compared to those not receiving services (4.64) (198).
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In addition, and rather interestingly, while there was only a slight difference between those who received service and those who did not in terms of experiencing more reactions as time passed, those who did not receive services were more likely to report experiencing the same number of reactions from the initial survey to follow-up interview, and less likely to report fewer reactions. Of those who did not receive services (85), 41 percent reported a greater number of reactions from the initial survey to follow-up interview, 15 percent the same number, and 44 percent fewer reactions. Of those who did receive services (233), 43 percent reported a greater number, six percent the same number, and 51 percent fewer reactions as time passed (not shown).

For the follow-up sample, receipt of services through formal channels was significantly related to two measures of coping ability. As Figure 5.17 shows, victims who received services through formal channels (184) were significantly more likely to make lifestyle changes (4.47) and experience more reactions and problems (6.43) compared to those individuals who did not receive services through formal channels (3.27 changes and 4.90 reactions) (146).

Current Receipt of Services

Given the findings described previously, the impact of continued receipt of services on coping is of interest. Of the 205 individuals who reported receiving services after the crime, 21 percent were still receiving services at the time of the follow-up interview and all four measures of coping (change of residence, absence from work, lifestyle changes, and emotional problems/reactions) showed that these individuals were more affected by victimization than those who were not receiving services six months after the crime.

First, while 23 percent of victims not currently receiving services (162) had changed residences after the crime, 40 percent of those still receiving services (43) had moved (Figure 5.18). Second, individuals still receiving services (20) were also more likely to have missed time from work (85%), compared to those not receiving services (54%) (94) (Figure 5.18).

In addition, as Figure 5.19 shows, victims still receiving services were also significantly more likely to report making a greater number of lifestyle changes and experiencing negative reactions compared to those not receiving services at the time of the follow-up interview. While those receiving services (43) made an average of 5.67 changes and reported a mean of 9.35 reactions, those not receiving services (162) reported making an average of 4.17 changes and experiencing an average of 5.83 reactions.

These findings could indicate that those receiving services were enabled to make lifestyle changes and to articulate their reactions. Further research is needed before this connection can be known.
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Presence of Unmet Needs

The presence of unmet needs is an additional factor with considerable weight in determining how effectively a victim copes with victimization. Whether an individual receives services or not, if there are needs which continue to exist, the effect of the crime incident may be greater than for someone who feels that all needs have been fulfilled. The presence of unmet needs for the initial sample was significantly related to all four outcome measures. In addition, three of the four outcome measures were impacted by unmet needs reported by the follow-up sample.

As Figure 5.20 shows, victims reporting unmet needs on the initial survey were significantly more likely to move (22%) (277) and to miss work (38%) (280) compared to those individuals who felt their needs had been fulfilled (13% of 381 and 20% of 383, respectively). Further, as shown in Figure 5.21, victims with unmet needs (283) also reported making a greater number of lifestyle changes (4.01) compared to those whose needs were met (2.40) (386) and also experiencing a greater number of emotional reactions (8.24) compared to those whose needs were met (4.59).
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LIFESTYLE CHANGES AND EMOTIONAL REACTIONS BY NEEDS NOT MET
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For the follow-up sample, the presence of unmet needs continued to be significantly associated with absence from work. Six months after the crime, 74 percent of those whose needs continued to be unmet (72) reported missing work, while fewer than one-half (46%) of those who felt their needs had been met (110) reported absences (Figure 5.22). The trend for those with unmet needs to report more lifestyle changes and emotional reactions also continued for the follow-up sample. Individuals with unmet needs (125) reported making 5.13 lifestyle changes, compared to those with fulfilled needs (202) who made 3.21 changes (Figure 5.23). Those with unmet needs (125) also reported a greater number of emotional reactions (8.54) compared to those whose needs had been met (4.02) (202).

When the difference between the number of reported lifestyle changes on the initial survey and follow-up interview was computed (for the follow-up sample) and compared for those reporting or not reporting unmet needs, an interesting finding emerged (not shown). Individuals were asked on both the initial survey and the follow-up interview if they currently had unmet needs. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of respondents who reported the presence of unmet needs (134) on the initial survey reported the same or a fewer number of lifestyle changes as time passed, compared to 44 percent of respondents who reported they did not have any unmet needs on the initial survey (170). Thus, those who reported unmet needs early (four weeks after the crime on the initial survey) were less likely to report making more lifestyle changes six months later. However, those who reported unmet needs on the follow-up interview (as opposed to the initial survey) were less likely to report the same or fewer lifestyle changes as time passed. Only 33 percent of those who reported unmet needs on the follow-up interview (125) made the same or fewer changes as time passed (from the initial to follow-up survey), compared to 59 percent of those who said all their needs were met on the follow-up interview (202). Perhaps those who were aware of unmet needs soon after the crime attempted to fulfill them, while those who were not aware of needs until later remained unfulfilled. This finding illustrates the importance that follow-up contact may have for individuals who do not realize they have needs until time has passed since the incident.

The same pattern of results was demonstrated when the difference between the number of reported emotional reactions on the initial survey and follow-up interview was computed (for the follow-up sample) (not shown). Specifically, 66 percent of individuals who reported unmet needs on the initial survey (134) experienced the same or fewer emotional reactions as time passed, compared to 50 percent of those who said their needs were met at the time of the initial survey (170). Again, however, those who reported unmet needs on the follow-up interview (125) appeared to do worse, with only 45 percent reporting the same or fewer emotional reactions compared to 64 percent of those who said their needs were fulfilled at the time of the follow-up interview (202).
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NATURE OF THE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN THE VICTIM AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AS PREDICTIVE FACTORS

Satisfaction with Police and Detectives

To determine if positive interactions with law enforcement were related to better coping abilities on the part of victims, initial survey respondents were asked to rate the helpfulness of services provided by the police. Specifically, services provided at the time of the crime by patrol officers and after the incident by detectives were rated. Respondents were given the choice of rating themselves as very satisfied, satisfied, not satisfied, or very unsatisfied with the services. Responses to these questions were recoded so that there were two levels of satisfaction, rather than four. These levels are referred to as satisfied and dissatisfied.

For the follow-up sample, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with law enforcement in general. Here, respondents were given the choice of saying they were very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied or dissatisfied, not satisfied, or very dissatisfied. Responses to this question were recoded so that there were three levels of satisfaction, rather than five. These levels will be referred to as satisfied, neutral, and dissatisfied.

Missing time from work was significantly predicted by satisfaction with the services provided by the detective in the case (Figure 5.24). Analyses showed that a significantly greater percentage of individuals who were dissatisfied (48%) (69) reported missing work, compared to those individuals who were satisfied (29%) (325).

In addition, satisfaction with the services of the police for the initial sample, and satisfaction with law enforcement in general for the follow-up sample were significantly related to the number of lifestyle changes which were made. For the initial sample, those who were satisfied with the police (542) made an average of 2.76 changes, compared to those who were dissatisfied (161) who made an average of 3.71 changes (Figure 5.25). Follow-up interview respondents were asked, overall, how satisfied they were with their contact with law enforcement officers in this case during the past six months. Those who said they were satisfied (190) reported making a mean of 3.64 changes, those who were neutral (41) reported making 4.02 changes, and those who were dissatisfied (69) reported making 5.29 changes (Figure 5.26).
Further, satisfaction with police, detectives, and law enforcement officers in general were all significantly related to the number of emotional reactions reported by victims. For the initial sample, victims who were very satisfied with police service (542) reported experiencing a mean of 5.76 reactions, compared to those who were dissatisfied (161) who reported experiencing a mean of 7.43 reactions (Figure 5.25). Similarly, on the same survey, those who were satisfied with the detective (332) reported a significantly fewer number of reactions (6.07), compared to those who were dissatisfied (7.86) (72) (Figure 5.27). For the follow-up sample, dissatisfaction with the police was also associated with negative emotional changes since the crime incident. Those who were satisfied with law enforcement (190) reported an average of 5.02 reactions, those who were neutral (41) reported 5.41, and those who were dissatisfied (69) reported 8.26 reactions (Figure 5.26).

Interestingly, satisfaction with the police on the initial survey did not guarantee that one would be less affected by the victimization, according to measures of lifestyle changes and emotional reactions six months later. Victims who were satisfied with police services at the time of the crime (263) were more likely to make a greater number of lifestyle changes as time passed (56%) compared to those who had been dissatisfied (31%) (58) (not shown). Similarly, those who were satisfied with police services at the time of the crime (263) were more likely to experience a greater number of emotional reactions as time passed (46%) compared to those who had not been satisfied (31%) (58) (not shown).
Figure 5.25
LIFESTYLE CHANGES AND EMOTIONAL REACTIONS
BY POLICE SATISFACTION
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

Figure 5.26
LIFESTYLE CHANGES AND EMOTIONAL REACTIONS
BY POLICE SATISFACTION
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
Satisfaction with the services provided by a detective also predicted similar differences as time passed for the number of emotional reactions experienced by victims. Specifically, those who had been satisfied with the detective at the time of the initial survey (136) were significantly more likely to experience a greater number of emotional reactions as time passed (44%), compared to those who were originally dissatisfied (24%) (38) (not shown). Perhaps this finding is due to the fact that this positive interaction with the criminal justice system did not last and was limited to the original contact by the victim.

Supporting this explanation is the finding that individuals who rated themselves as satisfied or neutral in their opinions of the services provided by law enforcement (on the follow-up interview) were significantly less likely to express a greater number of reactions as time passed. Of those who were satisfied (190), 38 percent reported a greater number of reactions from the initial survey to the follow-up interview, 37 percent of those who were neutral (41) reported a greater number of reactions, and 61 percent of those who were dissatisfied (69) reported a greater number of reactions.
Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System and the Perception that Opinions Were Heard

General satisfaction with the criminal justice system was asked on the follow-up interview in a format similar to that used to measure satisfaction with law enforcement. Ratings were made and recoded again as satisfied, neutral, or dissatisfied. As Figure 5.28 shows, those individuals who were satisfied with the criminal justice system (164) experienced an average of 5.10 reactions, those who were neutral (47) experienced an average of 5.51 reactions, and those who were dissatisfied (89) experienced an average of 7.45 reactions. Analysis of how the number of reactions changed over time also showed that those who were unhappy with the criminal justice system were worse off, suggesting that "secondary victimization" by the system can occur and have negative effects. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of those who were dissatisfied with the system (89) reported a greater number of reactions as time passed, while only 40 percent of those who were satisfied (164) and 34 percent of those who were neutral (47) did (not shown).

In addition, those who felt their opinions had been listened to by those in the system were less likely to miss work and experienced a fewer number of reactions at the time of follow-up. As Figure 5.29 shows, individuals who felt their voices were heard were significantly less likely to miss work (50% of 96), compared to those who felt they were ignored (67% of 66). Referring to Figure 5.30, individuals who felt they had been heard (172) experienced significantly fewer emotional reactions (5.00) compared to those who felt they had not been heard (6.63) (112). These findings appear to support Erez and Tontodonato (1990), who have stated that victim involvement and the opportunity to voice an opinion are necessary for psychological healing and for the restoration of victim welfare.

NON-SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS

Knowledge of factors which are not significantly related to coping ability is in some ways as useful as knowing which are significantly related. A number of additional factors, not listed in Table 5.1, were included in the data analysis but were found not to predict any of the outcome measures. These variables included arrest of the suspect, perceiving assistance received as helpful, perceiving the services received as helpful, satisfaction with a Deputy District Attorney, and satisfaction with the judge in the case.

SUMMARY

The effect of criminal victimization has been operationalized and measured in a variety of ways by a number of researchers. For the current study, victim self-reports of changing residence, absence from work, number and type of changes in lifestyle, and number and type of emotional responses were discussed. The predictive power of crime type, victim characteristics, services received, and the nature of the interaction between the victim and the criminal justice system was explored.
Figure 5.28
EMOTIONAL REACTIONS BY SATISFACTION
WITH CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

Figure 5.29
ABSENCE FROM WORK BY OPINIONS HEARD
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
A variety of victim characteristics were significantly associated with one or more measures of coping ability. Immediately after the crime, male victims were significantly more likely to miss work compared to female victims. However, six months after the crime, female victims appeared to be significantly more affected by the crime, using all four measures of coping ability. Household income was significantly related to coping ability, as measured by the number of lifestyle changes and emotional problems. Specifically, victims who were in higher income brackets were less likely to report making lifestyle changes and experiencing emotional problems. Individuals who had received services in the past, possibly demonstrating a history of prior problems or victimization, were more likely to move after the current victimization and to experience a greater number of emotional problems. In addition, younger victims and individuals with a history of prior victimization were more likely to experience emotional reactions, those with more formal education were more likely to miss work, and Asian and Hispanic victims were most likely to miss work after the crime, while Blacks were least likely.

Particular characteristics of the crime situation were also predictive of victim coping ability. Those who were injured and perceived that their life had been threatened were more likely to miss work, make lifestyle changes, and experience emotional problems. In addition, the relationship between the victim and suspect, as reported on the initial survey, significantly predicted the number of emotional problems experienced, with those who knew the suspect reporting less problems. Crime type was significantly related to missing time from work, making lifestyle changes, and experiencing emotional problems for the follow-up sample, with sexual assault victims appearing to be most affected.
The analyses presented in this chapter concur with previous research (Steinmetz, 1987 and 1989; cited in Magurie, 1992) which suggests that individuals receiving assistance and services are more likely to be more affected by the crime incident than those not receiving aid. However, because individuals were not randomly assigned to receive help or not, the causal factors responsible for this are not clear. Possibly, victims who receive assistance have greater needs than those who do not receive help, or alternatively, as Steinmetz hypothesized, many problems that victims have cannot be resolved by support workers and victims' hopes are falsely raised. Specifically, victims who reported they received assistance at the time of or after the crime, or services related to the crime event, noted significantly more lifestyle changes and emotional problems and those who received services or assistance after the crime were also more likely to miss work. Finally, individuals who continued to receive services six months after the crime occurred and those who reported unmet needs were significantly more likely to miss work, move, make lifestyle changes, and experience emotional problems. Future research directions were suggested to better understand the mechanisms responsible for these findings.

Lastly, the current research demonstrated that negative interactions are associated with measures of negative coping ability. Being satisfied with the police was significantly related to making less lifestyle changes and experiencing less emotional reactions, and satisfaction with the detective was significantly related to less absence from work and less emotional reactions. In addition, satisfaction with the criminal justice system as a whole was significantly related to a smaller amount of emotional problems, and feeling that one's opinions had been listened to was significantly related to less absence from work and less emotional reactions. The importance of positive interactions between the victim and the criminal justice system throughout the victim's interaction with the system was discussed.

These predictive relationships may provide useful information for service providers interested in determining who best to target for assistance efforts. At longer intervals after the crime, females, individuals in lower socio-economic groups, sexual assault victims, and victims who were injured, or perceived their life had been threatened were most likely to be affected by criminal victimization. Suggestions were made regarding the importance of these factors in determining who may best benefit from receiving the limited resources offered by victim assistance programs.
CHAPTER 6

USE OF FORMAL ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES BY VICTIMS
USE OF FORMAL ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES BY VICTIMS

INTRODUCTION

Individuals deal with criminal victimization differentially; some individuals may recover quickly, while others are left with serious forms of maladjustment as a result of the experience. Researchers such as Steinmetz (1984) have argued that there are two necessary conditions for proper integration of the crime experience in the pattern of daily life. The first is the individual's own coping capacities. The second is the support and help actually provided by others.

This chapter examines the second factor of external support. Sometimes crime witnesses are present and able to intervene to end a victimization, while in other situations, intervention is not possible or likely. Some victims receive offers of assistance or service after the crime has occurred, while others do not. Some services are perceived as more helpful, compared to others which are received. Some needs are met, while others are not. The analyses discussed in the current chapter were done in part to determine which services and forms of assistance are most frequently offered to victims, which are most helpful, and which needs remain unmet.

An additional question of interest concerned which victims are most likely to receive offers of, and take advantage of, services. Namely, are any characteristics of the victim or the crime significantly related to receipt of assistance or services, or the perception of unmet needs? Friedman (1982; cited in Ellison, Ganger, Quigley, and Rosenberger, 1986) has suggested that victims who are indigent, ethnic minorities, or have limited education, are less likely to get all the help they need. In another study, Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer (1990) found a relative lack of influence of demographic characteristics in predicting who would use services. The last section of the chapter is devoted to testing the validity of these competing assumptions.

ASSISTANCE RECEIVED BY VICTIMS

On the initial survey, victims were asked two separate close-ended questions regarding the assistance they received relating to the crime incident. Specifically, respondents were asked if assistance was offered by someone, other than police officers, at the time of or after the incident. Overall, 24 percent of respondents reported that they had received assistance at the time of the crime and 28 percent reported receiving assistance some time after the crime had occurred.
Table 6.1

ASSISTANCE VICTIMS RECEIVED
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>At Crime</th>
<th>After Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paramedics</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Medical Staff</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Whose Name Has Been Forgotten</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Individual in Position to Help</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Intervention Team (CIT)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Community Services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Social Worker</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 170 193

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

As Table 6.1 shows, at the time of the crime, paramedics and hospital medical staff were most likely to assist a victim, being cited by 24 percent and 17 percent of those individuals who were helped, respectively. In addition, 42 percent of victims in the initial sample reported receiving assistance from the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program after the crime, and 11 percent from the San Diego Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) after the crime. Eleven percent (11%) and 18 percent could not recall the name of the agency which assisted them, either at the time of or after the crime, respectively.

Other individuals reported being assisted by a friend, other individuals in the position to help (i.e., store clerk, landlord, witnesses, co-worker, security guard), the Center for Community Services, a local non-profit organization (formally the Center for Women Studies and Services), a detective, neighbors, or a hospital social worker. Five percent (5%) or less reported being assisted at the time of the crime or after the crime by a family member, a Deputy District Attorney, the EYE Crisis and Advocacy Team, another victim service program, the Trauma Intervention Program (TIP), the coroner, the Women's Resource Center (WRC), a 911 operator, a hospital chaplain, Navy Family Advocacy, a counselor, or other entities (not shown).
Because "at the time of" and "after" were not clearly defined on the initial survey instrument (which was administered approximately four weeks after the crime), the questions may have different meanings for different individuals. However, it is interesting that assistance at the time of the crime was most often offered by those in the position to offer medical assistance, and after the crime by the DA’s Victim-Witness Assistance Program. As described in Chapter 3, this organization attempts to be responsible for contacting every violent crime victim either by telephone or through the mail.

SERVICES RECEIVED BY VICTIMS

Both the initial survey and the follow-up interview included close-ended questions regarding the type of services victims received. While assistance was defined as help from a particular individual (i.e., friend) or group of individuals (i.e., paramedics), who were not law enforcement officers, services pertained to specific forms of assistance, such as case information, referrals, or counseling, regardless of the provider.

In addition to victim self-reports, data collection efforts also included archival analyses from police records, and program records from the CIT and EYE. This information was used as an additional measure of which services were made available to victims in the aftermath of their victimization. Because these data were collected from official records, and no special efforts were made to increase the record keeping accuracy of police officers or program volunteers, the percentages presented here may be underestimations of the actual number of services provided.

Services Received by the Initial Sample

Forty-six percent (46%) of the initial sample reported receiving services at the time of the crime and 51 percent after the crime had occurred. These percentages are nearly double the percentage of individuals who reported receiving assistance from someone at the time of the crime (24%) or after the crime (28%). This may reflect the fact that multiple services are provided by the same person or that, alternatively, law enforcement was responsible for providing a number of services to victims.

As Table 6.2 shows, of those who received services, the three most commonly received services for both time periods included explanations and information from the police, referrals, and case information. A quarter or less also reported receiving hotline information, explanations of medical procedures, counseling, health care, assistance with court proceedings, transportation, education, advocacy with outside agencies, financial assistance, assistance with claim forms, and psychiatric services. Not shown in Table 6.2 are those services received by less than five percent of the individuals at the time of and after the crime. These include interpreter services, emergency shelter, receipt of basic necessities, child care, alcohol or other drug treatment, and funeral or burial services.
Table 6.2
SERVICES VICTIMS RECEIVED
Initial Victims’ Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Received</th>
<th>Services At Crime Incident</th>
<th>Services After Crime Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanations From Police</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline Information</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Medical Procedures</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance With Court Proceedings</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy With Outside Agencies</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with Claim Forms</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Services</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 323 359

NOTE: “Don’t know” and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

Services Received by the Follow-up Sample

Follow-up sample respondents were also asked if they had received services pertaining to the crime incident. However, they were not asked to distinguish which particular services had been received at the time of the crime incident, or after it.
Table 6.3
SERVICES VICTIMS RECEIVED
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations From Police</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline Information</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with the Court Process</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Medical Procedures</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Services</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Groups</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Necessities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 207

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

Overall, 63 percent, or 207 individuals, reported receiving some type of service. Fifty-six percent (56%) of respondents reported receiving services on the day of the incident, 67 percent within a month of the incident, and 24 percent after a month had passed since the incident. Twenty-one percent (21%) reported that they were still receiving services, approximately six months after the crime had occurred (not shown).

As Table 6.3 shows, referrals (57%), explanations from police (41%), and case information (40%) continued to be the most frequently received services for the follow-up sample. With the exception of assistance in completing financial assistance forms and advocacy with outside agencies, the services listed in Table 6.2 were also reported as having been received by greater than five percent of the follow-up sample. Receipt of basic necessities, previously mentioned by less than five percent of the initial sample, was reported by five percent of the follow-up sample, and funeral or burial services were not noted at all.
Table 6.4
SERVICES VICTIMS CURRENTLY RECEIVED
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Services</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Groups</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance With the Court Process</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Necessities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Other Drug Treatment</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 43

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included.

Police officers were cited most frequently as the provider of services by victims on the follow-up interview (68%) (not shown). Other service providers included the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program (32%), another individual or group (28%), hospital medical staff (23%), the Women's Resource Center (WRC) (11%), the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) (9%), paramedics (8%), a hospital social worker (6%), and the Center for Community Services (5%). Less than five percent of respondents reported receiving services from the EYE, the Trauma Intervention Program (TIP), and a hospital chaplain. Other service providers included friends, family, ALANON, the YMCA, a Deputy District Attorney, legal clinics, the court, a personal physician, a health plan, other victims' program, a counselor or social worker, Navy Family Advocacy, California Mental Heath (CMH), work, or the individual and his or her own actions. Four percent of individuals could not remember who provided the services to them.

As Table 6.4 shows, 43 individuals in the follow-up sample were continuing to receive services related to their victimization at the time of the interview, approximately six months after the incident occurred, representing 21 percent of individuals who received services and were interviewed. Counseling (56%) and psychiatric services (35%) were the two most frequently cited services that were still being received. This finding highlights the emotional and psychological needs resulting from violent victimization. Others reported that they were continuing to receive health care, financial assistance, help from support groups, assistance with the court process, basic necessities, alcohol and other drug treatment, referrals, transportation, and other services. Less than five percent of respondents also reported continued receipt of case information and emergency shelter.
Services Reported by Police and Programs

As an additional source of information, data were collected from CIT and EYE records for each crime incident in the initial sample. According to program reports, service providers were present at the crime scene for only two percent of the initial sample (717 crime victims). Of these 12 instances, nine were assisted by the San Diego Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) and three were helped by volunteers from the EYE. An additional 443 people were assisted at the crime scene by law enforcement officers. As previously discussed, these extremely small numbers did not meet expectations upon which the original study design was based.

As stated in the previous section, 14 initial survey respondents reported being assisted at the time of the crime by the CIT and 21 respondents reported receiving assistance after the crime from the CIT. For the same sample, seven initial survey respondents reported receiving assistance at the time of the crime from the EYE and four reported receiving assistance from the EYE after the crime occurred. When the self-reports of these individuals were matched with the police report information, there was a lack of congruence. Specifically, none of the individuals who reported receiving assistance from the CIT on the initial survey actually did, and only two actually received assistance from the EYE. In addition, none of the seven or four individuals who reported receiving assistance from the EYE on the initial survey actually did, according to program records. As discussed previously, these discrepancies could either be due to erroneous self-reports, or alternatively, to incomplete record keeping by service providers.

Services provided to victims at the crime scene by the CIT and EYE, as recorded by the agencies, included referrals (7), hotline information (4), counseling (3), basic necessities (2), explanation of medical procedures (2), explanation of police procedures (2), interpreter services (2), temporary restraining orders (2), other services (2), assistance with the court process (1), advocacy with outside agencies (1), education (1), and support group meeting information (1) (not shown).

The most frequently provided service by law enforcement at the crime scene, received by 390 victims, was information regarding options during domestic violence situations according to police reports (not shown). Such a large number of individuals reflects the proportion of domestic violence victims in the study sample. Other services provided by law enforcement at the scene included temporary restraining orders (29), interpreter services (24), transportation (13), other services (11), referrals (6), explanation of police procedures (3), counseling (2), explanation of medical procedures (2), case information (1), and health care (1) (not shown).

According to official records, 24 percent of the initial sample received some form of assistance after the crime (not shown). The majority of these individuals were contacted by the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program (66%). Official reports also showed that 25 percent were contacted by law enforcement and three percent were contacted by volunteers from the EYE.
Follow-up services provided by the EYE and the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program included hotline information (82), referrals (75), assistance completing forms (62), case information (42), assistance with the court process (40), counseling (37), emergency shelter (11), other services (7), interpreter services (6), advocacy with outside agencies (5), education (3), temporary restraining orders (3), transportation (3), support group information (2), and psychological services (1). Follow-up services provided by law enforcement included other services (27), temporary restraining orders (18), case information (17), referrals (8), explanation of police procedures (4), counseling (2), domestic violence information (1), support group information (1), and transportation (1) (not shown).

FINANCIAL LOSS AND ASSISTANCE

Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the follow-up sample reported experiencing some type of financial loss associated with victimization. When these 195 individuals were asked about the nature of the loss, 43 percent said they had lost wages, 43 percent lost property, 39 percent had incurred medical expenses, 16 percent had counseling costs, 13 percent legal costs, and five percent funeral or burial costs. Eight percent (8%) reported other losses, including time, money stolen, transportation, credit, bail, and costs associated with moving (not shown).

Only one in three (32%) of the 183 individuals who responded to the question regarding reimbursement received said they had received some assistance in dealing with these costs (not shown). Approximately one-half (49%) were reimbursed through insurance. Others received help from state agencies (20%), local agencies (17%), and federal agencies (15%). Forty-six percent (46%) reported that all of their costs had been covered. Of the additional 24 individuals whose costs were not covered in full, the mean covered was 61 percent.

SERVICES NEEDED AND NOT RECEIVED

According to Maguire (1992), when victims are asked to state their unmet needs, there is a large degree of variability in their responses, attributable to the type of technique used to elicit their answer as well as when the question is asked. For the current study, victims were asked a close-ended question on the initial survey and follow-up interview regarding the presence of unmet needs after they had already answered questions regarding services they had received.

At the time of the initial survey, 44 percent of the follow-up sample (the subset of the initial sample who also responded to the follow-up interview) said they had unmet needs. For the follow-up interview, 38 percent of the follow-up respondents said that they had unmet needs, a six percent decrease from approximately five months earlier. Because the most appropriate comparison for this data is between the same sample of individuals over time, only responses from the follow-up sample are presented for both the initial survey and follow-up interview in Table 6.5. The responses for the entire initial sample on the initial survey did not differ by more than three percent for any given response, and only differed on average by one percent.
### Table 6.5

**SERVICES NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED BY VICTIMS**

*Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview*

*Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993 and 1994*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Initial Survey</th>
<th>Follow-Up Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Information</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations From Police</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance With Court Proceedings</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Services</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy With Outside Agencies</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Necessities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline Information</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance With Claim Forms</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations of Medical Procedures</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (Clean-Up, Repair)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter Services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Groups</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Information</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Survey</th>
<th>Follow-Up Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.*

As Table 6.5 shows, the most common unmet needs for both time periods included the need for case information, counseling, and financial assistance. It is worth noting that while case information was among the most frequently received services, it was also the most frequently cited unmet need, either because some did not get any information, or others did not think the amount received was sufficient.
Other victims responding to the initial survey expressed a need for explanations from police, assistance with court proceedings, education, psychiatric services, advocacy with outside agencies, basic necessities, health care, transportation, hotline information, assistance with claim forms, child care, explanations of medical procedures, emergency shelter, other services such as clean-ups and repairs (a closed-ended option), and interpreter services. Other needed services, cited by less than five percent of respondents on the initial survey, included alcohol and other drug treatment, funeral or burial services, and other services not offered as choices on the close-ended questions (insurance or disability, police protection, better treatment, and getting property back).

When the responses of the follow-up sample are compared at the time of the initial survey and six months later at follow-up, the need for case information increased slightly (2%), as did the need for assistance with claim forms (7%), emergency shelter (3%), and interpreter services (1%). Support groups was a need offered as a closed-ended choice on the follow-up interview, but not the initial survey, and legal information was an unmet need offered by individuals on the follow-up interview when asked if there were any unmet needs not offered as choices. All other needs either stayed the same, or decreased over time.

A question was included on the follow-up interview asking respondents who reported the presence of unmet needs if they were aware of the existence of services which could have met these needs. One-half of the respondents (50%) reported knowing that there were services available to help them, while one-half (50%) did not know this help was available. This lack of knowledge suggests not only the importance of providing victims with information and referrals, even when a need for it is not immediately expressed, but also the critical importance that timing may play when sharing this information. Perhaps immediately after a victimization, a victim, still in shock, is not in the best state of mind to make the best use of resources and outreach efforts should be continuing in nature, or delayed to a later time.

HELPFULNESS OF ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES

Individuals who reported receiving assistance or services on the initial survey were asked to rate how helpful it was. To reiterate, "assistance" was defined as contact from another individual, other than law enforcement, who offered to help the victim either at the time of or after the crime. "Receiving services" referred to specific forms of assistance, regardless of the provider. These initial survey respondents who received assistance were asked if it was helpful or not by rating the helpfulness on a three-point scale, which included the choices of "very helpful," "helpful," and "not helpful." The "very helpful" and "helpful" responses were combined and compared to the "not helpful" responses.

The follow-up interview respondents were also asked to rate the helpfulness of the services received in response to their victimization (no questions were included on the follow-up interview regarding assistance received). The same three-point scale used on the initial survey was utilized with the "very helpful" and "helpful" responses combined and compared to the "not helpful" responses.
Helpfulness of Assistance Received by the Initial Sample

A very high percentage of respondents expressed appreciation for the assistance they received. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the initial sample said that the person offering assistance at the time of the crime helped them, compared to 65 percent of initial survey respondents who said that the person offering assistance after the crime was helpful. As Table 6.6 shows, when asked how assistance both at the time of the crime and after was helpful, the most commonly cited response for both types of assistance was that the person offered emotional support (47% and 50%). For example, one victim expressed her appreciation for the counseling she received, stating that "it made me feel that I was not the only one this happened to." This finding is consistent with research by Billings and Moose (1985; cited in Greenberg and Ruback, 1992) which suggests that emotional support has the strongest impact on psychological well-being.

Perhaps not surprising, protection and someone ending the crime incident were the second most frequently given reasons for why assistance at the time of the crime was helpful (23%). Approximately one in five respondents (22%) also appreciated the information and referrals they received at the time of the crime, 13 percent mentioned the general assistance, 13 percent the first aid, and three percent legal action related to the incident (i.e., filing of charges, receiving a restraining order against the suspect). The value of referrals is best illustrated through the thoughts of an actual victim, "...I felt supported because I knew [the referrals are] out there. I didn’t have to look for help because I had the numbers if I needed them."

Receiving information and referrals was also cited by approximately one-half (48%) of the initial sample respondents when asked how assistance after the crime was helpful, suggesting that providing information may be most useful after the victim receives the emotional support he or she needs. Other explanations for how assistance after the crime was helpful included the fact that general assistance was useful, as were first aid, legal action, and protection, each cited by six percent or less of respondents.

Table 6.6

HOW ASSISTANCE WAS HELPFUL TO VICTIMS
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance Provided</th>
<th>At Crime</th>
<th>After Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/Ended</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Referrals</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assistance</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
Respondents were also asked how the assistance received, both at the time of and after the crime, could have been more helpful (not shown). For those assisted at the time of the crime who answered the question, 67 percent said that nothing could have been improved; 65 percent of those receiving assistance after the crime felt that nothing could have been better. Of the remaining individuals who felt there was room for improvement (27 regarding assistance at the time of the crime and 29 regarding assistance after the incident), some wished that the suspect had been prosecuted (19% and 21%, respectively), that the assistance had arrived more promptly (15% and 3%), that they had received information and referrals (11% and 14%), that the person providing assistance had been more personable (11% and 79%), that they had received follow-up (11% and 17%), that they had more information regarding case status (7% and 10%), that they had received financial assistance (7% and 3%), and other ways (15% and 21%). In addition, 19 percent of those receiving assistance at the time of the crime wished that they had received better medical treatment and three percent of those who received assistance after the crime felt they should have been taken more seriously.

Helpfulness of the Services Received by the Initial Sample

An even greater percentage of initial survey respondents agreed that the services they received were helpful. Again, services referred to specific forms of assistance received, regardless of the service provider. Eighty-eight percent (88%) said that these services received at the time of the crime were very helpful or helpful. Of the individuals who rated the services they received after the crime, 86 percent rated them as very helpful or helpful.

When asked why these services were helpful, the most common reason was that the service was good or useful (61%) (not shown). Others appreciated the knowledge they gained (21%), the referrals (9%), the case information (8%), and the compassion of the service provider (6%). Other reasons, reported by five percent or less of respondents, included the arrest of the suspect, assistance with paperwork, and the fact the abuse stopped.

Fifty-two individuals cited reasons for their negative ratings of the services received. While 13 of the individuals said that the services received were not helpful because they provided nothing the individual felt he or she needed, eight felt they got the run-around. As one victim shared, "Even if I call, they keep passing me on to other extensions and I never reach [any]one." Another victim said that "I feel like I'm being given the run around. The police don't call me back. They don't respond to me." Other respondents noted their dissatisfaction with the police department (7), the need for better referrals (7), the lack of promptness in the delivery of services (5), a service provider who did not want to help him or her (5), an insensitive service provider (5), the release of the suspect from custody (3), the difficulty in obtaining the services (3), and complained that they still had the problem (3).
Helpfulness of the Services Received by the Follow-Up Sample

An equally high percentage of the follow-up sample (responding to the follow-up interview) felt that the services they received pertaining to the crime, in the six months after the incident, were very helpful or helpful. Of the 88 percent of individuals who said the services were very helpful or helpful, the most common reason given for this rating was that the victim received referrals, information, and options (50%) (not shown). According to Harris (1984), assistance programs for crime victims not only alleviate some of the more direct impact of victimization, but also indirect consequences by making services available to victims even if they may not need them. In addition, 35 percent of the follow-up sample appreciated the emotional support they received, 12 percent the general assistance, seven percent the advice, six percent the generally good treatment they received, six percent assistance with the legal process (i.e., assistance obtaining a restraining order, court accompaniment), five percent that the service changed their own behavior (i.e., how to deal with potential conflict, self-defense, crime prevention), and four percent the case information. The importance of support in assisting victims is shown through the response of one victim when explaining the value of the services received, “I couldn’t have made it through without it. The hotlines are incredible, supportive, and well informed ... They told me their own stories and it was important for me to know that this can happen to anyone...”

The 23 individuals who rated the services received as not helpful reported that the information was not useful (6), that they did not receive enough services (6), they received the wrong type of service (6), they were upset they did not get financial reimbursement (3), or felt that they did not need the services (3).

WHAT WAS MOST HELPFUL TO CRIME VICTIMS

What Was Most Helpful Overall For Victims

On both survey instruments, victims were asked what was most helpful to them in the aftermath of the crime. Table 6.7 presents initial survey responses to this question for the follow-up sample (the subset of individuals who completed the follow-up interview), and the follow-up sample responses to the follow-up interview. Again, because the most useful comparison is over time, the responses of the entire initial sample to the initial survey is excluded from this table. The initial sample as a whole and the subset of individuals who were contacted for follow-up did not provide different answers to this question. Specifically, none of the percentages differed by more than three percent by group, and the mean difference was one percent.

It should be noted that a rather large proportion of respondents chose not to reply to this question on the initial survey, perhaps because they were unsure of an answer. Only 65 percent of the follow-up sample answered this question on the initial survey, and of these 12 percent of these respondents said that nothing was helpful. The response rate for the question on the follow-up interview was considerably higher, explaining the discrepancy between the number of respondents across time. Eighty-seven percent (87%) answered this question on the follow-up interview, and only six percent of respondents said that nothing was helpful (either because of the survey method or their opinions had changed over time).
At the time of the initial survey, friends and neighbors, the individual's own actions, and family members were most frequently rated as most helpful by respondents (Table 6.7). Others cited the helpfulness of the police officer or detective, other individuals who provided assistance (medical personnel, victim programs, attorneys, employers), emotional support they received, legal action (filing of charges, restraining orders), other things, information and referrals, and other criminal justice staff.

When comparing the responses of the follow-up sample at the time of the initial survey to their responses six months later at the follow-up interview, some interesting patterns emerge. First, police officers and detectives were cited by 45 percent of the respondents as being most helpful, triple the percentage citing law enforcement personnel on the initial survey. Secondly, family members were also cited by a greater percentage of individuals as time passed, while friends were cited by roughly the same percentage of respondents (21%). As one victim stated, “family, friends ... were there for me from day one until now.” Third, only four individuals said that their own actions were most helpful, a considerable decrease from approximately the quarter of respondents who gave this response on the initial survey.

### Table 6.7

**WHAT WAS MOST HELPFUL TO VICTIMS**

 Initial Victims' Survey and Follow-Up Victims' Interview  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
<th>Follow-Up Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Survey</td>
<td>Follow-Up Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Neighbors</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/Own Actions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer/Detective</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Offering Assistance</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ways</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Referrals</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criminal Justice Staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE:* "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
The follow-up sample was additionally asked the reason that someone or something was rated as "most helpful" (not shown). More than one-half (62%) of respondents said their rating was based upon the receipt of emotional support, explaining in part the decreasing percentages citing their own actions as being most helpful. In addition, 23 percent appreciated the information they received, 11 percent each noted the safety provided or the needed service that was received, ten percent the good service received, and eight percent each that justice was served and the fact the person was nice and courteous.

What Was Most Helpful During Specific Time Periods

Follow-up interview respondents were asked what was most helpful on the day of the incident, within a month of the incident, and after a month had passed since the incident. Again, many respondents chose not to answer these questions. Fifty-five percent (55%) answered what was most helpful on the day of the incident and what was most helpful after a month had passed since the incident, and 54 percent answered what was most helpful within a month of the incident. In addition, of those who answered the question, 16 percent said nothing was helpful on the day of the incident, 41 percent within a month of the incident, and 57 percent after a month had passed since the incident. These increasing percentages suggest either that needs decreased over time, or alternatively, that support and other services dropped off over time while it was still needed.

Table 6.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT WAS MOST HELPFUL TO VICTIMS DURING SPECIFIC TIME PERIODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Victims' Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer/Detective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Offering Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criminal Justice Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
As Table 6.8 shows, on the day of the incident, police officers and detectives were cited most frequently as being most helpful (65%), followed by others offering assistance (20%) (legal clinics, firemen, health insurance, victim groups, the CIT, medical personnel, shelter providers, and attorneys). After the day of the incident, there was less consensus regarding what was most helpful. Twenty-three percent (23%) said police officers and detectives were most helpful within a month after the incident, 23 percent the emotional support, and 22 percent cited other criminal justice staff (a Deputy District Attorney, court staff, the DA’s Victim-Witness Assistance Program). After a month had passed, emotional support was cited by 32 percent of respondents, other criminal justice staff by 22 percent, and others offering assistance by 18 percent. Other forms of assistance cited by six percent or less of respondents included information and referrals, legal action, friends and neighbors, family, and other things. An unanswered question remains regarding why family and friends/neighbors were cited so frequently when asked what was most helpful, overall, but were cited so infrequently when probed regarding specific time periods.

Table 6.9

REASONS FOR HELPFULNESS DURING SPECIFIC TIME PERIODS
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day of Incident</th>
<th>Within Month After Incident</th>
<th>More Than Month After Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Protection</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Referrals</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful/Needed Service</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Prompt Service</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice/Courteous Service</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 151 105 77

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

As Table 6.9 shows, when asked the reasons that someone or something was most helpful, the responses also varied as a function of the time period the service was received. On the day of the incident, 34 percent appreciated the safety and protection they received, 27 percent the information and referrals, 23 percent the receipt of a needed and useful service, 21 percent the emotional support, 9 percent the promptness with which the service was received, and 7 percent the courtesy they received on the part of the service provider. Within a month of the incident, receiving information and referrals (44%) and emotional support (38%) were the most...
frequently given reasons for helpfulness ratings. After a month had passed since the incident, these two reasons remained the most frequently cited by respondents for why a service was most helpful. The increasing proportion rating emotional support as most helpful as time progresses again highlights the long-term detrimental emotional and psychological impact of violence.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE RECEIPT OF SERVICES

Previous researchers have suggested that certain factors may be related to receiving services after a crime incident (i.e., Friedman, 1982, cited in Ellison, Ganger, Quigley, and Rosenberger, 1986). To test these claims and other hypotheses, significance tests were done to determine if any victim or crime characteristics were related to the receipt of assistance at the time of or after the crime for the initial sample, and the receipt of services and presence of unmet needs for both samples.

Table 6.10

MEASURES OF ASSISTANCE, SERVICES, AND NEEDS AND POSSIBLE PREDICTIVE FACTORS

MEASURES OF ASSISTANCE, SERVICES, AND NEEDS

Assistance At Time of Crime (Initial Sample)
Assistance After Crime (Initial Sample)
Receiving Services (Initial and Follow-Up Samples)
Presence of Unmet Needs (Initial and Follow-Up Samples)

POSSIBLE PREDICTIVE FACTORS

Victim Gender
Victim Ethnicity
Victim Educational Level
Relation to Suspect
Victim Injury
Prior Victimization
Perception That Life Was Threatened
Victim Age
Crime Type
Only those factors which were significantly related to one of the measures in Table 6.10 are discussed. The following summarizes the results. Those most likely to receive assistance from others included:

- victims attacked by a stranger
- individuals injured during an attack
- those who perceived their life had been threatened.

The following were significantly more likely to report that they received services related to the crime:

- females
- individuals who continued their education after high school
- those victimized by someone they knew
- victims of sexual assault.

Those most likely to report the presence of unmet needs included:

- Hispanic victims and victims of "other" ethnicities
- individuals who had experienced prior victimization
- individuals between the ages of 35 and 49
- those who were injured
- those who perceived that their life had been threatened.

**Victim Gender**

The subject's sex was significantly related to the receipt of services (i.e. different types of help) for both the initial and follow-up samples. As Figure 6.1 shows, initial sample females (500) were significantly more likely to report they received services (74%) compared to male victims (66%) (198). For the follow-up sample, 67 percent of females (231) received services compared to 55 percent of males (95). While this finding may be explained by the disproportionate number of females who were victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in the follow-up sample, crime type was not significantly related to these measures for the initial sample.

**Victim Ethnicity**

Victim's ethnicity was significantly related to the presence of unmet needs for the initial sample (not shown). Hispanic victims (165) and victims of "other" ethnicities (16) were most likely to report that they had needs which were not met (53% and 56%, respectively), compared to 40 percent of White victims (336), 34 percent of Asian victims (29), and 33 percent of Black victims (123). Significance tests were then done to determine if there was any difference across ethnicities in the types of unmet needs victims reported. Table 6.11 presents those unmet needs which were reported by significantly different proportions of victims of different ethnicities. Funeral and burial services were most often cited as an unmet need by members of "other" ethnicities, child care by Asian victims, educational services by Black victims, and explanations of medical procedures by Hispanic victims and victims of "other" ethnicities.
Figure 6.1
RECEIVING SERVICES BY GENDER
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

Table 6.11
VICTIMS’ UNMET NEEDS BY ETHNICITY
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim Ethnicity</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funeral/Burial Services</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain Medical Procedures</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS: 41, 10, 136, 87, 9

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included.
Victim Educational Level

A victim's education was also significantly related to receiving services (i.e., different forms of help) for the initial sample (not shown). Individuals who continued their education after high school graduation were significantly more likely to receive services (78%) (335) compared to those who were high school graduates or who dropped out before graduation (66%) (358). This finding tentatively supports previous research suggesting that victims with limited education are less likely to get all the help they need. The hypothesis that receiving services was due to knowledge was tested indirectly by determining if educational level was related to knowledge of the availability of services to meet unmet needs. Forty-seven percent (47%) of those who ended their education at or before high school graduation said they had knowledge of services to meet their needs, compared to 53 percent of those who continued their education after high school. This result tentatively suggests that something else other than knowledge may be playing a part in who receives services and who does not.

Relation to Suspect

The relationship between the victim and suspect was significantly related to assistance at the time of the crime (i.e., specific individuals offering help), assistance after the crime, and receipt of services (i.e., different forms of help) for the initial sample.

Those victims not previously acquainted with the suspect were significantly more likely to receive assistance, both at the time of the crime and after the crime. As Figure 6.2 shows, 34 percent of individuals victimized by a stranger (141) received assistance at the time of the crime, compared to 20 percent of those victimized by someone they knew (524). After the crime, 40 percent of those victimized by a stranger (139) received assistance, compared to 25 percent of those who knew their assailant (517). Interestingly, however, this pattern was reversed for services received. As Figure 6.3 shows, individuals who knew their assailant were significantly more likely to report that they received services (75%) (522) compared to those victimized by a stranger (66%) (134).

Perhaps victimizations by strangers are more likely to occur in situations with greater opportunity for others to offer assistance, explaining the higher percentage of victims attacked by a stranger reporting they received assistance. The finding that individuals who know their assailant are more likely to report receiving services may be related to the fact that individuals victimized by someone they know are more likely to be repeated victims of violence. That is, they may have greater knowledge available to them. However, as a later section will show, prior victimization was not significantly related to reports of receiving services.
Figure 6.2
ASSISTANCE AT TIME OF AND AFTER CRIME BY SUSPECT RELATION
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

![Bar chart showing assistance at crime and after crime by suspect relation.]

Figure 6.3
RECEIPT OF SERVICES BY SUSPECT RELATION
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

![Bar chart showing receipt of services by suspect relation.]
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Victim Injury

Being injured during the crime was significantly associated with assistance at the time of the crime (i.e., specific individuals offering help), assistance after the crime, and the perceived need for other services for the initial sample. As Figures 6.4 and 6.5 show, those who were injured were more likely to receive assistance at the crime (27%) (436), receive assistance after the crime (31%) (430), and to report that they needed services they did not receive (49%) (405). On the other hand, those who were not injured were less likely to receive assistance at (17%) (242) or after the crime (20%) (238), or to report that they need unreceived services (29%) (235).

Prior Victimization

In a 1990 study, Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer found through random phone calls to violent crime victims, victims of non-violent crimes, and non-victims that the need for assistance was greater when recent victimization followed other victimization experiences. For the initial sample in the current study, individuals who experienced criminal victimization in the past were, in fact, significantly more likely to report that they needed services they did not receive. While 36 percent of individuals who had just experienced their first victimization (357) said they had unmet needs, one-half (50%) of those who had been previously victimized reported unmet needs (307) (not shown). This finding, which supports previous research, suggests either that there may be some additive effect of continuing victimization, or that individuals who are victims of repeated victimization are less likely to seek or receive the help they need.
Perception That Life Was Threatened

Initial survey respondents who perceived that their life had been threatened were also significantly more likely to both receive assistance (i.e., specific individuals offering help) at the time of the crime and to feel that not all needs were met (Figures 6.6 and 6.7). Twenty-seven percent (27%) of individuals who felt their life was threatened (430) reported receiving assistance compared to 17 percent of those who did not share this perception. In addition, while approximately one-half (48%) of the individuals who felt their life had been threatened reported having unmet needs (406), only 28 percent of those who did not feel this threat had occurred (218) noted the same. As discussed previously, there is a high correlation between being injured during a victimization and perceiving that one's life has been threatened. In addition, both have been shown to be related to the presence of unfulfilled needs, suggesting which victims are in most need of assistance from service providers: injured victims in fear for their life.
Figure 6.6
ASSISTANCE AT TIME OF CRIME BY LIFE THREATENED
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

Figure 6.7
PRESENCE OF UNMET NEEDS BY LIFE THREATENED
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993
Victim Age

For the follow-up sample, the age of the victim was significantly related to self-reported unmet needs (not shown). Specifically, victims between the ages of 35 and 49 were most likely to report unmet needs (49%) (94), followed by victims 25 to 34 (38%) (125), and those under the age of 25 (34%). Those 50 and over were least likely to report unmet needs (20%) (30). Victim age and crime type were significantly related, but not in a way which could easily explain the above finding. That is, 35 to 49 year olds were not significantly more likely to be victims of any particular crime. Therefore, the relationship between age and reporting unmet needs was not confounded by crime type, a possible explanation for this finding.

Crime Type

Crime type was a significant predictor of whether or not a victim of the follow-up sample reported receiving services (not shown). Ninety percent (90%) of sexual assault victims reported receiving some type of service pertaining to the crime (20), compared to 66 percent of domestic violence victims (185), 57 percent of homicide survivors and witnesses (14), and 54 percent of assault victims (107).

Relationship of Receipt of Assistance and Service to Unmet Needs

As an additional analysis, individuals who reported receiving or not receiving assistance (or services) were compared to one another to determine if one group was more or less likely to report the presence of unmet needs. While the receipt of assistance, either at the time of or after the crime did not predict the presence of unmet needs, the receipt of services did. Specifically, members of the initial sample who did not receive services (184) were significantly more likely to predict unmet needs (51%) compared to individuals who had received services (39%) (472).

This finding is interesting for both theoretical and applied reasons because both it and the alternative (that individuals who did not receive services did not have unmet needs) offer important implications to service providers and others who work with victims. That is, those who report unmet needs are not individuals who receive services and merely have an unusual high level of need compared to other victims. Rather, it appears that victims are not receiving needed services and that outreach efforts are worthwhile and should perhaps be expanded.

SUMMARY

Previous research has suggested that victims attach differing levels of importance to services received subsequent to victimization. For the current study, members of the initial and follow-up samples were asked questions regarding the assistance and services they received, how helpful these were, and what needs were still unmet.
Approximately one-quarter of the initial sample reported receiving assistance at the time of and after the crime from someone other than a law enforcement officer. At the time of the crime, individuals in the position to offer medical assistance, such as paramedics and hospital medical staff, were those most frequently cited as giving assistance. After the crime, the DA’s Victim-Witness Assistance Program was cited by the greatest percentage of victims as offerers of assistance.

Members of both samples were also asked which services they received. Services pertained to specific forms of assistance, such as case information, referrals, or counseling, regardless of the provider. Seventy-four percent (74%) of the initial sample reported receiving services either at the time of the crime or after, and 63 percent of the follow-up sample said they received some services pertaining to the victimization. The most frequently received services for respondents included explanations from police, referrals, and case information. For the follow-up sample, police officers were cited most frequently as the provider of these services. Approximately one in five of the follow-up sample who received services continued to receive services six months after the incident occurred. Information gathered from police and program reports showed that, while a large percentage of individuals was assisted by law enforcement, only two percent of the initial sample actually received services from the CIT or EYE. The fact that all victims who report their victimization to law enforcement come into contact with a police officer highlights the potential and important role they could have in helping meet the needs of victims. Because so few individuals are reached by programs, law enforcement could serve as a bridge to additional support and informational networks outside the victim’s immediate circle of friends and family.

Over one-half of all victims indicated that all of their needs had been fulfilled. Both initial and follow-up respondents reported the greatest need was for case information, counseling, and financial assistance. Case information was one of the most frequently provided services as well as one of the most common needs.

Sixty-five percent (65%) or more rated the assistance and services they received as helpful for both samples. The provision of emotional support was noted as the most important feature of helpful assistance at the time of the crime incident. Helpfulness ratings for assistance after the crime and services received generally pertained more to the information gained. When victims were asked what was most helpful, friends and family were the most common responses for the initial sample, regardless of the fact that they were not cited as often as other providers of assistance or services. For the follow-up sample, police officers were rated as most helpful, followed closely by family members, and then by friends. When asked why these individuals were most helpful, the most common reason was the emotional support they provided.

As a post-hoc analysis, several factors relating to the crime and the victim were tested as predictors of assistance or service receipt, or the presence of unmet needs. For the initial sample, females, individuals who knew their assailant, those who were injured and individuals with higher education were significantly more likely to receive services. Victims who were injured were also more likely to receive assistance at the time of and after the crime, but victims who were previously acquainted with the suspect were significantly less likely to receive
assistance. Individuals who perceived that their life had been threatened were significantly more likely to receive assistance at the time of the crime. Hispanics, members of "other" ethnicities, individuals who felt their life had been threatened, and those who had experienced prior victimization were most likely to report the presence of unmet needs. For the follow-up sample, females were also significantly more likely to receive services, as were victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. In addition, victims between the ages of 35 and 49 were most likely to report the presence of unmet needs.
CHAPTER 7
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UTILIZATION OF FORMAL SERVICES AND AVAILABILITY OF OTHER SOURCES OF SUPPORT

INTRODUCTION

While it appears that a variety of services are available to assist victims, a small percentage of individuals appear to take advantage of them. This lack of service utilization was demonstrated in the current project and had an impact on the research design. As previously explained, while the original project was to be based upon comparisons of individuals assisted by the San Diego Crisis Intervention Team (CIT), the EYE Crisis and Advocacy Team, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program with victims receiving no services, the relatively small number receiving assistance from the first two programs necessitated changes in the study's focus.

Various researchers have examined the reasons why victim support services are not more widely utilized and have suggested that underutilization is due in part to victims (Reiff, 1979), in part to the police (Corbett and Maguire, 1988), and in part to the nature of the services provided (Corbett and Maguire, 1988). Further, in many cases, support from outside agencies may not be necessary because the victim has access to a strong network of family and friends (Skogan, 1978).

A detailed review of this literature is provided in the current chapter and is incorporated into a discussion of possible reasons for formal service underutilization, factors impeding as well as facilitating service delivery, and the availability of social support through informal channels available to the victim.

REASONS FOR UNDERUTILIZATION

A paradox exists in that services are available to victims, but very few individuals utilize them. However, is this truly a paradox? Are researchers and practitioners accurate in assuming that victim needs are unmet, as these survey results suggest, or are needs being met through alternative channels?

In 1979, Reiff emphasized the importance of distinguishing between victim need for services and service utilization. According to Reiff, the staff of the Crime Victims Service Center in New York expected to open their doors and find a crowd of needy victims demanding their services. Instead, they found that a wide gap existed between what victims reported they needed and their willingness and ability to access services. With 22 percent of victims declining referrals they were offered, Reiff hypothesized that apathy, hopelessness, and frustration are learned reactions from previous attempts to utilize services and that any delay in getting help reinforces an already hesitant attitude.
In a more recent study, Maguire (1992) found that many victims are reluctant to ask for help, even when they would accept it if offered directly. A study conducted by Maguire and Corbett (1987; cited in Maguire, 1992) found that over 90 percent of victims visited unannounced by a victim volunteer acted cordially toward the individual, discussed the experience, and requested some form of practical assistance. In contrast, victims responded to written contact in fewer than seven percent of cases. Maguire and Corbett concluded from these findings that "the failure to respond may be due partly to the lack of knowledge about the kinds of services available, partly to inertia or lack of time, and partly to a common aversion to asking for charity" (p. 406).

More direct evidence regarding lack of utilization is offered by Skogan, Davis, and Lurgio (1990; cited in Maguire, 1992). In their study, victims who had failed to respond to an offer of assistance were contacted to determine why communication was not continued. They found that one-half did not reply because they had received the help they needed elsewhere, over one-quarter had no time or transportation to go to the program, and most of the remainder had felt that the program could not help them.

Another possible reason for underutilization of formal services is that barriers exist preventing violent crime victims from accessing them. The 29 service providers surveyed as part of this study were asked a close-ended question regarding this possibility and an overwhelming 92 percent agreed that barriers exist. As Table 7.1 shows, 68 percent felt that it takes too long for services to be delivered, 64 percent noted lack of information as restricting service utilization, 55 percent said the bureaucracy acted as a barrier, 55 percent suggested that transportation problems made programs inaccessible, 50 percent mentioned cultural attitudes about violence prohibiting some individuals from seeking assistance, 32 percent complained that programs target only a limited population, 32 percent believed that expenses related to services limited use, and 18 percent stated that screening criteria for participation were not inclusive enough. Some of these barriers were also recognized by the victims participating in this study, as the following quotes demonstrate.

"The police just handed me a piece of paper with numbers and that wasn't good enough. I didn't know what the numbers were about or what they could do for me."

"... I asked the police about the victim-witness program and they told me to forget it because the program didn't have any more money."

"The prosecutor's office told me about the funds for victims, but they didn't have any of the forms."

"Victims should be contacted because they feel as if no one wants to help and are frightened and ashamed of [the] incident. Therefore, more services should try harder to contact and offer help by speaking directly to victims, not through the mail."
Table 7.1

BARRIERS TO SERVICES
Service Provider Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider Survey</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay Too Great</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance Regarding Service Availability</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Bureaucracy</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Problems for Victims</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibiting Cultural Attitudes</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Limited Populations</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Expensive for Victims</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Standards Too High for Victims</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 22

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

FACTORs FACILITATING AND IMPEDING SERVICE DELIVERY

A number of factors potentially related to service provision for violent crime victims were explored through surveys of service providers, law enforcement officers, and members of the CIT, the EYE, and the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program. These factors include familiarity with available programs by those providing referrals, appreciation and use of these services, agency coordination, the referral process, duplication of services, and availability of services by area, time periods, and cost.

Program Familiarity

Of all the criminal justice representatives, police officers are generally most likely to have contact with victims at some point after the crime incident. Given such a position, these individuals have a unique opportunity to assist victims dealing with the stress and trauma recently experienced. This assistance can take the form of requesting a crisis interventionist or providing referrals for follow-up assistance.

To examine law enforcement knowledge regarding victim assistance programs, a series of questions were included on the police officer survey about program familiarity (not shown). The largest percentage of officers with the San Diego Police Department were familiar with the CIT (76%). Similarly, most officers in the North County were familiar with the EYE (78%). In addition, approximately one-half (51%) of both samples stated they knew about the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program. However, knowledge of other programs offering crisis
intervention and more long-term assistance was considerably less. Only 37 percent of respondents had ever heard of the Women's Resource Center, 36 percent the Center for Community Services, and 12 percent the Trauma Intervention Program (TIP). In addition, when officers who used the CIT or EYE were asked why other officers do not take advantage of these services, 66 percent said they do not think of it or else do not know about the program.

A question was also asked regarding how officers became familiar with either the CIT or the EYE (depending on the officer's jurisdiction) and the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program. Over one-half (57%) of officers reported that they learned about the crisis team during "line-up". Others said that they became familiar with the program during the police academy (40%), through training bulletins (34%), at advanced officer training (25%), on the job (8%), and through other forms of training (3%). Fifty-two percent (52%) of officers learned about the DA's program during the academy, 33 percent during line-up, 29 percent through training bulletins, 17 percent at advanced officers training, and ten percent while working on the job (not shown). According to CIT and EYE program administrators, all the methods of training mentioned on police surveys are used to increase law enforcement awareness of program services. The high proportion receiving information about these programs during "line-up" and the academy suggests that these types of communication are the most memorable and that officer knowledge and use of these programs may be increased through more frequent "in person" communication.

Use and Appreciation of Programs by Law Enforcement

While 73 percent of the San Diego Police officers surveyed reported making referrals to the CIT (an average of 2.5 calls per officer in the previous 12 months) and 85 percent of the North County officers reported making referrals to the EYE (an average of 4.5 calls per officer in the previous 12 months), knowledge of other programs did not guarantee use or referral. Responses showed that only 27 percent of officers had ever made a referral to the Women's Resource Center, 26 percent to the Center for Community Services, 26 percent to the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, and six percent to TIP. Further, as previously mentioned, review of police and program records for the study sample revealed low levels of police referrals to the CIT and EYE programs.

Previous researchers have noted that police may be skeptical of using the services in the most serious cases when help is most needed (Corbett and Maguire, 1988). Law enforcement were asked about the factors influencing their request for a crisis interventionist and the types of prior incidents in which they requested an interventionist (not shown). Seventy-four percent (74%) of respondents said they request assistance when no immediate forms of support are available for the victim, 73 percent called an interventionist when the victim was very emotional, 53 percent determined need based upon the type of crime, and 21 percent responded to victim requests for an interventionist. Officers reported they were most likely to request an interventionist from the CIT or EYE in cases of suicide (45%), SIDS or other natural deaths (44%), and sexual assault (44%). In addition, others reported they would call for crisis intervention in domestic violence or other assault incidents (26%), accidents (16%), robberies (6%), gang-related incidents (4%), hostage situations (3%), and cases involving homeless individuals (3%).
Ninety-six percent (96%) of the officers stated that there were benefits of having the CIT and EYE available. When they were asked to describe these benefits, one-half of respondents (50%) said it was the emotional support offered to victims. Slightly more than one-third (36%) said that having an interventionist present allows the officer to perform other duties. Other benefits mentioned include the expertise in dealing with victims (9%), provision of referrals and information (6%), practical assistance given (6%), immediate counseling (6%), attention to the victim's family and witnesses (5%), and general assistance offered to the police (3%) (not shown).

There was slightly less consensus regarding the benefits of the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, with 80 percent of respondents saying there were benefits and with no one reason being given by more than one-third of respondents. Thirty-one percent (31%) said that the program is generally helpful for victims, 25 percent that financial assistance is available, 23 percent that referrals and information are given, eleven percent that information regarding the criminal justice system is provided, ten percent that emotional support is offered to victims, five percent that it involves victims more in the process, four percent that counseling is offered, four percent that practical assistance is available, and three percent that follow-up service is given (not shown).

**Agency Coordination**

An additional factor which may impede service delivery may be conflicts between those agencies involved. That is, if difficulties in coordination arise, then individuals responsible for initiating contact may be more hesitant to do so in the future. Both law enforcement and service providers were asked questions regarding their interaction with one another as related to violent crime victims.

Of the 382 police officers surveyed who requested an interventionist from the CIT or EYE, only ten percent said they had ever experienced problems coordinating with the individual who arrived. As Table 7.2 shows, coordination conflicts included lengthy response time by the interventionist (39%), pushiness (30%), lack of coordination with the officer (12%), inability to help the victim (9%), an unsupportive or non-responsive volunteer (6%), and incompatibility with the victim (3%). It is interesting to note that the need for rapid response was also listed as a reason some officers may not utilize interventionists, with approximately one-third (31%) of police survey respondents stating that lengthy response time discourages use of the CIT and EYE programs.
Table 7.2

COORDINATION PROBLEMS BETWEEN LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRISIS INTERVENTIONISTS
Law Enforcement Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Time Too Long</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Was a Nuisance</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Coordination</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Help the Victim</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupportive or Non-Responsive</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Different From the Victim</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 33

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Service providers interact with both criminal justice personnel and other service providers as they attempt to assist violent crime victims. Therefore, separate questions were answered by service providers regarding coordination. First, they were asked about their interactions with criminal justice staff. Of the 22 service providers who stated that they coordinate with criminal justice agencies, 36 percent reported having experienced problems at one time or another. When given a list of possible problems, seven individuals said there were limited resources in criminal justice agencies to assist victims, four individuals that criminal justice personnel are difficult to contact, four individuals that language barriers exist for victims as they seek information from justice staff, and three individuals that criminal justice personnel lack concern for the victim. One individual each also said that inappropriate referrals are given, territorial issues arise, and the criminal justice staff are uncooperative (Table 7.3). When asked how these problems could be resolved (not shown), seven individuals agreed that more staff and resources would be helpful, six that better communication was needed, five that efforts should be made to increase knowledge regarding available services among staff, three that there should be a more clear definition of roles, and three that more concern should be shown to the victims.

A greater percentage of service providers reported problems coordinating with other service providers (48%) than the proportion noting problems with the criminal justice system. However, there was slightly less consensus regarding the source of the problems. As Table 7.3 shows, while eleven individuals said limited resources produced problems, less than one-third of respondents cited inappropriate referrals, language barriers, territorial issues, lack of concern for the victim, and difficulty in contacting them as factors leading to coordination problems. When asked how these problems can be resolved (not shown), the overwhelming response was more staff and resources (11 of 12 respondents). In addition, seven said that better communication would help, five a greater knowledge of services, three that there should be more clearly defined roles, and two that more concern should be shown to the victim.
Table 7.3

COORDINATION PROBLEMS BETWEEN SERVICE PROVIDERS AND OTHER AGENCIES
Service Provider Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Criminal Justice Agencies</th>
<th>Other Service Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to Contact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Barriers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Concern for Victims</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Referrals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies are Territorial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies are Uncooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included.*

The 1993 survey of the CIT, EYE, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program also included questions regarding coordination between the respondents and law enforcement, criminal justice agencies, and other community-based agencies. Fifty percent (50%) of the CIT respondents, 76 percent of the EYE, and 81 percent of the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program reported that they coordinated with law enforcement. Of these 49 individuals, seven (across all three programs) felt that problems exist (not shown). Three said that officers are too busy, two complained that officers do not take full advantage of their services, and two were discouraged that forms and reports were incomplete. When asked how these problems could be resolved, one suggested that the police dispatcher should request the volunteer directly, two felt that administration should show more support, and one said officers should take more effort in following instructions on relevant forms.

Sixty-two percent (62%) of the CIT, 36 percent of the EYE, and 75 percent of the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program reported they coordinate with other criminal justice agencies (not shown). Of these 43 individuals, only three staff members with the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program felt that problems exist. Two said that these agencies are uncooperative and one felt that there was a lack of concern for the victim. Only one individual offered a solution: think more of the victim.
Forty-seven percent (47%) of the CIT, 73 percent of the EYE, and 60 percent of the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program respondents said that they coordinate with community agencies (not shown). Eight of these 40 individuals reported problems in this coordination. Three individuals said that they had experienced difficulty reaching the programs, and one each cited the length of time it took for these programs to respond, language barriers, territorial disputes, and inappropriate referrals. When asked how the situation could be resolved, two said that the individual who responds should be changed, two expressed the need for more resources, and one each reported the need for better communication, a more clear definition of roles, and the need to educate all parties involved regarding services available.

**Referral Procedures**

Closely related to problems in coordination is satisfaction with how referrals are made. The service providers surveyed were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the referral procedures used by agencies from whom they received referrals. This rating was done on a five-point scale where "1" represented very satisfied, "2" satisfied, "3" neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, "4" dissatisfied, and "5" satisfied. The ratings of "very satisfied" and "satisfied" were combined and are presented in Table 7.4.

The majority of respondents reported receiving referrals from other community-based organizations (69%) (Table 7.4). Others reported referrals from hospitals (59%), law enforcement officers (59%), religious organizations (48%), and the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program (48%). Other referral sources, cited by approximately one-third or less of respondents, included the EYE, judges, CIT, the Public Defender, the Trauma Intervention Program, prosecutors, and paramedics.

As Table 7.4 shows, more than one-half of all individuals who received referrals from a given source were satisfied with the process. However, only hospitals received a perfect rating of satisfaction, suggesting that there is room for improvement.

**Duplication of Services**

Another question of interest pertained to duplication of services in the San Diego region. Members of the CIT, EYE, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, as well as service providers, were asked if they thought services were being duplicated by different agencies and if this led to problems in how well victims were served.
Table 7.4

SATISFACTION WITH REFERRAL PROCEDURES
Service Provider Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Source</th>
<th>Percent Receiving Referrals</th>
<th>Percent Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community-Based Organizations</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Intervention Program</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organizations</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYE</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedics</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego CIT</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 29 5 - 20

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included.
Percentages based upon multiple responses.

Overall, 41 percent of service providers felt that services are being duplicated (not shown). Of these 12 individuals, seven offered their insight into which services were duplicated. Five individuals said counseling was duplicated, five noted emergency shelter, five stated support groups, and four listed the provision of basic necessities. In addition, three each said interpreter services, hotlines, and psychiatric services; two each said advocacy, educational services, public awareness, health care, child care, alcohol and other drug treatment, conflict resolution, job assistance, and other types of services; and one each said the provision of case information, court accompaniment, and claims assistance. Four of ten individuals who stated that duplication occurs felt that this situation leads to such problems as frustrating the client (3), not distributing resources in the best way possible (2), and frustrating agency personnel (1). It may be worthwhile to examine service duplication in future research to determine if limited capacity of each individual program creates a situation in which multiple programs offering the same services are required to meet demand for services, or if services are unnecessarily duplicated.
Overall, 40 percent of the respondents to the 1993 CIT/EYE/DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program Survey said that there was duplication of services. Approximately one-half (53%) of 15 respondents felt that this situation did not lead to problems. Of those who said there were problems, three said the circumstances confuse the victim, two that territorialism results, two that agency miscommunication arises, and one that no proper follow-up occurs.

**Availability of Programs to Victims**

Other factors possibly impeding service delivery pertain to how contact is initially made between the program and the victim, the cost of services to the victim, and the accessibility of services. That is, many people may work and find it difficult to access services during weekdays or in areas far from their homes. Service providers were asked how initial contact with the victim occurred, when services were available, what communities were served, and the cost to victims.

Eighty-two percent (82%) of service providers stated that contact with the program is usually initiated by the victim and 21 percent said that their agency takes responsibility for making first contact (not shown). If victims are truly apathetic or ignorant about assistance and unlikely to actively seek needed services, the fact that most programs require initial contact from the victims suggests that many victims may not be getting the assistance they need.

Thirty-one percent (31%) of the service providers surveyed stated that they operated during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). In addition, 52 percent said they offered services weekday evenings, 38 percent weekend days, seven percent weekend evenings, and 55 percent offered some services 24-hours per day (not shown).

The service providers represented the majority of communities in San Diego region. Approximately one-half (48%) stated that they offered their services countywide and 62 percent stated that they operated in the City of San Diego. Services were provided in smaller jurisdictions by approximately one-third of the programs surveyed (not shown).

Sixty-four percent (64%) of the service providers stated that some of their services are offered at no charge to the victim or witness, 50 percent that their services were offered on a sliding scale, and 39 percent that they offered services under $100. None of the service providers charged more than $100 for any one service.

**AVAILABILITY OF SOCIAL SUPPORT THROUGH INFORMAL CHANNELS**

Various researchers have suggested that individuals who seek mental health services are those who have the fewest informal supports available to them (Steinmetz, 1984; cited in Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer, 1990) and those with strong family networks may expect to experience the least amount of fear and trauma (Skogan, 1977 and van Dijk, 1979; cited in Maguire, 1992). Krupnick and Horowitz (1980; cited in Lurgio and Resick, 1990) and Symonds (1980; cited in Lurgio and Resick, 1990) have found that the support of family and friends is vital to the adjustment of crime victims. Friedman et al. (1982; cited in Lurgio and Resick, 1990) reported that crime victims were more likely to recover from the trauma of the episode with the support of family and friends.
As previously suggested, with one-half of the respondents in Skogan, Davis, and Lurgio's sample reporting that assistance was received elsewhere, it becomes clearer that assistance may be coming from informal, versus formal, channels. However, Coates and Winston (1983; cited in Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer, 1990) have suggested that "naturally occurring social resources, typically useful for coping with stress, may be relatively ineffective in alleviating the distress accompanying victimization" (p. 538). Given these mixed conclusions regarding the usefulness of social support through information channels, the role of family and friends in victim recovery from the trauma of victimization was examined.

**Victim Contact with Friends and Family**

While ten percent of the follow-up sample reported they lived alone, the overwhelming majority reported living with at least one other individual (not shown). Thirty-five percent (35%) said they were living with their spouse at the time of the incident, 19 percent with a significant other, 15 percent with their parent(s), ten percent with another member of their family, and nine percent with a roommate or friend. In addition, 47 percent reported they lived with their own child(ren), and three percent lived with someone else's offspring. Seventy percent (70%) reported that they had family or friends living in the area.

The majority of victims reported that they told the person they lived with about the crime incident (82%) or that they told their friends about it (80%) (not shown). Eight percent (8%) of individuals who said they lived with another person said that this person was the suspect in the crime against them and were removed from this analysis. This small proportion of individuals sharing that they lived with the suspect seems inconsistent with the fact that a large percentage of the sample were domestic violence victims. Due to the methodology involved in this project, there was no way to verify this information.

When asked about the reaction received from roommates and friends on the day of the incident, 90 percent of both groups reported that they were very supportive or supportive. Within a month of the incident, 83 percent said the person they lived with was very supportive or supportive, while 87 percent reported their friends were supportive or very supportive. After a month had passed, 79 percent reported the person they lived with was very supportive or supportive, while 80 percent reported their friends were supportive or very supportive. Forty-one percent (41%) of victims reported that their family and friends encouraged them to seek help (not shown).

**Relationship of Family and Friends to Victim Coping**

To further explore the role that family and friends play in coping after victimization, a number of related factors and their relationship were examined. Table 7.5 lists measures of coping ability, as well as the factors examined as potentially related to post-victimization adjustment. Having friends or family in the area, a roommate's reaction to the incident (on the day of, within a month of, or after a month had passed since the incident), and friends' reactions on the day of the incident were not significantly related to any of the measures and, therefore, will not be included in the discussion further.
Table 7.5

CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION REACTION MEASURES AND POSSIBLE RELATED FACTORS
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

MEASURES OF CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION REACTION

- Change of Residence (Yes/No)
- Absence from Work (Yes/No)
- Lifestyle Changes (Number)
- Emotional Problems and Reactions (Number)

POSSIBLE RELATED FACTORS

- Informing Roommate(s) About the Crime Incident
- Informing Friend(s) About the Crime Incident
- Friends' Reaction Within a Month of the Incident
- Friends' Reaction More than a Month After the Incident
- Encouragement From Friends or Family to Seek Help

Informing Roommate(s) About the Crime Incident. Individuals who failed to inform their roommate(s) about the incident were significantly more likely to move after the crime, compared to those who did share this information (not shown). While 21 percent of those who did tell their roommate(s) about the crime (203) moved, 39 percent of those who did not inform the person(s) they lived with (41) moved. Because the number of individuals failing to communicate this information to roommates is so small, any conclusions based upon this finding should be made with caution.

Informing Friend(s) About the Crime Incident. Victims who told their friends about the incident made a significantly higher amount of lifestyle changes, as well as experienced significantly more emotional problems and reactions (Figure 7.1). Respondents who told their friends about the incident (261) made an average of 4.3 lifestyle changes and reported experiencing an average of 6.3 emotional reactions. Those who did not inform others of the incident (either by choice or necessity) made an average of 2.8 changes and experienced 3.7 reactions and problems. This finding supports research which suggests that the assistance from friends and family may not be adequate to deal with victimization.
Friends' Reaction Within a Month of the Incident. Of the 127 individuals who reported their friends had been very supportive within a month of the crime incident, 64 percent reported that they had missed work because of the crime incident (Figure 7.2). Of the nine individuals who said their friends had been neutral (i.e., neither supportive nor unsupportive), only two individuals (22%) missed work. Of the six individuals who reported that their friends had been unsupportive, five (83%) were absent from work. While these differences were significantly different, due to the discrepancy between the number of individuals in each group, as well as confounding factors possibly inherent in the analysis, these findings may have limited applied value. For instance, for this sample of individuals, it is unknown if individuals with unsupportive friends (or who claim their friends are unsupportive) are somehow different than those with supportive friends.
As Figure 7.3 shows, individuals who claimed that their friends were not supportive (12) were more likely to report making a significantly greater number of lifestyle changes (5.9) than those with supportive or neutral friends. The 217 with supportive friends made an average of 4.5 lifestyle changes, and the 20 respondents with neutral friends noted an average of 2.7 changes in lifestyle following victimization. Similarly, respondents with unsupportive friends experienced an average of 10.3 emotional reactions and problems, while those with supportive friends reported an average of 6.5, and those with neutral friends 5.1.

**Friends' Reaction More Than a Month After the Incident.** The relationship between the reaction of friends and victimization and a victim's ability to cope continues as time passes. Respondents were asked how their friends reacted after one month following the incident. Victims who reported that their friends were unsupportive at this time made significantly more lifestyle changes and experienced significantly more reactions and problems (Figure 7.4). These individuals (13) reported making 5.9 changes and experiencing 10.9 reactions and problems. Those whose friends were supportive (194) made 4.5 changes and experienced 6.6 reactions. Those whose friends were neutral (34) made 3.2 changes and 4.6 reactions.
Figure 7.3
LIFESTYLE CHANGES AND EMOTIONAL REACTIONS
BY FRIENDS’ REACTION WITHIN A MONTH OF THE INCIDENT
Follow-Up Victims’ Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

Figure 7.4
LIFESTYLE CHANGES AND EMOTIONAL REACTIONS
BY FRIENDS’ REACTION A MONTH AFTER THE INCIDENT
Follow-Up Victims’ Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
Encouragement From Friends or Family to Seek Help. Individuals who were encouraged by their friends or family to seek help were also significantly more likely to report that they missed work (Figure 7.5), made a significantly greater number of lifestyle changes, and experienced a significantly greater number of problems and reactions (Figure 7.6).

While 77 percent of those whose friends or family encouraged them to seek help (74) were absent from work, only 44 percent of those who said they did not receive this encouragement (106) were absent. Perhaps those who received encouragement acted on it, necessitating the absence, or alternatively, those most affected by victimization were more likely to receive encouragement. In addition, while those who received encouragement (131) made an average of 5.5 changes and experienced an average of 8.8 reactions, those lacking it (191) made an average of 3.0 changes and experienced an average of 3.8 reactions.

Figure 7.5
ABSENCE FROM WORK BY ENCOURAGEMENT FROM FRIENDS OR FAMILY TO SEEK HELP
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
SUMMARY

The fact that a substantive percentage of victims fail to receive services through formal channels has been examined by various researchers. Some have suggested that apathy is a learned reaction and any delay in service receipt reinforces an already hesitant attitude (Reiff, 1979). Others have discussed the roles that ignorance about available services, lack of time, reluctance to ask for help, availability of assistance through other channels, and lack of appreciation for services may have in underutilization of services (Maguire, 1992). Almost all of the service providers surveyed felt that barriers to services exist and that the primary ones include delays in receiving assistance and ignorance that services are available. This chapter focused on factors related to service delivery.

Law enforcement officers are in a unique position to provide referrals and information to victims. Unfortunately, however, approximately one in four officers was not fully aware of the services available through the CIT and EYE. An even greater percentage were unfamiliar with the DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program and other formal service providers. Further, actual referrals to victim assistance programs were infrequent even though a majority of the respondents believe that these programs are helpful. These findings suggest an opportunity for
increasing law enforcement referrals to services and improving program utilization by expanding police training. Though there was no common training received by all officers, the highest proportion learned about the programs during "line-up" or the academy. The programs use these methods, as well as training bulletins. Since the officers remembered the in-person training more often, expansion of this method with less reliance on written bulletins may increase program referrals.

Agency coordination is another factor contributing to service delivery. One in five, or less, of survey respondents (i.e., CIT, EYE, DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program, law enforcement) reported dissatisfaction with coordination efforts. Service providers expressed the most dissatisfaction, with limited resources being the primary contributor to problems. These service providers were also asked who they received referrals from and how they would rate this process for each referral source. The majority of referrals were from other community agencies, with only 59 percent reporting they ever received referrals from law enforcement agencies. Service providers seemed satisfied with how the referrals were made, with at least 50 percent reporting satisfaction, and the greatest satisfaction being expressed for referrals from hospitals (100%).

Forty percent (40%) of service providers and 41 percent of the CIT, EYE, and DA's Victim-Witness Assistance Program respondents reported that services are duplicated in the San Diego region. Approximately one-half (53%) of these individuals felt that this duplication leads to problems such as confusing the crime victim.

Services in the region appeared to be available to victims in a variety of areas, at a variety of times. In addition, 64 percent of providers reported that some services are available at no charge and one-half said services are available on a sliding scale. Unfortunately, however, four in five said that initial contact was typically initiated by the victim. Relying upon victim initiation is probably one of the largest contributors to underutilization since victims frequently do not know about the services available and are hesitant to seek help from strangers.

The majority of victims in the sample reported having friends and family in the area and that they informed these individuals about the crime incident, as well as those living with them. Previous researchers (i.e., Lurgio and Resick, 1990) have suggested that victims are not only more likely to recover from victimization more quickly with the help of friends, but that their support may be vital to the adjustment of crime victims. Others (i.e., Coates and Winston, 1983, cited in Norris, Kaniasty, and Scheer, 1990) have questioned if social support through informal channels is adequate to meet the unusual needs of victims. These conflicting views were examined through an analysis of data obtained during the interviews with violent crime victims six months after the incident. Specifically, the relationship between having family and friends available, as well as the support they offered, to the ability of an individual to cope with victimization was assessed. Statistical analyses showed that victims who failed to tell the person they lived with about the victimization were more likely to move after the incident. Those who said their friends were unsupportive were likely to miss work, as well as those whose friends and families encouraged them to seek help. Individuals who told their friends about the incident, victims who had unsupportive friends, and those who were encouraged to seek help by their friends and family made significantly more lifestyle changes and experienced significantly more
emotional reactions and problems. While it appears contradictory that individuals who claimed
their friends were unsupportive, as well as those who said their friends and family encouraged
them to seek help, were highly likely to be affected by victimization, lack of random assignment
and an unequal number of individuals in conditions limit the conclusions that can be reached
from these data at this time. However, these findings do support other results reported in the
literature that existing social support systems are often unable to provide the assistance needed
following violent criminal victimization.
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INTRODUCTION

Elias (1986) has characterized victims as the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system. Not only are they responsible for reporting their victimizations, but without their cooperation, arrest, prosecution, and conviction may not be possible (Spelman and Brown, 1981; cited in Skogan, Lurgio, and Davis, 1990). However, while their participation is vital, often when victims come forward to seek resolution and justice, they find a system that fails to protect them, treats them with indifference, and inflicts a "second injury" upon them (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1985).

A good deal of research has been published documenting how well victims are treated by the criminal justice system (i.e., Lurgio and Resick, 1990), the importance of their involvement in the justice process (i.e., Cannavale and Falcon, 1976, cited in Davis, 1987a), their satisfaction with law enforcement (i.e., Brandl and Horvath, 1991) and other criminal justice representatives (i.e., Wemmers, 1993), and how this satisfaction is related to their level of cooperation and plans for future participation (i.e., Davis, 1987a).

This chapter presents information regarding the case outcomes for the sample of individuals who completed the follow-up interview, both through self-reported knowledge and through official case records. Victim satisfaction with the criminal justice process and factors related to this satisfaction are also examined through interviews of victims and law enforcement officers.

CASE OUTCOME

Case Outcome According to Victims

The follow-up sample was asked about their knowledge of how the crime incident was resolved. Specifically, questions were included on the follow-up victims' interview, which was administered approximately six months after the crime incident, regarding whether an arrest was made, progress through the system, and, if conviction occurred, what sentence the suspect received.

Figure 8.1 shows the flow of follow-up sample cases through the criminal justice system, according to victim knowledge. Forty-nine percent (49%) of respondents said that someone had been arrested for the crime incident. Of those 151 cases in which an arrest had been made, 22 percent were unaware of the final case outcome. Of those who did have access to this
information, 58 percent reported that the defendant had pled guilty or was convicted in court, 22 percent that the case had been dropped or dismissed, and five percent that the defendant had received diversion as an alternative to prosecution. Twelve percent (12%) reported that the case was still pending, and three percent that the military was resolving the situation.

Victims who reported that the suspect had pled guilty or was convicted were asked to share sentencing information. Ninety-four percent (94%) of these 69 individuals responded to this question. The most commonly received sentence was a jail or prison term, reported by 57 percent of respondents. Probation was ordered in 46 percent of the cases, counseling or treatment in 42 percent, and restitution in 15 percent. Twenty-two percent (22%) reported some other type of sentence had been given, such as required payments to the Crime Victims' Fund, community service, or work furlough. Of the ten victims who reported the suspect in the case had been ordered to pay restitution, only two reported that they had actually received any payments.

In addition to asking victims about their knowledge of the actual sentence, a close-ended question was included on the interview regarding what they wished would happen to the suspect (not shown). The most common sentence requested, by 55 percent of the sample, was counseling. Others said they wished the person would serve time in jail or prison (42%), pay restitution (28%), be sentenced to probation (20%), be a victim of a similar crime (7%), or receive the death sentence (2%). In addition, ten percent said they wished nothing would happen to the person who committed the crime against them, and 14 percent reported another option not listed as a close-ended option (have empathy, be apprehended or stopped from harming others, find religion, get psychiatric help, be deported, do hard labor, do community service, have his or her driver's license revoked, get alcohol or other drug treatment, pay the cost incurred by the judicial system, receive a warning, get a fair trial, or be divorced from the victim).

**Case Outcome According to Case Records**

According to police reports, 45 percent of suspects were arrested in the follow-up sample cases (Figure 8.2). Of these 147 cases, a suspect was booked in 94 percent and, of these 138 cases, a complaint was filed in 63 percent. Of the 87 cases filed, the most frequent outcome was that the suspect pled guilty or was convicted (66%). The outcome was still pending in 14 percent of the cases, the complaint was rejected in nine percent, the suspect failed to appear in five percent, diversion was ordered in three percent, the suspect was a juvenile with a true finding determined in two percent of the cases, and the case was dismissed in one percent.

Of the 57 cases in which adult conviction occurred, approximately one-half (51%) resulted in the individual sentenced to serving time in jail and then probation. The suspect was sentenced to probation alone in 32 percent of the cases, and to prison alone in seven percent. The sentence was still pending in 11 percent of the cases. For the two juveniles, one was sentenced to the California Youth Authority and one to twenty-four hour school.
Figure 8.1
FLOW OF FOLLOW-UP SAMPLE CASES THROUGH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

CRIME INCIDENT

ARREST 49%
NO ARREST 51%

NO KNOWLEDGE OF CASE OUTCOME 22%
KNOWLEDGE OF CASE OUTCOME 88%

PLED GUILTY 58%
DIVERSION 5%
CASE DROPPED 22%
CASE PENDING 12%
MILITARY HANDLING 3%

NO KNOWLEDGE OF SENTENCE 6%
KNOWLEDGE OF SENTENCE 94%

JAIL/PRISON 57%
PROBATION 46%
COUNSELING OR TREATMENT 42%
OTHER SENTENCE 22%
RESTITUTION 15%

RECEIVED PAYMENT 20%
HAD NOT RECEIVED PAYMENT 80%
Figure 8.2
FLOW OF FOLLOW-UP SAMPLE CASES THROUGH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
Case Records
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

CRIME INCIDENT

ARREST 45%

NO ARREST 55%

NO SUSPECT BOOKED 6%

SUSPECT BOOKED 94%

NO COMPLAINT FILED 37%

COMPLAINT FILED 63%

CASE DISMISSED 1%

DIVERSION 3%

COMPLAINT REJECTED 9%

ADULT CONVICTION/PLED GUILTY 66%

CASE PENDING 14%

SUSPECT FTA 5%

JUVENILE TRUE FINDING 2%

JAIL AND PROBATION 51%

PROBATION 32%

PENDING 11%

PRISON 7%

CYA 50%

24-HOUR SCHOOL 50%
In addition, ten individuals were sentenced to domestic violence treatment and 26 to alcohol or other drug treatment (not shown).

It should be noted that while other researchers (i.e., Erez and Tontodonato, 1992) have examined the relationship between the victim's expectation of a fair sentence with what actually occurred, this analysis was not feasible in the current study. First, the close-ended responses offered to victims were not the same as those used when collecting data from official reports, limiting the comparisons which could be made. Second, a victim could choose more than one case outcome option, and often did, further complicating the issue. Third, while a useful analysis would have included determining if the actual sentence was more or less lenient than what was desired by the victim, the level of leniency in sentencing is somewhat arbitrary. That is, for some individuals, counseling may be considered worse punishment compared to paying restitution, while for others, restitution may be considered worse than counseling. Lastly, because victims were not asked the appropriate amount of time that a given sentence should last (i.e., how many months in jail), congruity between what actually occurred and what the victim wished for (i.e., jail time) may not actually exist if the sentence is shorter or longer than what the victim wanted.

VICTIM INTERACTION AND SATISFACTION WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Victim interaction and satisfaction with the criminal justice system has generated interest from researchers for two basic reasons. First, the fact that insensitive treatment by members of the system can lead to secondary victimization has been examined. According to Lurgio and Resick (1990), studies have shown that victims may be subject to long waits, loss of wages, poor protection against intimidation, mishandling of property, difficult questioning by police and attorneys, unnecessary trips to court, and a variety of other inconveniences which lead to further problems in addition to their criminal victimization.

The second reason relates to the belief that satisfaction on the part of the victim can lead to better cooperation with the criminal justice system, both in the present and the future. For instance, Cannavale and Falcon (1976; cited in Davis 1987a) found that victims and witnesses fail to cooperate with prosecutors because officials do not communicate important information to them. Further, Davis (1987a) explains that a positive experience with the criminal justice system in the Milwaukee study led victims to be more willing to cooperate with officials in the future. Replicating these findings, Shapland, Willmore, and Duff (1985; cited in McLeod, 1987) found that the willingness of victims to give continued cooperation to the criminal justice system was dependent upon the amount of feedback they received from police, regardless of the progression of police investigations.

Questions were included on the initial survey, administered approximately four weeks after the incident, regarding the victims' satisfaction with the police officer(s) who responded at the time of the crime incident and the detective who contacted them at a later time. Subjects were asked to make this rating on a four-point scale: very satisfied, satisfied, not satisfied, or very dissatisfied. The follow-up interview, conducted approximately five months later, asked respondents to rate their satisfaction with law enforcement, a Deputy District Attorney or
prosecutor, the presiding judge in the case, and the criminal justice system as a whole. Here, ratings were made on a five-point scale, with the categorization of "neutral" being added to the other four options. Ratings were combined (very satisfied with satisfied, not satisfied with very dissatisfied) and the data are presented as "satisfied," "neutral," or "not satisfied." Lastly, law enforcement officers were queried regarding their perception of what factors were related to victims' satisfaction with their services.

Victim Interaction With the Criminal Justice System

Not surprisingly, police officers and detectives were cited most often as the criminal justice representatives with whom victims had contact (not shown). Overall, 80 percent of the follow-up sample reported contact between themselves and a police officer or detective on the day of the incident, 49 percent within a month of the incident, and eleven percent more than a month after the incident. In contrast, 57 percent reported that they had spoken to other members of the criminal justice system. Of these 182 respondents, 47 percent reported speaking directly to a Deputy District Attorney, 20 percent to a defense attorney, and nine percent to a judge at sentencing regarding how the crime affected them. In addition, eleven percent said they had testified in court and 40 percent obtained a temporary restraining order (TRO) (not shown).

According to case records, only three members of the follow-up sample attended the preliminary hearing, and one person attended the trial and sentencing (not shown). Such a small number of victims actively participating in the justice process may not be surprising to some, given previous research. For example, McLeod (1987) conducted a study in which probation departments responsible for filing Victim Impact Statements were contacted and surveyed regarding this form of victim involvement in the criminal justice process. Overall, he found that victims in general seldom exercise their right to participate, with fewer than 18 percent of victims attending sentencing.

Satisfaction With Law Enforcement Officers

Skogan (1989) has accurately pointed out that police officers responding to a crime are often the sole contact a victim has with the criminal justice system. Given this critical role law enforcement play, the nature of their interaction with victims is of extreme interest and importance. Additionally, what factors are related to satisfaction are of interest for those who seek how the relationship can be improved. For instance, researchers such as Brandl and Horvath (1991) have found that while education, gender, and income were not significantly related to satisfaction with police, the expectation of response time, a high degree of investigative effort, and police professionalism had a large effect, suggesting potential ways of improving the relationship between law enforcement and victims.

Initial sample respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the police officers who assisted them at the crime scene and with the detectives who contacted them after the crime. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of respondents said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the police, and 82 percent said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the detective with whom they interacted (not shown). Table 8.1 presents the victims' reasons for their ratings. Because
respondents could list both positive and negative reasons for their ratings, percentages are based upon the total number of individuals who responded to the question, rather than how many were satisfied or not.

Table 8.1

REASONS FOR SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT
Initial Victims' Survey
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Satisfaction</th>
<th>Police Officer</th>
<th>Detective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Demeanor</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Response</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Police Officer</th>
<th>Detective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Competence</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Demeanor</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay in Responding</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 387 266

Note: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

The most common reason given for why both police officers and detectives were helpful had to do with the individual's personality and the manner in which he or she handled the situation (59% for police officers and 49% for detectives). Personality factors included patience, kindness, helpfulness, professionalism, politeness, honesty, easiness to talk to, ability to positively interact with children, enthusiasm, and the ability to not exaggerate the situation. For example, one initial survey respondent praised the service she received by stating that "the officers responding to my call were prompt, professional, and very understanding. They helped me to calm down and asked appropriate questions." Others appreciated the quick response time with which the police officers arrived (18%), the competence of the officer (e.g., thorough, got the job done, took the suspect away, saved the victims' life) (15%), and the knowledge and information the officer shared (7%). A quick response was less important for satisfaction with detectives, cited by only three percent of respondents. With these interactions, victims seemed to place more of an emphasis on the knowledge they received from the detective (29%) and the competency (i.e., thoroughness of the investigation) (13%).
Negative reasons responsible for dissatisfaction with law enforcement officers were primarily
due to traits not exhibited (Table 8.1). First, some victims were dissatisfied with the apparent
lack of competence on the part of the officer. Eighteen percent (18%) were unhappy that a
suspect was not arrested or was released, felt that a thorough investigation had not been
conducted, or that the officer was unknowledgeable, unhelpful, or unable to do anything to help
the victim. Others were dissatisfied with the officer's personality and demeanor (i.e., patronizing
or rude, insensitive, biased, blasé, or had exaggerated the situation) (14%). Lastly, 13 percent
cited a response time that was too long. As Table 8.1 shows, much smaller percentages listed
reasons for their dissatisfaction with detectives. Only six percent felt the detective was
incompetent, two percent that the detective's demeanor was not appropriate, and one percent that
the response time was too long.

Follow-up interview respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with law enforcement,
without distinguishing between the services offered from the police and those offered by
detectives (Table 8.2). Overall, 63 percent of the follow-up sample reporting being very
satisfied or satisfied with the police, 14 percent were neutral, and 23 percent were not satisfied or
very dissatisfied (not shown).

Table 8.2

REASONS FOR SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Satisfaction</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Demeanor</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Response</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Dissatisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Competence</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Demeanor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay in Responding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 253

Note: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
For this group of individuals, six months after the crime had occurred, personality and demeanor (i.e., patience, helpfulness, professionalism, enthusiasm, honesty, extroversion, seriousness, lack of exaggerating the situation) were also the most important factors influencing victim satisfaction, reported by 44 percent of respondents (Table 8.2). In addition, 36 percent appreciated the competent service they felt they received, 21 percent the quick response time, and 15 percent the knowledge of the officers and detectives. Negative reasons were cited by fewer respondents and included a lack of competence on the part of officers (31%), personality and demeanor factors (12%), and delays in responding (4%).

Given this knowledge of what factors victims reported influenced their judgments, law enforcement officers were asked a close-ended question on a survey administered during routine line-up regarding their perception of what factors are related to victim and witness satisfaction with police (not shown). Approximately one-half (52%) felt that the most important factor was a quick response time. Others felt that showing compassion, empathy, or support (41%), the level of professionalism (37%), the thoroughness of the investigation (18%), the amount of information or referrals given (14%), contacting the victim after the incident to ask questions (14%), providing case information (12%), and whether an arrest was made (11%) were factors related to victim satisfaction. Thus, while officers gave appropriate weight to an officer's demeanor when responding to a crime scene, they appeared to give greater importance to the impact of response time on victim satisfaction.

Satisfaction With a Deputy District Attorney

Questions were included on the follow-up interview regarding victim satisfaction with other members of the criminal justice system, including a Deputy District Attorney and the presiding judge in the case. Of the 81 individuals who interacted with a Deputy District Attorney and rated their satisfaction, 64 percent said they were satisfied or very satisfied, 10 percent were neutral (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied), and 26 percent were not satisfied or very dissatisfied. This distribution of percentages is very similar to the distribution of law enforcement ratings reported previously for the same sample. This congruence does not support previous research by Wemmers (1993), who found that victims were more satisfied with the performance of the police than with the performance of the courts or prosecution.

As Table 8.3 shows, the most common reasons given for satisfaction with a Deputy District Attorney involved the competent service received (i.e., being contacted, efficient service, feeling the individual had their best interest at heart) (38%). Others cited the prosecutor's personality and demeanor (i.e., pleasant, personable) (24%), the information and referrals received (19%), the fact the prosecutor asked for their opinion (12%), and the case outcome (7%). Reasons for dissatisfaction included the prosecutor giving the appearance of being incompetent (i.e., not contacting the victim, not providing enough information) (20%), case outcomes which did not satisfy the victim (i.e., no restitution, not appropriate) (19%), and the prosecutor's personality or demeanor (i.e., impersonal, difficult to work with, biased) (14%). Because individuals could give positive or negative reasons, regardless of their rating, percentages in Table 8.3 are based upon the total number of respondents.
Table 8.3

REASONS FOR SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION
WITH A DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Satisfaction</th>
<th>38%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Demeanor</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/referrals</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for victim's opinion</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case outcome</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Dissatisfaction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of competence</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case outcome</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/demeanor</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 74

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.

Satisfaction With the Presiding Judge

Of the 20 members of the follow-up sample who interacted with a judge, one-half (50%) were satisfied or very satisfied, 15 percent were neutral (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied), and 35 percent were not satisfied or very dissatisfied (not shown). These rankings are lower compared to satisfaction ratings bestowed upon law enforcement and prosecutors, supporting the second half of Wemmers (1993) finding that law enforcement received higher satisfaction ratings than the prosecution and the courts.

Of the 17 individuals who provided reasons for their ratings, five felt the judge had acted in a fair manner, three were satisfied with the verdict, and one appreciated having the opportunity to talk in court. However, seven individuals felt that the judge did not listen to the victim’s opinion, one felt the judge acted in a rude manner, and one did not appreciate the tardiness of the judge when appearing in court (not shown).

Satisfaction With the Criminal Justice System

Overall, 55 percent of the follow-up sample reported being very satisfied or satisfied with the criminal justice system, as a whole. In addition, 16 percent reported they were neutral (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) and 30 percent were not satisfied or very dissatisfied (not shown).
As Table 8.4 shows, the primary reasons for satisfaction with the entire criminal justice system included perceiving that the service providers were competent (i.e., quick response, contacted the individual, did their job) (28%), liking their personality or demeanor (i.e., patient, helpful, professional, easy to work with) (17%), satisfaction with the case outcome (12%), receiving information or referrals (6%), and receiving emotional support (i.e., having someone listen, receiving personal attention) (4%). In addition, others were dissatisfied with the services received and the lack of competence by staff (i.e., lack of contact, lack of follow-up, difficult to contact, need for more services, lack of useful services, unhappy with the costs, too much paperwork) (33%), the personality or demeanor of the individual they dealt with (i.e., patronizing, not listening, insensitive, biased, harassed) (11%), and case outcome (9%). Again, respondents could provide positive or negative reasons, regardless of their rating, necessitating that percentages be based upon the total number of respondents.

Table 8.4

REASONS FOR SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Demeanor</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Outcome</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Referrals</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Dissatisfaction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Competence</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Demeanor</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Outcome</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RESPONDENTS 254

NOTE: "Don't know" and blank responses not included. Percentages based upon multiple responses.
CORRELATES OF VICTIM SATISFACTION AND INVOLVEMENT

Additional analyses were conducted to determine if there were any victim, crime, or service factors related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system, its participants, or the importance placed upon involvement with the system in the future. Table 8.5 lists those measures which were used and the factors whose predictive power were tested.

As in the previous analysis of follow-up interview data, ratings from the five-point scale of very satisfied and satisfied were combined to form one rating, as were the ratings of not satisfied and very dissatisfied. These new combined ratings will be referred to as "satisfied" and "not satisfied." Questions regarding the importance of involvement in the criminal justice process required victims to give one of four ratings: very important, somewhat important, not very important, and not important at all.

Table 8.5

MEASURES OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM SATISFACTION AND POSSIBLE PREDICTIVE FACTORS
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

MEASURES OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM SATISFACTION
- Satisfaction with Law Enforcement Officers
- Satisfaction with a Deputy District Attorney
- Satisfaction with the Judge
- Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System
- Importance of Criminal Justice Involvement

POSSIBLE PREDICTIVE FACTORS
- Victim Gender
- Crime Type
- Household Income
- Case Outcome
- Receiving Services
- Receiving Case Information
- Perception that Opinion Was Heard
- Presence of Unmet Needs
Only those factors which were significantly related to one of the measures in Table 8.5 are discussed. Contrary to what may be expected, victim ethnicity, victim age, and whether or not there was an arrest were not significantly related to satisfaction with members of the criminal justice system, or the system as a whole. Interestingly, it appeared that satisfaction ratings with one participant in the criminal justice system did not generalize to other participant ratings. For example, case outcome was related to satisfaction with the prosecutor, but not with law enforcement and case information was related to satisfaction with law enforcement, but not the prosecutor or judge. Two exceptions, however, are the perception that one's opinions had been heard and the presence of unmet needs. These two factors had a great deal of predictive power and were significantly related to three or more ratings. The fact that these two factors were strongly related to satisfaction levels has positive implications for the criminal justice system. Specifically, providing case information to a victim, a frequently cited unmet need, and making victims feel like their opinions matter are relatively easy ways to gain cooperation and prevent secondary victimization from occurring.

**Victim Gender**

Victim gender was significantly related to dissatisfaction with law enforcement officers. Specifically, while roughly equal percentages of males (89) and females (211) said they were satisfied with law enforcement (64% and 62%, respectively), significantly more males were not satisfied (30%) and less were neutral (8%), compared to females (20% of whom were not satisfied and 16% of whom were neutral) (not shown). Previous research has not consistently documented such a relationship and the factors responsible for this finding are unknown at this time.

**Crime Type**

Crime type was significantly related to satisfaction ratings given to law enforcement as well as to a victim's opinion of the importance of participation in the criminal justice system. As Figure 8.3 shows, while 69 percent of 163 domestic violence victims, 67 percent of 18 sexual assault victims, and 57 percent of 106 assault victims were satisfied with the services received from law enforcement, only 38 percent of 13 homicide survivors and witnesses were. In addition, while 84 percent of 104 assault victims, 81 percent of 176 domestic violence victims, and 80 percent of 20 sexual assault victims thought that being involved was very important, only 55 percent of eleven homicide survivors and witnesses did (Figure 8.4). This finding highlights the importance of law enforcement officers and other criminal justice treating *survivors and witnesses*, as well as victims, with appropriate compassion and sensitivity regarding their opinions and needs.
Figure 8.3
SATISFACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT BY CRIME TYPE
Follow-up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

Figure 8.4
IMPORTANCE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE INVOLVEMENT
BY CRIME TYPE
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
Household Income

A victim's self-reported household income was significantly related to the perception of the importance of involvement in the criminal justice system, with those in the lower socio-economic groups placing less emphasis on it (not shown). While 89 percent of those with incomes between $15,000 and $35,000 (91), and 83 percent with incomes above $35,000 (70) said it was very important, only 73 percent of those with incomes below $15,000 (129) did the same. This is a 16 percent and ten percent difference from the other groups. Nineteen percent (19%) of the individuals in the lowest economic group said involvement was somewhat important, six percent that it was not very important, and two percent that it was not important at all. These percentages compare to ten percent and 17 percent who said involvement was somewhat important ($15,000 to $35,000 and over $35,000, respectively) and one percent of those with incomes between $15,000 and $35,000 who said it was not very important. This lack of interest may be due to a sense of powerlessness and control over one's living situation.

Case Outcome

Case outcome was significantly related to satisfaction with the prosecutor, as well as with satisfaction with the criminal justice system as a whole. As Figure 8.5 shows, of those cases in which the victim was aware that the suspect had pled guilty or was convicted (37), 70 percent reported being satisfied with a Deputy District Attorney, five percent reported being neutral and 24 percent said they were not satisfied. In the two cases in which diversion occurred, both victims said they were not satisfied. In the eight cases in which the case was dropped, 38 percent said they were satisfied, 25 percent that they were neutral, and 38 percent that they were not satisfied. This pattern of satisfaction generalized to ratings of the criminal justice system (Figure 8.6). When the suspect was found guilty (68), 60 percent reported they were satisfied, 15 percent were neutral, and 25 percent were not satisfied. In the five cases in which diversion of the suspect occurred, only one individual was satisfied and the other four were not satisfied. For those instances in which the case was dismissed, 52 percent were satisfied, four percent were neutral, and 44 percent were dissatisfied.

Receiving Services

Whether or not a victim reported receiving services was significantly related to satisfaction with law enforcement officers (not shown). Specifically, while 68 percent of those who received services (195) were satisfied, only 54 percent of those who received no services (102) felt the same way. Twelve percent (12%) of those who received services said they were neutral and 19 percent that they were not satisfied. Sixteen percent (16%) of those who did not receive services were neutral and 30 percent were not satisfied. This finding is probably related to the fact, discussed in Chapter 6, that law enforcement officers were cited most frequently as the providers of services to victims.
Figure 8.5
SATISFACTION WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY BY CASE OUTCOME
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

Figure 8.6
SATISFACTION WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM BY CASE OUTCOME
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
Receiving Case Information

Forst and Hernon (1985) have found that victims were more likely to be satisfied with the criminal justice system when they knew the outcome of the case. In a study published one year later (Shaplan, Wilmore, and Duff, 1986; cited in Wemmers, 1993), a failure to inform victims of case information was an important source of dissatisfaction with law enforcement officials while an inability to catch the suspect had little influence. Current analyses showed that those who received case information were significantly more likely to be satisfied, both with law enforcement and the criminal justice system as a whole.

As Figures 8.7 and 8.8 show, 89 percent of those who received case information were satisfied with law enforcement and 71 percent felt the same about the criminal justice system. Alternatively, only 54 percent of those who did not receive information were satisfied with law enforcement and 48 percent were satisfied with the criminal justice system as a whole. The desire for information regarding the status of the case in the criminal justice system is also reflected by the victims through the following quotes.

"I didn't know anything and wondered every day whether I was going to have to go to court."

"The DA was very responsive to me. She listened to my side of the story and she was good about calling me back and letting me know what is going on. Just informing me of the whole process."

"... I would like to know if this guy is still running around town ... Has he been arrested? Did he post bail? Is he in county jail? Could he still try to run me down?"

Because case information is a relatively easy need to fulfill, taking extra steps to ensure that victims and witnesses are informed should be regularly done to ensure they are satisfied with the criminal justice system and that secondary victimization is avoided.

Perception That Opinions Were Heard

Researchers such as Erez and Tontodonato (1990) have suggested that victim grievances are more with the procedures of the criminal justice system, particularly the lack of victim involvement in the decision-making process, than with the supposed injustice of the outcome. Supporting this research, a perception that one's opinions had been heard was the most predictive factor relating to satisfaction ratings. This finding is shown through the following quotes from victims.

"The lady was considerate, asked my opinions on what should be done, made me feel my opinions were valuable ..."

"... I felt the judge did not listen to what I had to say. I was timid and the suspect knew what he was doing so he had the advantage..."

"No one cared about what I had to say. I got discouraged about the whole thing."
Specifically, those who felt their opinions were heard gave higher satisfaction ratings to law enforcement, Deputy District Attorneys, the presiding judge, and the criminal justice system as a whole.

As Figure 8.9 shows, 78 percent of those who felt they were heard (159) were satisfied with law enforcement, compared to 44 percent who felt that they had not been listened to (104). Thirteen percent (13%) of those who felt they had been heard said they were neutral and nine percent said they were not satisfied. A comparable percentage (13%) of those who felt they were not heard said they were neutral, while 42 percent said they were not satisfied.

Eighty-three percent (83%) of victims who felt their opinions were heard (48) said they were satisfied with the prosecutor, compared to only 28 percent of those who said they were not heard (29) (Figure 8.10). Ten percent of both samples said they were neutral, but while only six percent of those who felt they had been heard were not satisfied, 62 percent of those who did not feel heard were not satisfied.

Figure 8.9
SATISFACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT BY OPINIONS HEARD
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
Figure 8.7
SATISFACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT BY RECEIVING CASE INFORMATION
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

Figure 8.8
SATISFACTION WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
BY RECEIVING CASE INFORMATION
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
Of the eight individuals who interacted with a judge and felt they had been heard, six were satisfied and the remaining two said they were neutral (Figure 8.11). In comparison, of the ten individuals who also interacted with a judge, but felt they had not been heard, only three reported being satisfied, one was neutral, and six were not satisfied.
Lastly, Figure 8.12 presents satisfaction with the criminal justice system as a whole, as a function of whether or not a victim felt his or her opinion was heard. Seventy-four percent (74%) of those who felt their opinions were heard were satisfied, 13 percent were neutral, and 13 percent were not satisfied. Of those who felt they were not listened to, 26 percent said they were satisfied, 20 percent were neutral, and 54 percent were not satisfied.

This finding reiterates the importance of listening to victims and returning power to them in the decision-making process.

Figure 8.12
SATISFACTION WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM BY OPINIONS HEARD
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

Presence of Unmet Needs

The presence of unmet needs was also a predictor of victim satisfaction ratings. First, those individuals who said that all their needs had been met were more satisfied with law enforcement officers (Figure 8.13). While 74 percent of those whose needs were met (186) said they were satisfied, only 46 percent of those with unmet needs (111) felt the same. Fairly equal percentages rated themselves as neutral (13% of those who had their needs met; 14% of those who had unmet needs). However, while only 13 percent of those whose needs were met were not satisfied, 40 percent of those with unmet needs were not satisfied.

Secondly, those who reported their needs were met (44) were significantly more likely to report they were satisfied with a Deputy District Attorney, compared to those with unmet needs (37) (46%) (Figure 8.14). In addition, seven percent of those whose needs were met said they were neutral and 14 percent that they were not satisfied, while 14 percent of those with unmet needs were neutral and 41 percent were unsatisfied.
Figure 8.13
SATISFACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT BY NEEDS NOT MET
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

Figure 8.14
SATISFACTION WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY BY NEEDS NOT MET
Follow-Up Victims’ Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994
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Lastly, those whose needs were met (185) were significantly more satisfied with the criminal justice system as a whole (69%), compared to those with unmet needs (113) (32%) (Figure 8.15). Fifteen percent of those whose needs were met reported being neutral and 17 percent said they were not satisfied. In contrast, 18 percent of those with unmet needs said they were neutral, and 50 percent that they were not satisfied.

**Figure 8.15**
SATISFACTION WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM BY NEEDS NOT MET
Follow-Up Victims' Interview
Crime Victims Study, San Diego Region, 1994

**SUMMARY**

Victims have been referred to as the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system. In part to avoid secondary victimization, and in part to ensure their continued cooperation, researchers have actively studied what factors may be related to their satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its participants. This chapter presented case outcome data from victim self-reports and case records, and then examined victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Predictive factors of victim satisfaction were examined in detail.
Arrests were made in approximately one-half of the follow-up sample cases. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of victims reported some knowledge of case outcome and 94 percent were aware of what type of sentence the suspect received when conviction occurred. The most frequently received sentence, according to both victim self-report and case records, was jail and probation. Court records showed that very few individuals attended the preliminary hearing, trial, or sentencing.

Police officers are most likely to have contact with a victim and are in a unique position to influence his or her perception of the entire criminal justice system. Fortunately, dissatisfaction ratings for law enforcement were the lowest of the three types of criminal justice staff rated (23% compared to 26% for prosecutors and 30% for judges). For both police and detectives, personality and demeanor were the most frequently cited factors associated with satisfaction with law enforcement, and a lack of competence was the most frequently cited reason for negative ratings. When officers were asked for their perception of what factors influenced victim satisfaction, they appeared to give appropriate weight to personality factors, but also seemed to overemphasize the importance of a quick response, at least according to the reports of the follow-up sample. Satisfaction with a Deputy District Attorney seemed primarily related to perceptions of competence, and satisfaction with the judge appeared to be related to fairness and satisfaction with the verdict.

While victim age, victim ethnicity, and suspect arrest were not related to any measures of satisfaction, several factors were associated. Specifically, females, victims of sexual assault, assault, and domestic violence (as opposed to homicide survivors and witnesses), those who received services and case information, victims whose needs were met, and individuals who felt their opinions were heard were more likely to report being satisfied with law enforcement. In addition, a guilty verdict, having one's needs met, and perceiving one's opinions were heard were predictive of victim satisfaction with the prosecutor. Feeling that one had been listened to was also significantly related to satisfaction with a presiding judge. A guilty verdict, receiving case information, and feeling one had been heard were all related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Homicide survivors and witnesses were also significantly less likely to feel that participation in the criminal justice system was important, highlighting the necessity of giving them the same quality of service crime victims receive. The primary conclusion from these findings is that providing case information to a victim and making victims feel like their opinions matter are relatively easy ways to gain cooperation and prevent secondary victimization from occurring.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Through a variety of research methods, this project examined the needs of victims of violence, assessed the match between needs and services received, and evaluated the factors predicting coping ability and service utilization. The following findings are of interest to researchers as they study the impact of violence on the lives of victims and to practitioners as they use the results from this study to enhance awareness about the needs of victims.

First, a few methodological caveats.

- Though the composition of the initial victim survey sample (i.e., based upon crime type, gender, and ethnicity) was similar to the population from which it was drawn, the response rate varied by crime type, with homicide witnesses and survivors, as well as sexual assault victims, more likely to participate in the study than victims of domestic violence and other types of assault. Whites were also more likely to return the survey than minorities. Over one-half of the survey respondents were victims of domestic violence. These characteristics may have influenced the results of the study with respect to the impact of the victimization and needs following the crime incident. Interpretation of findings from this study acknowledges these biases in the sample.

- Data gathered through police reports and information provided by victims were not always consistent. This finding has implications regarding the validity of official police records to describe victims rather than letting the victims speak for themselves.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Victims of violence are characterized in the following findings. As service providers and the members of the criminal justice system design methods for improving the response to violent crime victims, these findings can be relevant.

- Repeat victimization is common. Forty-six percent (46%) of 709 respondents to initial victims’ survey stated that the current victimization was not their first. Of these, 86 percent stated that they had previously been victims of assault, 18 percent victims of sexual assault, and 16 percent victims of robbery or other theft. Further, four of five victims reported that they knew their assailant before the incident. These findings are reflective of the fact that a large proportion of the survey respondents were victims of domestic violence.
• **Violence affects individuals regardless of socio-economic status and other demographic characteristics.** Based upon self-reported characteristics (i.e., education, marital status, employment, and income), the individuals included in the sample were relatively evenly distributed across categories, which illustrates the variability among victims.

• **Financial loss is frequently associated with violence.** Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the follow-up sample reported experiencing some type of financial loss associated with the violent incident. When these 195 individuals were asked about the nature of the loss, 43 percent said they had lost wages, 43 percent lost property, and 39 percent incurred medical expenses.

• **The impact of violence on the lives of victims is significant.** According to responses on the initial survey and follow-up interview, victims moved due to a perceived lack of safety at the previous residence, missed work (over one-half of the respondents at follow-up), changed their lifestyle (e.g., avoided certain people, stayed home more often, spent more time with family, avoided going out alone, avoided going out at night), and experienced negative emotional reactions (e.g., painful memories, depression, distress).

• **Women tend to be more affected by violence than men.** Approximately six months following the incident, females were more likely than male victims to have moved and missed work, as well as make a greater number of lifestyle changes and experience more negative emotional reactions.

• **Ethnicity and education were not significantly related to coping ability** (i.e., changing residence, absence from work, lifestyle changes, or negative emotional reactions) for the study sample.

• **Individuals who comprise lower socio-economic groups seem to be those most in need for special attention from service providers.** Victims reporting smaller household incomes made a significantly greater number of lifestyle changes and had more emotional problems compared to those from higher socio-economic groups.

• **Victims with injuries and/or those perceiving that their life was threatened during the incident also seem to have a high level of needs requiring the services of victim assistance programs.** Being injured during the violence and perceiving that one’s life was threatened were associated with receiving offers of assistance from others. However, these two factors were also related to unfulfilled needs. Sixty-four percent (64%) of initial survey respondents said that they were injured as a direct result of the crime incident, illustrating the magnitude of the finding that injured victims have a high level of needs.
• Victimization by strangers, perhaps because of perceived arbitrary nature of the violent act, may have a greater effect on the long-term emotional reactions of victims. Initially, individuals victimized by a stranger were less likely to experience problems and emotional reactions to the incident. Six months later, however, these victims appeared to be more affected by the crime incident than those who knew the suspect.

• The effects of violent victimization can be long-lasting, supporting the need for follow-up counseling. Approximately one in five victims continued to receive services six months after the original incident. Over time, the proportion of victims experiencing specific emotional reactions and problems increased. The proportion noting painful memories, distress, anger, frequent annoyance, lack of comfort with physical contact, and forgetfulness increased between the initial survey and the follow-up interview.

• The long-term effects of victimization vary over time. The type of victimization (i.e., homicide, sexual assault, domestic violence, and other assault) was not significantly related to any of the coping measures for the initial sample. However, there were differences for the follow-up sample.

• The needs of victims change over time due to the long-term detrimental emotional and psychological impact of violence. Over time, a greater proportion of victims noted that law enforcement and family members were helpful following the violence and fewer stated that their own actions were the most helpful. Further, as time passed, the type of assistance most appreciated varied. Receiving protection was most helpful on the day the violence occurred. Information and referrals were most helpful within a month following the incident. An increasing proportion of respondents rated emotional support as most helpful as time progressed. As a result, emotional support was the most helpful service noted more than a month after the crime.

• Victims of sexual assault appeared to be the most greatly affected by their victimization. Sexual assault victims were more likely to have missed work, made more lifestyle changes, and experienced more emotional problems than victims of other types of violence.

• Survivors and witnesses of homicide are directly affected by the crime to an equal, if not greater, degree than other victims of violence. A higher proportion of homicide survivors and witnesses missed work, made lifestyle changes, and experienced negative emotional reactions compared to other victims, with the exception of sexual assault.

• The response by the criminal justice system did not significantly influence the ability to cope with the violent incident. The following variables did not predict coping ability: arrest of the suspect, satisfaction with the prosecutor, and satisfaction with the judge.
• Over one-half of all victims indicated that all of their needs had been fulfilled. Though a large proportion of the sample received some type of service, unmet needs remained, particularly for minority groups. Overall, 63 percent, or 207 individuals, reported receiving some type of service. However, Hispanic victims and victims of “other” ethnic groups were most likely to report that they had needs which were not met. In particular, these two minority groups needed medical procedures explained. Those in “other” ethnic groups also required funeral and burial services. Members of victims assistance programs agreed that at least some of the needs of victims are unmet.

• While case information was among the most frequently received services, it was also the most frequently cited need, either because some did not get any information or the amount received was viewed as insufficient.

• Repeat victimization was associated with unmet needs, indicating that there may be some additive effect of continuing victimization or that individuals who are victims of repeated violence are less likely to seek or receive needed assistance. Individuals who experienced criminal victimization in the past were significantly more likely to report that needed services had not been received.

• Having some form of social support system in place may be required for recovery following a violent incident. However, it may not be sufficient; assistance from victim service providers is necessary. As one victim shared, though friends were supportive and talking about the incident with them was helpful, “professional guidance may have been preferable.”

• Satisfaction with the criminal justice system was more related to being treated with dignity and respect than demographics or case outcome. Victim ethnicity, age, and whether or not there was an arrest were not related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system. The perception that one’s opinions had been heard and the presence of unmet needs were related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Providing case information, a frequently-cited unmet need, and seriously considering the victim’s opinions in making case decisions are relatively easy ways to gain cooperation and prevent the occurrence of secondary victimization. As one volunteer with a victim assistance program stated, victims need “to have their own victimization validated, to be treated with dignity and respect, to be listened to.” While some law enforcement officers surveyed did indicate an understanding of these needs, overall the police over-emphasized the influence of response time on victim satisfaction, suggesting a need for further officer training.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the results of this study, a number of recommendations are provided for improving services for victims of violence.

- **Outreach efforts by victim assistance programs to victims are worthwhile and should be expanded.** Victims who did not receive services were significantly more likely to have unmet needs compared to those who received services. Further, one-half of those with unmet needs were unaware that programs existed to assist them. Thus, it appears that victims are not receiving the services they are in need of and creative methods of providing information to them should be developed to ensure that they are aware of available assistance.

- **Follow-up contact may be critical in delivering services to individuals who may not realize they have needs until time passes.** The difference was computed between the number of lifestyle changes reported during the initial survey and those mentioned during the follow-up interview and compared based upon met versus unmet needs. Those who reported unmet needs early (i.e., on the initial survey) were less likely to report making more lifestyle changes six months later. However, those who reported unmet needs on the follow-up interview were more likely to experience more lifestyle changes as time passed. Thus, identification of needs should not only occur immediately following the incident, but also many months later. As one victim shared, “Any information I received was in the beginning, when I was in shock, numb, and in a state of confusion. Two weeks later, I couldn’t remember who, what, where, etc.”

- **It is important to provide information and referrals, regardless if a need is expressed. In addition, assessment of receptivity prior to making referrals is key to ensuring that the information will be useful.** For respondents indicating that some of their needs remain unmet, one-half reported not knowing that services were available to help them. Perhaps immediately after a violent incident, while a victim is still in shock, the victim is not in the best state of mind to utilize offered resources. For example, respondents indicated that information and referrals were helpful when received after the incident, suggesting that information may be most helpful after the victim receives the emotional support required through existing social circles.

- **Information on referrals and services available to assist victims should also be provided to family and friends.** Family and friends may be able to provide immediate emotional support, but not equipped to meet all the long-term needs of victims. After the initial shock and emotional trauma of the violence dissipate slightly, friends and family can relay referral information to the victim, who could be in a more receptive state than immediately following the incident. In addition, since a majority of victims moved following the incident, which limits the ability of service providers to follow-up at a later time, providing referrals to family and friends increases the chance that victims will receive the information when they are more receptive.
• Utilization of services could be improved by developing methods to follow-up rather than relying on the victim to call a number on a referral list which may have been misplaced since originally provided. The majority of victim assistance program members reported that initial contact with victims was initiated by the victims themselves. Relying upon victim initiation is probably one of the largest contributors to service underutilization since victims frequently do not know about the services available and are hesitant to seek help from strangers. Obtaining address and phone information from family and friends may provide an additional way to contact victims following the violence, given that the majority move within six months after the incident. The benefit of offering services, regardless of a request from the victim, is best illustrated through the words of an actual victim. Though this victim did not utilize the referrals received, a positive feeling resulted which could assist in the coping process following violence. “It was good to know that there was help out there and that San Diego wanted to help victims, like a town that takes care of its victims.”

• Program utilization could also be improved through law enforcement training regarding the availability and purposes of local victim assistance programs. Law enforcement officers are in a unique position to provide referrals and information to victims. Police officers were cited by the victims surveyed as most frequently providing services, illustrating the important role they can play in serving as the bridge to additional support and informational networks outside the victim’s immediate circle of family and friends who may not be able to meet long-term needs. As one victim noted, “I was amazed and relieved that the police were as helpful and supportive as they were. I did not feel interrogated or disbelieved. Rather, I felt supported and respected.” Unfortunately, however, a large proportion of officers were not familiar with the local programs available. As a result, referrals to victim assistance programs were infrequent, though many officers believed that these programs could be helpful.

• Training for law enforcement should be provided during the academy and “line-up” briefings. According to the service providers participating in this study, officers are provided information regarding their programs through training bulletins, advanced officer training programs, on the job, “line-up,” and the academy. The largest proportion of officers surveyed indicated that information regarding victim assistance programs was provided during “line-up” and the academy, suggesting that these types of communication are the most memorable and that officer knowledge and use of these programs may be increased through more frequent “in person” communication.

• Formal service providers faced with limited resources should consider targeting their outreach efforts to those most in need. Recruitment of staff and volunteers should focus on sub-groups of the population most in need. Further, methods should be developed to match characteristics of programs staff and volunteers with clients to reduce the proportion of individuals in various sub-groups of the population with unmet needs. The following sub-groups of victims were associated with unmet needs, more lifestyle changes, and negative emotional reactions six months following the violent crime incident:
1. women  
2. Hispanics  
3. those in "other" ethnic groups  
4. victims with lower socio-economic backgrounds  
5. injured victims  
6. those who felt their life was threatened during the victimization  
7. victims of sexual assault  
8. individuals experiencing repeated victimization  
9. those victimized by a stranger  
10. victims who received services prior to the crime incident (i.e., those with a history of prior problems or victimization).

- **Methods for improving coordination between victim assistance programs and the criminal justice system should be implemented.** Some suggestions provided by members of victim assistance programs include the following: dedicate more staff and resources in the criminal justice system to assisting victims, improve communication, increase knowledge among criminal justice staff regarding services available, clearly define roles, and increase concern shown to victims.

- **Victim service providers should ensure that their information is always up-to-date with those in the criminal justice system who may be in contact with victims in need (e.g., police, prosecutors, etc.).** As one victim noted, the resource list given had numbers that had changes and others which were difficult to access.

- **To reduce secondary victimization, improvements are needed in the response and sensitivity by the criminal justice system to the needs of victims.** Though almost two-thirds of the follow-up interview respondents were satisfied with law enforcement contacts, almost one-quarter were dissatisfied. Further, while over one-half reported being satisfied with the criminal justice system as a whole, 30 percent were not satisfied. The importance of the positive interactions between victims and the criminal justice system was clearly illustrated through study findings. Satisfaction with the police and the criminal justice system was significantly related to fewer lifestyle changes and emotional reactions or problems resulting from the violence. The need for sensitivity was clearly expressed by one victim when asked to describe the nature of contact with the criminal justice system. I "felt like just another number, not a person whose case they were working on." This victim also noted that little time and consideration were provided.

- **Sensitivity should be a continual focus for victim assistance programs.** As one victim sadly reported, when she needed someone to listen to her, she spoke to a few agencies and "some of them paid no attention and others answered in an angry way," leaving her depressed and angry.
• Considering victims' opinions and providing case information throughout the criminal justice process are relatively easy ways to decrease secondary victimization and gain victim cooperation. According to the victims surveyed, case information was frequently provided. However, victims also noted that they were unaware of the status of their case. Further, the perception that one's opinions had been heard was related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system, while the presence of unmet needs was associated with dissatisfaction. The following quotes from surveys completed by victims in this study illustrate the critical need for considering victims' opinions and keeping them informed.

  “Remaining in the dark just made me even more scared.”

  “Every time I talked to someone regarding this case, they made me feel like it was my fault...”

  “It seemed like my case was just thrown in a pile.”

  “...no matter what I did, the suspect came out ahead.”

• Survivors and witnesses of violence should be treated as victims, with dignity and respect. Crime type was related to satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Survivors and witnesses of homicide were generally less satisfied, highlighting the importance of treating survivors and witnesses, as well as victims, with appropriate compassion and sensitivity regarding their opinions and needs.

• Future research should seek to determine why victims receiving assistance or services seem to be more affected by the violence than those not receiving aid. Based upon the findings from this study, receipt of services from formal service providers, as opposed to services through informal channels or no services at all, was significantly associated with lifestyle changes and negative reactions resulting from the crime incident. Individuals who continued to receive services six months after the incident appeared to be more impacted by the victimization. Further, individuals who received assistance were among those most likely to report the presence of unmet needs. The reasons for these findings are unknown. Receipt of assistance could lead to a stronger reaction to the violence through having one's hopes falsely raised. Victims more likely to react to the crime could be more likely to receive assistance. The services could provide victims with the tools necessary to make changes and articulate reactions to the violence. Further research is needed to discover the true relationship between cause and effect.
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SERVICE PROVIDERS SURVEYED

Battered Women's Services
Brother Benno's Foundation
Center for Child Protection/Childrens Hospital
Center for Community Services
Child Guidance Clinic
Child Protective Services
Community Christian Service Agency
Community Resource Center
Compassionate Friends
Crime Victims Fund
Crime Victims Legal Clinic
Domestic Violence Recovery Program
Episcopal Community Services, Victim Recovery Center
Escondido Psychotherapy Center
Faith and Love Ministries
Family Treatment Institute
Nancy Gamble, Ph.D.
Helix Center for Family Development
Hispanic Family Violence Intervention program
House of Rachel
Institute for Counseling Domestic Violence Treatment Program
Institute for Crime and Trauma Survivors
Julian's Anchorage
La Mesa Counseling Domestic Violence Treatment Program
St. Claire's
St. Vincent de Paul
San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program
South Bay Community Services
YMCA Battered Women's Services
PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

The original intent of this project was to evaluate the differential impact of service receipt on victim participation in the criminal justice system. Two programs were to be contrasted with the traditional law enforcement response. Though the research design changed, this appendix briefly describes each program because these programs provide unique services worth consideration as policy makers seek to improve victim cooperation within the justice system. In addition, the District Attorney's Victim/Witness Program is included because all violent crime victims are served by this agency, as well as several other organizations providing on-site services, to demonstrate the variety of services available to victims immediately following the incident.

SAN DIEGO CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAM

The San Diego Crisis Intervention Team (CIT), operated by the San Diego Police Department (SDPD), is designed to provide free, immediate, on-scene, one-time emotional support, advocacy, and referrals to any victim, witness, or other survivor of a traumatic incident within the City of San Diego. The CIT was created under a grant with a local community-based agency (Casa Familiar) in 1987. After funding was unavailable for a six-month time period, the SDPD incorporated the team as a permanent program in 1988. The team is staffed primarily by volunteers, though there are three paid law enforcement staff. Each volunteer attends a seven week, 50 hour training academy to prepare them for the work of crisis intervention. The training includes such topics as active listening, ethics, working relationships with enforcement, and specific types of crimes (e.g., domestic violence, sex crimes, and child abuse). On-going training occurs through monthly meetings. Trained volunteers sign up for two twelve-hour shifts per month (the minimum commitment to be involved with the team).

Crisis intervention services are provided 24 hours per day, seven days per week, 365 days per year. Usually, it is a patrol officer who first contacts the victim, witness, or survivor during or immediately following a traumatic incident. The officer will assess the situation and contact police communications to request a crisis interventionist if (1) the officer believes an interventionist could be of service to a person at the scene and (2) the victim, witness, or survivor has agreed to the officer's offer of crisis intervention. Specialized units, such as the homicide teams, can request Crisis Intervention directly. Officers currently learn about the CIT during training academies, advanced officer training, and at line-ups or briefings.
When an officer requests the CIT, police dispatchers page one of the team's six dispatchers, who records information on the incident and sends an interventionist to the scene. The interventionist may respond to the immediate crime scene, a hospital, or another neutral location, such as the home of a friend or family member. At the scene, the officer briefs the interventionist with relevant information about the incident. The interventionist then works with the victim, witness, family member, or survivor to provide empathic listening, emotional support, identification and clarification of immediate needs, information about the criminal justice system, and referrals for future assistance. After a call, the officer completes a brief evaluation of the interventionist's work, while the interventionist completes a report including actions taken by the interventionist, brief information about the people involved (name, address, phone number, sex, and age), and referrals given.

EYE CRISIS AND ADVOCACY TEAM

The Crisis and Advocacy Team is a program of the EYE Counseling and Crisis Services that was initiated in 1978 and serves primarily the North County inland areas. The Crisis and Advocacy Team is comprised of three full-time staff members and over 50 volunteers. All volunteers and graduate-level interns must complete a 40-hour training program prior to joining the team. The team responds to incidents involving sexual assault, sudden infant death syndrome, marital and family disputes, spouse abuse or battering, attempted or completed suicide, child abuse, support for survivors of a violent crime or fatal traffic accident, and shelter screening for homeless or battered women and their children.

The program has four major components. Volunteers may specialize in an area of interest or complete training in more than one area. First, the program operates a 24-hour hotline for telephone intervention, referral information, and support. Second, there is an in-person crisis intervention team that responds to incidents in the field, much like the CIT. Counselors may be dispatched by hospitals, law enforcement agencies, or other local agencies during a crisis situation. The victims are asked by officers in the field if they would like to talk to a counselor prior to dispatching an EYE volunteer. The crisis intervention team operates on a 24-hour basis. The third program is the 24-hour Sexual Assault Response Team, which consists of trained and certified rape crisis advocates who are dispatched to Pomerado Hospital to assist victims and their families during the evidentiary examination. The fourth component of the EYE Crisis and Advocacy Team consists of advocates who are trained to provide telephone and in-person follow-up counseling to victims of violence and, in some cases, at-risk families and individuals. An advocate may, for example, assist a battered woman and her children during the initial crisis. However, the same advocate may also attend legal proceedings related to the family violence, up to a year after the initial contact. It is hypothesized that this follow-up contact increases an individual's chances of following through with community-based resources for long-term support. These individuals' families may be more likely to respond in a positive way after the initial contact with the trained crisis intervention advocate.
The Crisis Response and Advocacy Team is funded by the United Way, the State Office of Criminal Justice Planning, the City of Escondido, and donations from private community members. All crisis intervention and follow-up services are free, which makes them accessible to a broad population. In addition to the services described in the program overview, clients can also benefit from long-term counseling programs, support group workshops, and programs through the seven components in the EYE Counseling and Crisis Services. This aspect differentiates the program from the San Diego Crisis Intervention Team, which relies upon outside agencies for these services.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S VICTIM-WITNESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The District Attorney's program is funded by the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) and has been in operation since 1981. Consistent with state guidelines, to be eligible for funding, the Victim-Witness Assistance Program must:

- provide comprehensive services to victims and witnesses of all types of crimes;
- be recognized and selected by the County Board of Supervisors as the major provider of services for the County;
- assist victims of crime in the preparation, verification, and presentation of their claims to the State Board of Control for indemnification; and
- cooperate with the Board of Control in verifying the data required.

The state guidelines also list the following service requirements for the program:

- provide the mandatory category of victim-witness services to victims of all types of crimes;
- provide follow-up contact, upon request, to determine whether the client has received the necessary assistance;
- conduct field visits, upon request, to provide intervention and counseling services;
- recruit and use volunteers to augment paid staff in the delivery of victim-witness services to victims of all types of crimes;
- provide victim-witness services that are responsive and appropriate to the special needs of elderly victims; and
- provide all services regardless of whether or not a client speaks English or is hearing impaired.
Referrals to the program occur in a variety of ways. Law enforcement officers and court staff refer victims to the program or victims can contact the program directly. Also, the District Attorney’s Victim/Witness Program staff read the paper and contact any victims reported through news articles who may qualify for assistance. However, the primary referral source is crime reports. Each District Attorney’s Victim/Witness Program office receives copies of crime incident reports on a daily basis.

Services, as mandated by the State, include crisis intervention, emergency assistance, resource and referral counseling, follow-up counseling, property/evidence return, orientation to the criminal justice system, support through the court process, presentations and training for outside agencies, public presentation and publicity, information regarding case dispositions and case status, notification of friends and relatives, employer intervention, and assistance in requesting financial reimbursement from the State (Office of Criminal Justice Planning, 1992).

The San Diego County Victim-Witness Assistance Program employs investigative specialists who contact victims and provide intervention services, and claims technicians who process claims to the State Board of Control through a joint powers agreement. The program also has the support of several clerical staff positions and a number of volunteers. Investigative specialists work closely with a number of victim service agencies throughout the county and coordinate with crisis intervention staff to provide needed services. The volunteers assist investigative specialists with contact letters, restitution assistance, and follow-up counseling to victims after letters have been sent. The program operates through offices located throughout the San Diego region to be as accessible as possible to victims in need.

OTHER PROGRAMS PROVIDING ON-SITE SERVICES

Other than CIT and the EYE Crisis Response and Advocacy Team, one other program provides similar on-site services, the Trauma Intervention Program (TIP). Through these three programs, the majority of the region has crisis intervention services available at the scene of crimes and accidents.

In addition, support is provided to rape victims during examinations for physical evidence through the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART), which utilizes volunteers in CIT, the EYE, the Women’s Resource Center (WRC), and the Center for Community Solutions.

A wide range of services are also provided by other community-based agencies (see Appendix A for a list of those responding to the service provider survey), including shelter, basic necessities (e.g., food and clothing), counseling, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Services(^1)</th>
<th>CIT</th>
<th>EYE</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Scene Intervention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Hr. Response</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Hr. Hotline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Advocacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditor Intervention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Return Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation Specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court-Related Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception and Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Notification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Escort</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Paid Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Volunteers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Other emergency services, such as medical care, food, and financial assistance, are available only through referral.
CALIFORNIA PENAL CODES ASSOCIATED WITH CRIME CATEGORIES

Victims were contacted to participate in the current study according to the charge listed on the original police report. These California Penal Codes were used to categorize the victim, witness, or survivor into one of four categories: homicide witness or survivor, sexual assault victim, assault victim, or domestic violence victim.

**Homicide**

- 187 PC  
  Murder: Second Degree

**Sexual Assault**

- 220 PC  
  Assault to commit rape, mayhem and rape, rape and robbery, lewd or lascivious act on child, penetrate with foreign object, oral copulation, rape in concert with another, rape in concert with force, mayhem, or sodomy
- 261 PC  
  Rape: Not specified
- 261.2 PC  
  Rape of incompetent female or by force
- 261.4 PC  
  Rape by threat
- 261.5 PC  
  Rape of victim unconscious nature of act, rape, or unlawful sexual intercourse with minor
- 262 PC  
  Rape of spouse by force/fear/threat

**Assault**

- 69 PC  
  Obstruct/resist executive officer
- 245(A)(1) PC  
  Assault with a deadly weapon, not a firearm or force
- 246(A)(2) PC  
  Assault with firearm on person

**Domestic Violence***

- 236 PC  
  False imprisonment
- 242 PC  
  Battery
- 243 PC  
  Battery on citizen with great bodily injury
- 243.5 PC  
  Assault or battery on school property
- 273(A) PC  
  Willful cruelty to child
- 273.5 PC  
  Inflict corporal injury on spouse/cohabitant
- 422 PC  
  Intent crime with intent to terrorize

* These offenses were considered domestic violence if the police officer checked the appropriate box on the crime report form.
APPENDIX D

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE TEST RESULTS

This appendix includes information regarding the statistical tests which were conducted and discussed throughout the report. Each test which resulted in a significant finding is referred to with reference to the particular predictive factor and outcome measure, the type of statistical test, the results, and the significance level.

Two primary statistical tests were used. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is a test of the statistical significance of the difference among the mean scores of two or more groups on one or more variables. Specifically, the procedure involves computing a ratio of the variance within the groups (error variance) to the variance between groups (explained variance). A Chi-Square analysis is a goodness-of-fit test which involves determining if the distribution among categories matches or fits a theoretical explanation. The p-value refers to the probability that a result could have been produced by chance or random error. The smaller the p-value, the greater the likelihood that the result expressed was not merely due to chance.

CHAPTER FIVE
REACTION AND ABILITY TO COPE WITH VICTIMIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive Factor</th>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=696) = 5.16^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender²</td>
<td>Change of Residence</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=318) = 4.96^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender²</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=183) = 4.00^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender²</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>F (1, 328) = 7.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender²</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>F (1, 328) = 24.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender²</td>
<td>Change in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(2, N=330) = 27.54^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Ethnicity²</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(4, N=183) = 10.52^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Age¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>F (3, 703) = 3.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Factor</td>
<td>Outcome Measure</td>
<td>Statistical Test</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=691) = 4.61^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income²</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (2, 301) = 8.90^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income²</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (2, 301) = 5.73^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Victimization¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 707) = 16.99^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Victimization²</td>
<td>Change in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=322) = 8.93^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Service²</td>
<td>Change of Residence</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=318) = 5.11^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type²</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (3, N=183) = 10.28^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type²</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (3, 326) = 2.67^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type²</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (3, 326) = 4.05^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Suspect¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 672) = 8.42^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Suspect²</td>
<td>Change in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (3, N=310) = 6.57^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Injury¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=666) = 21.85^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Threatened¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=650) = 14.62^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Injury¹</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 685) = 41.28^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Threatened¹</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 669) = 53.51^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Threatened²</td>
<td>Changes in Lifestyle Changes Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=311) = 11.95^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Injury¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 685) = 66.86^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Threatened¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 669) = 48.38^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Threatened²</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=311) = 15.20^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance At Crime¹</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 706) = 16.19^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance At Crime¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 706) = 6.70^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance After Crime¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=681) = 5.38^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance After Crime¹</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 696) = 12.16^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance After Crime¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 696) = 6.99^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Services¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=680) = 3.69^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Factor</td>
<td>Outcome Measure</td>
<td>Statistical Test</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Services¹</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 696) = 14.426^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Services¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 696) = 23.05^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Services²</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 328) = 9.46^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Services²</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 328) = 5.50^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Services¹</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(2, N=318) = 7.09^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Currently²</td>
<td>Change of Residence</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=205) = 4.47^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Currently²</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=114) = 6.48^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Currently²</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 203) = 6.37^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Currently²</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 203) = 12.34^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs¹</td>
<td>Change in Residence</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=658) = 9.06^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=663) = 26.36^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs¹</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 667) = 56.53^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 667) = 81.37^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs²</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=182) = 13.19^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs²</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 325) = 23.86^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs²</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 325) = 52.63^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs²</td>
<td>Changes in Lifestyle Changes Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(2, N=304) = 16.77^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs²</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(2, N=304) = 16.22^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs²</td>
<td>Changes in Lifestyle Changes Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(2, N=327) = 19.86^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs²</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(2, N=327) = 11.43^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective Satisfaction¹</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=394) = 9.66^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Satisfaction¹</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 701) = 14.04^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Satisfaction²</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(2, 297) = 5.49^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Satisfaction¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 701) = 11.79^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective Satisfaction¹</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(1, 402) = 6.48^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Satisfaction²</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F(2, 297) = 7.79^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Satisfaction²</td>
<td>Changes in Lifestyle Changes Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=321) = 14.75^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Factor</td>
<td>Outcome Measure</td>
<td>Statistical Test</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective Satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=174) = 6.05^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=321) = 7.49^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (4, N=11.48) = 11.48^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD Satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (2, 297) = 4.67^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD Satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Changes in Emotional Reactions Over Time</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (4, N=300) = 9.67^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions Heard&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=162) = 4.43^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions Heard&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 282) = 5.51^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Initial Sample
<sup>2</sup>Follow-Up Sample

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
## CHAPTER SIX

**USE OF FORMAL ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES BY VICTIMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive Factor</th>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender¹</td>
<td>Received Services</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=698) = 4.07^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender²</td>
<td>Received Services</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=326) = 4.44^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Ethnicity¹</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (4, N=669) = 13.86^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level¹</td>
<td>Received Services</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=693) = 10.60^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Suspect¹</td>
<td>Assistance at Crime</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=665) = 11.53^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Suspect¹</td>
<td>Assistance After Crime</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=656) = 11.95^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Suspect¹</td>
<td>Received Services</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=656) = 3.72^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Injury¹</td>
<td>Assistance at Crime</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=678) = 8.49^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Injury¹</td>
<td>Assistance After Crime</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=668) = 10.11^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Injury¹</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=640) = 22.76^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Suspect¹</td>
<td>Received Services</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=656) = 7.38^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Suspect¹</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=664) = 13.83^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Threatened¹</td>
<td>Assistance at Crime</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=661) = 8.47^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Threatened¹</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=624) = 23.56^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Age²</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (3, N=322) = 9.26^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Age¹</td>
<td>Crime Type</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (9, N=707) = 37.27^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type²</td>
<td>Received Services</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (3, N=326) = 11.00^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Initial Sample  
²Follow-Up Sample  
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
CHAPTER SEVEN
UNDERUTILIZATION OF FORMAL SERVICES AND AVAILABILITY OF OTHER SOURCES OF SUPPORT BY VICTIMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive Factor</th>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing Roommate$^2$</td>
<td>Change of Residence</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=244) = 6.33^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing Friends$^2$</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 326) = 8.70^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing Friends$^2$</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 326) = 11.15^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends' Month Reaction$^2$</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=142) = 7.37^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends' Month Reaction$^2$</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (2, 246) = 3.49^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends' Month Reaction$^2$</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (2, 246) = 3.00^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends' After Month Reaction$^2$</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (2, 238) = 3.05^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends' After Month Reaction$^2$</td>
<td>Emotional Reaction</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (2, 238) = 5.11^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to Seek Help$^2$</td>
<td>Absence From Work</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N=180) = 19.09^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to Seek Help$^2$</td>
<td>Lifestyle Changes</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 320) = 42.20^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to Seek Help$^2$</td>
<td>Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (1, 320) = 63.56^{***}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$Initial Sample
$^2$Follow-Up Sample

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
CHAPTER EIGHT

VICTIM INVOLVEMENT WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive Factor</th>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Police Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=300) = 6.13^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Police Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (6, N=300) = 12.99^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Involvement Importance</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (9, N=311) = 18.44^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Involvement Importance</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (6, N=290) = 14.22^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Outcome&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>D.A. Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (4, N=47) = 9.42^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Outcome&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>System Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=98) = 9.55^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Services&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Police Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=297) = 6.15^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Police Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=297) = 29.69^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Information&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>System Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=296) = 12.48^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions Heard&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Police Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=263) = 43.09^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions Heard&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>D.A. Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=77) = 29.67^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions Heard&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Judge Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=18) = 7.20^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions Heard&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>System Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=270) = 67.05^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Police Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=297) = 30.54^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>D.A. Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=81) = 10.06^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>System Satisfaction</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$X^2 (2, N=298) = 44.74^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Initial Sample
<sup>2</sup>Follow-Up Sample

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
The San Diego Association of Governments is conducting a survey of people who have recently been involved in violent crimes in San Diego county. The survey will assist in identifying needs of crime victims and witnesses, services received, and ways to improve the response to victims and witnesses by all agencies. You have been selected based on the date of the incident in which you were involved. Your responses are very important to make sure the results of our survey represent a wide range of people and views.

By returning this survey you are agreeing to be part of our study. The information you give us will not be identified by name and will be completely confidential. Please complete this brief survey, and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope within the next few days. If you have questions, or wish to respond to the survey by telephone, please call Darlanne Hoctor at the San Diego Association of Governments (595-5375).

We would like some information about the people who respond to the survey to make sure our study represents all victims. Therefore, the first questions are about you.

1. What is the highest grade you completed in school? (PLEASE CHECK ONE)
   — some high school
   — high school graduate or GED
   — some college
   — college graduate
   — post-graduate
   — other (specify) ——

2. Are you currently employed?
   — yes
   — no (GO TO QUESTION 3)

2a. What is your job?

3. Are you:
   — married
   — separated
   — divorced
   — widowed
   — single/never married?

4. How long have you lived at your current residence? (ENTER NUMBER)
   — years   — months   — days

The next questions are about the crime incident.

5. What type of violent crime occurred recently?
   — assault/fight
   — sexual assault/rape
   — homicide/murder (GO TO QUESTION 9)
   — other (please describe)

6. Were you injured in the crime incident?
   — yes
   — no (GO TO QUESTION 7)

6a. (IF YES) Did you receive medical treatment?
   — yes
   — no (GO TO QUESTION 7)

6b. (IF YES) What type of treatment? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   — first aid
   — doctor visit
   — sexual assault exam
   — emergency hospital treatment
   — hospitalized
   — other (please explain)

7. Were you able to do anything to try to stop the crime?
   — yes
   — no (GO TO QUESTION 8)

7a. (IF YES) Do you think your actions helped the situation in any way?
   — yes
   — no

7b. Please explain.

8. Did you feel your life was threatened during the incident?
   — yes
   — no

9. Has anyone been arrested for this crime?
   — yes
   — no
   — don’t know
10. Was the suspect in the case a: (PLEASE CHECK ONE)
   ___ stranger
   ___ acquaintance/friend
   ___ boyfriend/girlfriend
   ___ spouse
   ___ other relative
   ___ don't know?

11. How satisfied were you with the service received from the police at the time of the incident? (PLEASE CHECK ONE)
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ not satisfied
   ___ very unsatisfied

11a. Please explain.

12. Were you contacted by someone at the time of the incident, other than police officers, who offered to help you?
   ___ yes (GO TO QUESTION 13)
   ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 14)

12a. (IF YES) Who contacted you? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   ___ San Diego Crisis Intervention Team
   ___ EYE Crisis Response Team
   ___ Center for Women's Studies and Services (CWSS)
   ___ Women's Resource Center
   ___ Trauma Intervention Program (TIP)
   ___ paramedics
   ___ hospital medical staff
   ___ hospital social worker
   ___ hospital chaplain
   ___ coroner
   ___ don't remember agency
   ___ other (specify)

12b. Did the person(s) who contacted you do anything that helped you?
   ___ yes
   ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 12d)

12c. (IF YES) What did the person(s) do that was helpful?

12d. What could the person(s) have done better?

13. Did a police detective contact you after the incident?
   ___ yes (GO TO QUESTION 14)
   ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 13)

13a. How satisfied were you with the service from the police detective(s)?
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ not satisfied
   ___ very unsatisfied

13b. Please explain.

14. Were you contacted by anyone other than police officers after the incident who offered to help you?
   ___ yes
   ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 14c)

14a. (IF YES) Who contacted you? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   ___ San Diego Crisis Intervention Team
   ___ EYE Crisis Response Team
   ___ Center for Women's Studies and Services (CWSS)
   ___ Women's Resource Center
   ___ Trauma Intervention Program (TIP)
   ___ District Attorney Victim/Witness program
   ___ paramedics
   ___ hospital medical staff
   ___ hospital social worker
   ___ hospital chaplain
   ___ coroner
   ___ don't remember agency
   ___ other (specify)

14b. Did the person(s) who contacted you do anything that helped you?
   ___ yes
   ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 14d)

14c. (IF YES) What did the person(s) do that was helpful?
14d. What could the person(s) have done better?

15. Which of the following services did you receive at the time of or after the incident? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

At

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>referrals to other agencies</td>
<td>interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counseling</td>
<td>psychological/psychiatric services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial aid, emergency money</td>
<td>explanation of police procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation of medical procedures</td>
<td>information on case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help with court process</td>
<td>help with other agencies (employers, creditors, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help with other outside agencies (employers, creditors, etc.)</td>
<td>assistance with financial claim forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)</td>
<td>emergency shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency shelter</td>
<td>necessities, such as food, clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessities, such as food, clothing</td>
<td>services, such as clean-up and repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health care</td>
<td>assistance with financial claim forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child care</td>
<td>funeral/burial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug/alcohol treatment</td>
<td>transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funeral/burial services</td>
<td>hotline information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation</td>
<td>other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15a. (IF RECEIVED SERVICES) Overall, how would you rate the services you received?

At

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>not helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15b. Please explain.

16. Were there any services you needed, but did not receive?

| Yes | No (GO TO QUESTION 17) |

16a. (IF YES) What services did you need? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

| interpreter | counseling |
| psychological/psychiatric services | financial aid, emergency money |
| explanation of police procedures | explanation of medical procedures |
| information on case | help with court process |
| help with other agencies (employers, creditors, etc.) | assistance with financial claim forms |
| education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.) | emergency shelter |
| necessities, such as food, clothing | services, such as clean-up and repairs |
| health care | child care |
| drug/alcohol treatment | funeral/burial services |
| transportation | hotline information |
| other (specify) |

17. Did you miss time from work because of the crime incident?

| Yes | No (GO TO QUESTION 18) |

17a. (IF YES) How much time? (ENTER NUMBER)

| hours | days | weeks |

18. Did you move after the crime incident?

| Yes | No (GO TO QUESTION 19) |

18a. (IF YES) Why did you move?
19. Have you changed the types of things you do as a result of the crime incident? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - avoid going out during the day
   - avoid going out at night
   - avoid crowds
   - avoid going out alone
   - stay home from work more often
   - stay home more often, in general
   - spend more time alone
   - call friends more often
   - call family more often
   - spend more time with friends
   - spend more time with family
   - avoid certain people
   - avoid the place where the incident occurred
   - avoid similar types of places
   - other (please explain)
   - NO CHANGES

20. Have you experienced any of the following as a result of the crime incident? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - family problems
   - problems at work
   - painful memories of incident
   - dreams or nightmares related to incident
   - distress when reminded of incident
   - loss of interest in usual activities
   - memory loss/forgetfulness
   - been jumpy or easily startled
   - problems sleeping
   - difficulty keeping up appearance/grooming
   - been more irritable or easily annoyed
   - trouble concentrating
   - confusion at times
   - anxious
   - changes in appetite
   - physical pain (soreness, bruises, etc.)
   - physical illness (nausea, headaches, etc.)
   - been uncomfortable with physical contact
   - fearful
   - angry
   - depressed/sad
   - increased alcohol use
   - other (please explain)
   - NONE

21. What was most helpful to you after the incident?

22. What do you think should happen to the suspect in this case? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - nothing
   - counseling/treatment
   - make payment to victim
   - probation
   - jail/prison term
   - death sentence
   - become a victim of a similar crime
   - other (please explain)
   - NO CHANGES

23. Have you been a victim of a violent crime, before this incident?
   - yes
   - no (GO TO QUESTION 24)

23a. What type of violent crime(s)? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - assault/light
   - sexual assault/rape
   - robbery/theft with force or threat
   - other (please explain)

23b. Was the suspect in the recent incident involved in any of the prior violent crime(s)?
   - yes
   - no

24. Do you have any suggestions to improve services for victims or witnesses?
This page will be separated from your survey when it is received to make sure your responses are confidential.

We may want to contact you in about six months to ask about your experiences with the criminal justice system and other agencies. Again, each person’s responses are very important to our study. If you agree to be contacted, please provide your name, address, and phone number below. If you think you might move, please provide the name, address, and phone number of a friend or relative. We would prefer to call you on the phone, but if you would like to be contacted by mail, please indicate in the space provided. Also, indicate if you would like a copy of our report.

PLEASE PRINT

Name: ______________________________ __

Address: --------------------------­

Day Phone: (___)____________________ _

Night Phone: (___)____________________ _

Contact by mail only ______

Would like copy of report ______

Relative or Friend

Name: ______________________________ __

Address: ____________________________ __

Phone: (___)____________________ __

Thank you for your help. Please return the survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.
The San Diego Association of Governments is conducting a study of people who have recently been involved in violent crimes in San Diego county. A few months ago, you returned a survey indicating that we could talk to you again about a violent crime that happened about six months ago. This survey includes questions about what has happened to you since that incident. As you probably remember from the other survey, you will not be identified by name and your answers will be completely confidential.

1. Have you been contacted by a police officer or detective working on the case about this incident? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - on the day of the incident
   - within a month after the incident or
   - after the first month?

2. Has anyone been arrested for this crime?
   - yes
   - no (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
   - don’t know (GO TO QUESTION 2d)

   a. How was the case resolved? (What happened with the case?) (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
      - defendant pled guilty (GO TO QUESTION 2b)
      - defendant convicted by court (GO TO QUESTION 2b)
      - diversion (defendant given a program instead of prosecution) (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - case dropped/dismissed (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - defendant found not guilty in trial (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - case pending/in process (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - some other way (please explain)

   b. (IF SUSPECT CONVICTED) What was the sentence? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
      - make payment to victim
      - counseling/treatment (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - probation (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - jail/prison term (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - death sentence (GO TO QUESTION 2d)
      - something else (please explain)

   c. (IF RESTITUTION ORDERED) Have you received any money from the suspect?
      - yes
      - no

   d. Did you do any of the following related to the case? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
      - talk to prosecutor(s) (District Attorney or City Attorney)
      - talk to defense attorney(s)
      - testify in court
      - obtain a restraining order
      - tell the judge how the crime affected you at sentencing
      - none of the above

   e. Do you feel your opinions were taken into account when decisions were made about the case?
      - yes
      - no

   f. What do you think should happen (should have happened) to the suspect in this case? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
      - nothing
      - make payment to victim
      - counseling/treatment
      - probation
      - jail/prison term
      - death sentence
      - become a victim of a similar crime
      - something else (please explain)
3. **(SKIP IF NO CONTACT WITH THE POLICE)**

   Overall, how satisfied were you with your contacts with the police in this case during the past six months? Would you say...

   (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
   
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ neither satisfied or dissatisfied
   ___ not satisfied
   ___ very dissatisfied?
   
   a. Why?

4. **(SKIP IF NO CONTACT WITH THE PROSECUTOR)**

   Overall, how satisfied were you with your contacts with the prosecution in this case during the past six months? Would you say...

   (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
   
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ neither satisfied or dissatisfied
   ___ not satisfied
   ___ very dissatisfied?
   
   a. Why?

5. **(SKIP IF NO CONTACT WITH JUDGE)**

   Overall, how satisfied were you with your contacts with the judge in this case during the past six months? Would you say...

   (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
   
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ neither satisfied or dissatisfied
   ___ not satisfied
   ___ very dissatisfied?
   
   a. Why?

6. **Overall**, how satisfied were you with your contacts with the criminal justice system (from police through court sentencing) during the past six months? Would you say...

   (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
   
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ neither satisfied or dissatisfied
   ___ not satisfied
   ___ very dissatisfied?
   
   a. Why?

7. During the past six months, have you been involved in any law suits related to this incident?

   ___ yes (please explain)
   ___ no

8. Have you received any of the following services since the incident (during the past six months)?

   (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   
   ___ referrals to other agencies
   ___ interpreter
   ___ counseling
   ___ psychological/psychiatric services
   ___ financial aid, emergency money
   ___ explanation of police procedures
   ___ explanation of medical procedures
   ___ information on case
   ___ help with court process (go with you to court proceedings, explain court process, assist you with restraining orders)
   ___ help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.
   ___ assistance with financial claim forms
   ___ education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)
   ___ emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
   ___ necessities, such as food, clothing
   ___ services, such as clean-up and repairs
   ___ health care
   ___ child care
   ___ drug/alcohol treatment
   ___ transportation
   ___ hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
   ___ attend support group meetings
   ___ any other service (please specify) ______
   ___ none (GO TO QUESTION 9)
a. Who provided the information or service to you? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- CIT - San Diego Crisis Intervention Team
- The EYE - Crisis Response Team (Escondido)
- TIP - Trauma Intervention Program
- WRC - Women's Resource Center
- CWSS - Center for Women's Studies and Services
- police officers or detectives
- District Attorney Victim/Witness program
- paramedics
- hospital medical staff
- hospital social worker
- hospital chaplain
- coroner
- someone else (please specify)
- don't remember agency (please describe service)

b. When was the information or service provided? Was that...
(PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- on the day of the incident
- within a month after the incident or
- after the first month?

c. Are you receiving services from any agency now?
- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 8d)

i. (IF YES) Which ones? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- referrals to other agencies
- interpreter
- counseling
- psychological/psychiatric services
- financial aid, emergency money
- explanation of police procedures
- explanation of medical procedures
- information on case
- help with court process (go with you to court proceedings, explain court process assist you with restraining orders)
- help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.
- assistance with financial claim forms
- education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)
- emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- necessities, such as food, clothing
- services, such as clean-up and repairs
- health care
- child care
- drug/alcohol treatment
- transportation
- hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- attend support group meetings
- any other service (please specify)


d. Overall, how would you rate the information or service you received? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
- very helpful
- helpful
- not helpful?

i. In what way?
e. For each of the following time periods, what information or service was most helpful to you? Why? (PLEASE PICK ONE SERVICE FOR EACH TIME PERIOD AND EXPLAIN)

i. on the day of the incident:

Why was this most helpful?

ii. within a month after the incident:

Why was this most helpful?

iii. after the first month:

Why was this most helpful?

9. Was there any information or service you needed, but did not receive?

yes
no (GO TO QUESTION 10)

a. (IF YES) What information or service did you need? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

interpreter

psychological/psychiatric services

financial aid, emergency money

explanation of police procedures

explanation of medical procedures

information on case

help with court process (go with you to court proceedings, explain court process, assist you with restraining orders)

help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.

assistance with financial claim forms

education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)

emergency shelter/hotel vouchers

necessities, such as food, clothing services, such as clean-up and repairs

health care

child care

drug/alcohol treatment

transportation

hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone

attend support group meetings

any other service (please specify)

10. Were you aware this information or service was available?

yes
no

11. Were you receiving any services before the incident?

yes
no (GO TO QUESTION 12)

a. (IF YES) What services did you receive before this incident? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

interpreter

counseling

psychological/psychiatric services

financial aid, emergency money

explanation of police procedures

explanation of medical procedures

information on case

help with court process (go with you to court proceedings, explain court process, assist you with restraining orders)

help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.

assistance with financial claim forms

education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)

emergency shelter/hotel vouchers

necessities, such as food, clothing services, such as clean-up and repairs

health care

child care

drug/alcohol treatment

transportation

hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone

attend support group meetings

any other service (please specify)

12. What financial loss, if any, resulted from this incident? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

lost wages

property loss/damage

counseling costs

medical/dental expenses

legal costs

funeral/burial costs

any other loss (please explain)

none (GO TO QUESTION 13)
13. **a.** (IF FINANCIAL LOSS) Did you receive any financial assistance from an insurance company, government or private agency? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - insurance company
   - federal agency (please specify)
   - state agency (please specify)
   - local government agency (please specify)
   - private agency (please specify)
   - other (please specify)
   - no (GO TO QUESTION 13)

   **b.** Did the financial assistance you received completely cover your monetary loss?
   - yes (GO TO QUESTION 13)
   - no

   **i.** (IF NO) About what percentage was covered?
   - ___ %

14. Do you have close friends or relatives living nearby?
    - yes
    - no

15. **a.** (IF LIVING WITH SOMEONE OTHER THAN THE SUSPECT) Did you tell anyone you live with about the incident?
    - yes
    - no (GO TO QUESTION 16)

   **a.** (IF YES) Was their reaction on the day of the incident? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
    - very supportive
    - supportive
    - neither supportive or unsupportive
    - unsupportive
    - very unsupportive
    - not applicable

   **b.** Was their reaction within a month after that? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
    - very supportive
    - supportive
    - neither supportive or unsupportive
    - unsupportive
    - very unsupportive
    - not applicable

   **c.** Was their reaction after the first month? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
    - very supportive
    - supportive
    - neither supportive or unsupportive
    - unsupportive
    - very unsupportive
    - not applicable

13. Who were you living with at the time of the incident? Who are you living with now? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
    **At time Now**
    - alone
    - parents/stepparents/guardians
    - husband/wife
    - boyfriend/girlfriend/significant other
    - son/daughter
    - other family member (please specify)
    - friend/roommate
    - other children
    - Other (please specify)
16. Have you told (other) close friends or relatives about the incident?
   ____ yes
   ____ no (GO TO QUESTION 17)
   
   a. (IF YES) Was their reaction on the day of the incident? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
      ____ very supportive
      ____ supportive
      ____ neither supportive or unsupportive
      ____ unsupportive
      ____ very unsupportive
      ____ not applicable?
   
   b. Was their reaction within a month after that? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
      ____ very supportive
      ____ supportive
      ____ neither supportive or unsupportive
      ____ unsupportive
      ____ very unsupportive
      ____ not applicable?
   
   c. Was their reaction after the first month? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
      ____ very supportive
      ____ supportive
      ____ neither supportive or unsupportive
      ____ unsupportive
      ____ very unsupportive
      ____ not applicable?

17. Have any of your friends or relatives encouraged you to seek help?
   ____ yes
   ____ no

18. As a result of the crime incident, do you ever . . .
    (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
    ____ avoid going out during the day
    ____ avoid going out at night
    ____ avoid crowds
    ____ avoid going out alone
    ____ stay home from work more often
    ____ stay home more often, in general
    ____ spend more time alone
    ____ call friends more often
    ____ call family more often
    ____ spend more time with friends
    ____ spend more time with family
    ____ avoid certain people
    ____ avoid the place where the incident occurred
    ____ avoid similar types of places
    ____ anything else (please explain)
    ____ none of the above

19. Are you experiencing any of the following as a result of the crime incident?
    (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
    ____ family problems
    ____ problems at work
    ____ painful memories of incident
    ____ dreams or nightmares related to incident
    ____ distress when reminded of incident
    ____ loss of interest in usual activities
    ____ memory loss/forgetfulness
    ____ been jumpy or easily startled
    ____ problems sleeping
    ____ difficulty keeping up appearance/grooming
    ____ been more irritable or easily annoyed
    ____ trouble concentrating
    ____ confusion at times
    ____ anxious
    ____ changes in appetite
    ____ physical pain (soreness, bruises, etc.)
    ____ physical illness (nausea, headaches, etc.)
    ____ been uncomfortable with physical contact
    ____ fearful
    ____ angry
    ____ depressed/sad
    ____ increased alcohol use
    ____ anything else (please explain)
    ____ none of the above
Now, a few questions about you.

20. Are you:
   ___ married
   ___ separated
   ___ divorced
   ___ widowed
   ___ single/never married?

21. Were you working at the time of the incident?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   a. (IF YES) Did you miss time from work because of the crime incident (during the past six months)?
      ___ yes
      ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 22)

   i. (IF YES) How much time?
      ___ hours ___ days ___ weeks ___ months

22. Are you currently employed?
   ___ yes
   ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 23)
   a. (IF YES) What is your job? (What do you do?)

23. What is the combined annual income of all family members living in your household (including yourself)? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE)
   ___ less than $10,000
   ___ $10,000 to $14,999
   ___ $15,000 to $24,999
   ___ $25,000 to $34,999
   ___ $35,000 to $49,999
   ___ $50,000 or over

24. How long have you lived at your current residence?
   ___ years ___ months ___ weeks ___ days
   a. (IF LIVED AT CURRENT ADDRESS LESS THAN 6 MONTHS) Why did you move during the past 6 months?

25. How important do you think it is for victims/witnesses of violent crimes to be involved in the criminal justice system? (PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE) Would you say . . .
   ___ very important
   ___ somewhat important
   ___ not very important
   ___ not important at all?

26. When you think back to your contacts with police, criminal justice personnel, community agencies, friends, and family, what was most helpful to you? Why?
27. Do you have any suggestions to improve the criminal justice process or services available for victims or witnesses?

Thank you. If you would like a copy of our report, the results of our study will be available in Spring 1995. To ensure receiving a copy of the study, it is important to have your correct address.

PLEASE PRINT

Name:____________________________________
Address:__________________________________
________________________________________

If your address changes, please call Darlanne Hector at 595-5375 to let us know.

San Diego Association of Governments
First Interstate Plaza
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101
### CASE TRACKING FORM

#### CASE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>Rec Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EVIDENCE COLLECTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Fingerprints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Other Prints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Weapon/Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Stains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Blood/Semen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Other - Explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SERVICE PROVIDERS AT SCENE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SDPD Crisis Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EYE Crisis Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Center for Women's Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Women's Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trauma Intervention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DA Victim/Witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other - Explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Follow Up Ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Loss $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Injured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Suspect Arrested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**Suspect Information**

| ID No. | 2 |
|--------|
| Rec Type |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Suspects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race of Suspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sex of Suspects (Enter Number) |  |
| Male |  |
| Female |  |

| Age of Suspects (Enter Number) |  |
| Under 18 |  |
| 18-24 |  |
| 25-35 |  |
| 36+ |  |

| Drug/Alcohol (Type Unknown) |  |
| 0 = None |  |
| 1 = Alcohol |  |
| 2 = Drug |  |
| 3 = Both |  |
| 4 = Drug/Alcohol (Type Unknown) |  |

| Number of Suspects Arrested |  |
| Number of Suspects Booked |  |

| Arrest Dates | |
| Suspect # | |
| Suspect # | |
| Suspect # | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Arrest Charge</th>
<th>BCS Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Number Complaint/Petition Filed |  |
| Number Charges Filed On |  |
| Highest Charge Filed | BCS Code |

| Number of Adult Sentences |  |
| Reject/No Complaint Filed |  |
| Diversion |  |
| Dismissed |  |
| Acquitted |  |
| Guilty Plea/Convicted |  |
| Pending |  |
| FTA |  |
| Other |  |
| Explain |  |
| Unknown |  |

| Number of Juvenile Dispositions |  |
| Not Referred by Police |  |
| Counseled and Closed by Probation |  |
| Informal Probation |  |
| True Finding |  |
| Dismissal |  |
| Pending |  |
| FTA |  |
| Other |  |
| Explain |  |
| Unknown |  |

| Disposition Dates | |
| Suspect # | |
| Suspect # | |
| Suspect # | |

| Highest Conviction Charge | BCS Code |
| Number of Other Conviction Charges |  |

| Number of Juvenile Sentences |  |
| CYA |  |
| Juvenile Ranch Facility |  |
| Juvenile Hall |  |
| 24-Hour School |  |
| Probation |  |
| Pending |  |
| FTA |  |
| Other |  |
| Explain |  |
| Unknown |  |

| Treatment Ordered |  |
| Reject/No Complaint Filed |  |
| Diversion |  |
| Dismissed |  |
| Acquitted |  |
| Guilty Plea/Convicted |  |
| Pending |  |
| FTA |  |
| Other |  |
| Explain |  |
| Unknown |  |

| Sentence Dates | |
| Suspect # | |
| Suspect # | |
| Suspect # | |
SERVICES PROVIDED AT SCENE

- Referrals (Please Specify)
- Interpreter (Please Specify)
- Counseling
- Psychological/psychiatric services
- Financial aid, emergency money
- Explanation of police procedures
- Explanation of medical procedures
- Information on case
- Help with court process
- Help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.
- Assistance with financial claim forms
- Education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)
- Emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- Necessities, such as food, clothing
- Services, such as clean-up and repairs
- Health care
- Child care
- Drug/alcohol treatment
- Funeral/burial services
- Transportation
- Hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- Support group meetings
- TRO
- DV Information sheet
- CWSS
- Any other services (Please Specify)

SERVICES PROVIDED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AT SCENE

- Referrals (Please Specify)
- Interpreter (Please Specify)
- Counseling
- Psychological/psychiatric services
- Financial aid, emergency money
- Explanation of police procedures
- Explanation of medical procedures
- Information on case
- Help with court process
- Help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.
- Assistance with financial claim forms
- Education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)
- Emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- Necessities, such as food, clothing
- Services, such as clean-up and repairs
- Health care
- Child care
- Drug/alcohol treatment
- Funeral/burial services
- Transportation

(Continued on next page)
SERVICES PROVIDED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AT SCENE (CONT.)

- [ ] Hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- [ ] Support group meetings
- [ ] TRO
- [ ] DV Information sheet
- [ ] CWSS
- [ ] Any other services (Please Specify)

FOLLOW-UP SERVICES PROVIDED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT

- [ ] Referrals (Please Specify)
- [ ] Interpreter (Please Specify)
- [ ] Counseling
- [ ] Psychological/psychiatric services
- [ ] Financial aid, emergency money
- [ ] Explanation of police procedures
- [ ] Explanation of medical procedures
- [ ] Information on case
- [ ] Help with court process
- [ ] Help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.
- [ ] Assistance with financial claim forms
- [ ] Education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)
- [ ] Emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- [ ] Necessities, such as food, clothing
- [ ] Services, such as clean-up and repairs
- [ ] Health care
- [ ] Child care
- [ ] Drug/alcohol treatment
- [ ] Funeral/burial services
- [ ] Transportation
- [ ] Hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- [ ] Support group meetings
- [ ] TRO
- [ ] DV Information sheet
- [ ] CWSS
- [ ] Any other services (Please Specify)

FOLLOW-UP CONTACT DONE BY

0 = None
1 = SDPD Crisis Team
2 = EYE Crisis Team
3 = Center for Women’s Studies
4 = Women’s Resource Center
5 = Trauma Intervention Program
6 = DA Victim/Witness
7 = Law Enforcement
8 = Other - Explain
9 = Unknown

FOLLOW-UP SERVICES PROVIDED

- [ ] Referrals (Please Specify)
- [ ] Interpreter (Please Specify)
- [ ] Counseling
- [ ] Psychological/psychiatric services
- [ ] Financial aid, emergency money
- [ ] Explanation of police procedures
- [ ] Explanation of medical procedures
- [ ] Information on case
- [ ] Help with court process
- [ ] Help with other outside agencies, such as employers, creditors, etc.
- [ ] Assistance with financial claim forms
- [ ] Education (self defense, crime prevention, etc.)
- [ ] Emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- [ ] Necessities, such as food, clothing
- [ ] Services, such as clean-up and repairs
- [ ] Health care
- [ ] Child care
- [ ] Drug/alcohol treatment
- [ ] Funeral/burial services
- [ ] Transportation
- [ ] Hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- [ ] Support group meetings
- [ ] TRO
- [ ] DV Information sheet
- [ ] CWSS
- [ ] Any other services (Please Specify)

HEARINGS ATTENDED

Preliminary Date
Trial Date
Sentencing Date
Probation Revocation Date
SURVEY OF VOLUNTEERS/STAFF IN VICTIM/WITNESS SERVICE PROGRAMS

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is conducting surveys of staff and volunteers involved with victim/witness programs in San Diego as part of a federally-funded evaluation of alternative victim assistance programs. This survey includes questions regarding your experiences with these programs, your responsibilities, and your opinions with respect to the needs of victims and witnesses. Your responses are confidential, and you will not be identified by name. Please return the survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by May 3, 1993.

Experience with the Program

1. How long have you been involved with the victim/witness assistance program?
   ____ years  ____ months

   la. Are you a staff member or volunteer?
      ____ staff member  ____ volunteer  ____ other (specify)

   1b. In a typical month, how many hours do you devote to the program (including training, meetings, etc.)?
      ____ hours

2. How did you first learn about the program? (CHECK ONE)
   ____ friend  ____ from another organization  ____ advertisement for volunteers
   ____ announcement/flyer  ____ tv or radio  ____ newspaper
   ____ other (specify)

3. Why did you become involved in the program? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   ____ to help other people
   ____ because I was a crime victim
   ____ because I was involved in another type of crisis situation
   ____ because a friend is involved in the program
   ____ because of my involvement in the criminal justice system
   ____ other (specify)

4. What is the specific purpose or goal of the program?
5. What are your responsibilities? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- crisis intervention
- sexual abuse response team
- referrals to outside agencies
- advocacy for clients
- follow-up counseling
- assist in processing claims to State
- locate financial aide or services for clients
- supervision of staff/volunteers
- other (specify) __________________________

5a. (IF CRISIS INTERVENTION OR SART) In a typical month, how many in-person calls do you respond to?

- calls

6. Has the program changed since you have been involved?

- yes (In what ways?)
- no

7. What specific types of referral services does your agency provide for victims and witnesses? What types of referrals do you make to other agencies? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own Agency</th>
<th>Other Agency</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on-scene intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>follow-up counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>psychological/psychiatric services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>financial assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>advocacy with outside entities (employers, creditors, justice agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other court-related services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>claims assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emergency shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>necessities, such as food, clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>services, such as clean-up and repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>child care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drug/alcohol treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>funeral/burial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hotline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other (specify) __________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. What services are needed most by victims and witnesses?

8. What types of victims and witnesses do you assist? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

   ___ victims of violent crimes
   ___ witnesses to violent crimes
   ___ victims/survivors of natural deaths/SIDS
   ___ accident victims
   ___ victims of hostage incidents
   ___ other (specify) __________________________

   ___ victims of other types of crimes
   ___ witnesses to other crimes
   ___ survivors of suicide victims
   ___ witnesses to accidents
   ___ others involved in hostage incidents
   ___ (such as families, witnesses, etc.)

9. Do your activities vary based on the type of crime or incident?
   ___ yes (In what ways?)
   ___ no

10. How do you establish rapport with victims and witnesses?

      Victims:

      Witnesses:

11. Do you receive feedback regarding how you handled crisis situations?
   ___ yes
   ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 12)

11a. Who provides the feedback? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

   ___ supervisor
   ___ police officer
   ___ other (specify) __________________________

   ___ hospital staff
   ___ victim
11b. In what form is the feedback? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

___ verbal
___ other (specify)
___ written

11c. Is the feedback helpful?

___ yes (In what ways?)
___ no (Why not?)

12. (CRISIS INTERVENTIONISTS ONLY) Which of the following have you done, or would you do, in crime-related incidents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have Done</th>
<th>Would Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give referrals (phone numbers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give copies of printed material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request additional volunteer(s) at scene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get cards from others at scene (e.g., police, coroner, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide drinks/snacks at scene to victim/witness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relay information between victim/witness and police at scene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relay information between victim/witness and others at scene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone other relatives/friends for victim/witness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact other agencies for victim/witness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide transportation to victim/witness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give stuffed animals or toys to child victims/witnesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clothing/blankets to victims/witnesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact victim/witness to follow-up after incident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call other volunteer or staff member to discuss call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Did you receive training to work with this program?

___ yes
___ no (GO TO QUESTION 14)

13a. How many hours was the training?

___ hours

13b. What was the format of the training? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

___ classroom lectures
___ workshops with participation by trainees
___ ride-alongs with police
___ other (specify)
___ role playing
___ visiting agencies
___ on-the-job training
13c. What topics were covered in the training?

13d. How would you rate the training you received? (CHECK ONE)

___ very good ___ good ___ fair ___ poor ___ very poor

13e. Please explain your response.

14. In general, how satisfied are you with the program? (CHECK ONE)

___ very satisfied ___ satisfied ___ unsatisfied ___ very unsatisfied

14a. Please explain your response.

15. Do you plan to continue with the program?

___ yes (Why?) ___ no (Why not?)

Coordination with Others
The following questions relate to your involvement with other agencies.

16. Do you coordinate with law enforcement agencies?

___ yes ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 17)
16a. Which agencies? Which units or divisions, primarily?

Agencies                  Divisions

16b. In what ways do you coordinate with law enforcement agencies?

___ coordinate the actions taken at the crisis scene
___ follow-up on crisis incidents
___ receive feedback regarding incidents
___ provide feedback regarding incidents
___ attend regular meetings
___ contact by phone, as needed
___ other (specify) __________________________

16c. Have you experienced any problems in coordinating with these agencies?

___ yes (Please explain.)      ___ no

16d. How could these problems be resolved?

17. Do you coordinate with other criminal justice agencies (such as the District Attorney Victim/Witness program, prosecutors, courts, police, probation etc.)

___ yes          ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 18)
17a. Which agencies?

17b. In what ways do you coordinate with these agencies?

- coordinate the actions taken at the crisis scene
- follow-up on crisis incidents
- receive feedback regarding incidents
- provide feedback regarding incidents
- attend regular meetings
- contact by phone, as needed
- other (specify) __________________________

17c. Have you experienced any problems in coordinating with these agencies?

- yes (Please explain.)
- no

17d. How could these problems be resolved?

18. Do you coordinate with community agencies?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 19)

18a. Which agencies?

18b. In what ways do you coordinate with these agencies?

- coordinate the actions taken at the crisis scene
- follow-up on crisis incidents
- receive feedback regarding incidents
- provide feedback regarding incidents
- attend regular meetings
- contact by phone, as needed
- other (specify) __________________________
18c. Have you experienced any problems in coordinating with these agencies?

____ yes (Please explain.)     ____ no

18d. How could these problems be resolved?

19. Is there duplication of services provided by different agencies?

____ yes     ___ no (GO TO QUESTION 20)

19a. Which agencies? In what ways? Does this create problems?

| Agencies | Ways | Problems |

Victim/Witness Needs

The focus of the next section is the specific needs of victims and witnesses.

20. In general, what are the needs of the violent crime victims and witnesses in San Diego county?
20a. Are these needs being met by the services available? (CHECK ONE)

   ____ yes (GO TO QUESTION 21)  ____ some  ____ no  ____ don't know

20b. What needs are not being met?

20c. How could these needs be met by your program, or other agencies?

21. Do you have any additional comments regarding services for victims and witnesses in San Diego county?

General Questions

As part of our study, we would like to compile some information on the types of people who work with victims and witnesses. Therefore, the next questions ask about you.

22. How old are you?

   ____ years

23. How many years of school have you completed?

   ____ years

24. Are you employed full-time, part-time, or not employed? (CHECK ONE)

   ____ full time
   ____ retired (GO TO QUESTION 25)  ____ part time
   ____ not employed (GO TO QUESTION 25)
24a. What is your current position?

25. Do you consider yourself? (CHECK ONE)
___ White
___ Hispanic
___ Other (specify) __________
___ Black
___ Asian

26. What languages do you speak? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
___ English
___ German
___ Spanish
___ Chinese
___ French
___ Japanese
___ Southeast Asian dialect (specify) __________
___ sign language
___ other (specify) __________

27. What is your position with the agency? (CHECK ONE)
___ supervisor
___ investigative specialist
___ other (specify) __________
___ counselor/interventionist
___ claims technician

28. Are you:
___ male
___ female
Research Being Conducted

29. We will be conducting surveys and interviews with crime victims and witnesses in San Diego County. Do you have any suggestions for questions to ask victims and witnesses in our surveys and interviews?

30. If you would like to receive a copy of our final report, please include your name and address. This page will be separated from the survey to preserve the confidentiality of your responses.

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing the survey. Please return the survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope to:

Christine Curtis
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 595-5361
SURVEY OF SERVICE PROVIDERS

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is conducting surveys of community agencies that provide services to violent crime victims and witnesses in San Diego as part of a federally-funded evaluation of victim assistance programs. This survey includes questions regarding your experiences with victim assistance programs, the services you provided by your program, and your opinions with respect to the needs of violent crime victims and witnesses. Your responses are confidential, and you will not be identified by name. Please return the survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by August 12th.

Program Information

1. What is the specific purpose or goal of your program related to crime victims? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - crisis intervention
   - emotional support
   - referrals and information
   - help with court process
   - advocacy
   - legal assistance
   - counseling
   - shelter
   - food/clothing
   - general assistance
   - transportation
   - employment assistance
   - interpreter
   - support groups
   - financial assistance
   - other (specify) ____________________________

2. What is your target population? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - domestic violence victims
   - homicide survivors/witnesses
   - sexual assault victims
   - child abuse victims
   - other violent crime victims
   - SIDS survivors
   - suicide survivors
   - natural death survivors
   - accident victims
   - witnesses to accidents
   - adolescents
   - senior citizens
   - other (specify) ____________________________

3. How is first contact usually made with the crime victim/witness? (PLEASE CHECK ONE)
   - victim/witness contacts us
   - we call victim/witness
   - other (specify) ____________________________

4. Are crime victims/witnesses ever referred to you by another agency?
   - yes
   - no (GO TO QUESTION 5)

4a. For each of the following agencies from which you receive referrals, please rate your level of satisfaction with referral procedures on a scale from one to five with 1 = very satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither satisfied or unsatisfied; 4 = unsatisfied; and 5 = very unsatisfied. (PLEASE RATE ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Law enforcement officers/detectives
   - San Diego Police Crisis Intervention Team
   - Other (specify) ____________________________

5. What are your agency’s hours of operation? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Normal business hours (Monday to Friday, 8 to 5)
   - Weekday evenings
   - Weekend days
   - Weekend evenings
   - 24 hours (e.g., hotline, availability by pager)
   - Other (specify) ____________________________

6. What area(s) of the county does your program serve? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - City of San Diego
   - Carlsbad
   - Chula Vista
   - Coronado
   - Del Mar
   - El Cajon
   - Encinitas
   - Escondido
   - Imperial Beach
   - Oceanside
   - Poway
   - National City
   - San Marcos
   - Santee
   - Solana Beach
   - Vista
   - Other (specify) ____________________________
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7. What is the range of fees for all of the services you provide for crime victims/witnesses? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- none
- $1 - $25
- $26 - $50
- $51 - $75
- $75 - $100
- over $100
- sliding scale
- other (specify) __________________________

8. What services do you provide to crime victims/witnesses?

- referrals to other agencies
- interpreter
- counseling
- psychological/psychiatric services
- financial assistance
- explain police procedures
- explain medical procedures/hospital accompaniment
- information on case
- advocacy with outside entities (e.g., employers, creditors, justice agencies)
- court accompaniment and other court-related services (e.g., explanation of the criminal justice system, legal services, help with the court process)
- claims assistance
- educational services (e.g., self defense, crime prevention)
- emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- necessities, such as food, clothing
- services, such as clean-up and repairs
- health care
- child care
- drug/alcohol treatment
- funeral/burial services
- transportation
- hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- support groups
- conflict resolution between individuals
- job assistance/training
- public awareness campaigns
- other (specify) __________________________

9. Do you ever refer crime victims/witnesses to other service providers?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 10)

9a. To which type of services do you refer?

- interpreter
- counseling
- psychological/psychiatric services
- financial assistance
- explain police procedures
- explain medical procedures/hospital accompaniment
- information on case
- advocacy with outside entities (e.g., employers, creditors, justice agencies)
- court accompaniment and other court-related services (e.g., explanation of the criminal justice system, legal services, help with the court process)
- claims assistance
- educational services (e.g., self defense, crime prevention)
- emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- necessities, such as food, clothing
- services, such as clean-up and repairs
- health care
- child care
- drug/alcohol treatment
- funeral/burial services
- transportation
- hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- support groups
- conflict resolution between individuals
- job assistance/training
- public awareness campaigns
- other (specify) __________________________

Coordination with Others

10. Do you coordinate with criminal justice agencies (such as the District Attorney Victim/Witness program, prosecutors, courts, police, probation, etc.)?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 11)

10a. With which criminal justice agencies do you coordinate? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Law enforcement
- District Attorney Victim Witness Program
- Prosecutor/District Attorney/Federal
- Prosecutor/Attorney General
- Defense Attorney
- Probation
- Court/Judges
- Prison/Department of Corrections
- other (specify) __________________________

10b. What types of situations would most likely lead to coordination?
10c. In what ways do you coordinate with these agencies?

- receive referrals
- give referrals
- follow-up on crisis incidents
- attend regular meetings
- contact by phone, as needed
- other (specify)

10b. In what ways do you coordinate with these agencies? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- receive referrals
- give referrals
- follow-up on crisis incidents
- attend regular meetings
- contact by phone, as needed
- other (specify)

10d. Have you experienced any problems in coordinating with these agencies?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 11)

10e. What problems? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- limited resources in other agencies to assist victims
- language barriers
- territorial
- lack of concern for victim
- inappropriate referrals
- difficult to contact
- uncooperative
- other (specify)

10f. How could these problems be resolved? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- better communication
- clearer definition of roles
- show more concern for victim
- greater knowledge of services offered
- increased staff and resources
- other (specify)

11. Do you coordinate with agencies other than criminal justice?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 12)

11a. Which agencies? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- hospitals
- Coroner/Medical Examiner
- SIDS groups/guilds
- organizations for battered women
- religious-based organizations
- shelters
- support groups
- hotlines
- child protective services and other social services
- legal clinics
- other (specify)

11b. In what ways do you coordinate with these agencies? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- receive referrals
- give referrals
- follow-up on crisis incidents
- attend regular meetings
- contact by phone, as needed
- other (specify)

11c. Have you experienced any problems in coordinating with these agencies?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 12)

11d. What problems? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- limited resources in other agencies to assist victims
- language barriers
- territorial
- lack of concern for victim
- inappropriate referrals
- difficult to contact
- uncooperative
- other (specify)

11e. How could these problems be resolved? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- better communication
- clearer definition of roles
- show more concern for victim
- greater knowledge of services offered
- increased staff and resources
- other (specify)

12. Is there duplication of services provided by different agencies?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 13)
12a. Which services? Domestic Violence Victims

We are particularly interested in special needs of families involved in domestic violence. Therefore, the following questions focus on this group.

13. What percent of your work involves violence against women? ____ percent

14. Are the needs of domestic violence victims being met by the services available?
   ____ yes (GO TO QUESTION 15)
   ____ most
   ____ some
   ____ no
   ____ don't know (GO TO QUESTION 15)

14a. What needs are not being met? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   ____ interpreter
   ____ counseling
   ____ psychological/psychiatric services
   ____ financial assistance
   ____ explain police procedures
   ____ explain medical procedures/hospital
   ____ accompaniment
   ____ information on case
   ____ advocacy with outside entities (e.g., employers, creditors, justice agencies)
   ____ court accompaniment and other court-related services (e.g., explanation of the criminal justice system, legal services, help with the court process)
   ____ claims assistance
   ____ educational services (e.g., self defense, crime prevention)
   ____ emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
   ____ necessities, such as food, clothing
   ____ services, such as clean-up and repairs
   ____ health care
   ____ child care
   ____ drug/alcohol treatment
   ____ funeral/burial services
   ____ transportation
   ____ hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
   ____ support groups
   ____ conflict resolution between individuals
   ____ job assistance/training
   ____ public awareness campaigns
   ____ other (specify) ____________________________

12b. In what ways are services duplicated?

12c. Does this create any problems?
   ____ yes ____ no (GO TO QUESTION 13)

12d. What types of problems does it create?

15. Are there barriers preventing access to services for domestic violence victims?
   ____ yes ____ no (GO TO QUESTION 16)
15a. What barriers exist?

- too much bureaucracy
- takes too long to receive service
- ignorance about service existing
- cultural attitudes about violence
- programs target only a limited population
- qualifying standards too high
- transportation problems
- expense of service
- other (specify) ________________

15b. How could these barriers be removed?

16. In general, throughout San Diego County, how helpful are services for domestic violence victims?

- frequently helpful
- sometimes helpful
- rarely helpful
- never helpful
- don't know

16a. Why?

17. Do you have suggestions regarding how services for domestic violence victims can be made more helpful?

- yes
- no (GO TO QUESTION 18)

17a. Please specify your suggestions.

Victim/Witness Needs

The focus of the next section is the specific needs of violent crime victims and witnesses.

18. In general, what are the needs of violent crime victims and witnesses in San Diego county? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- interpreter
- counseling
- psychological/psychiatric services
- financial assistance
- explain police procedures
- explain medical procedures/hospital accompaniment
- information on case
- advocacy with outside entities (e.g., employers, creditors, justice agencies)
- court accompaniment and other court-related services (e.g., explanation of the criminal justice system, legal services, help with the court process)
- claims assistance
- educational services (e.g., self defense, crime prevention)
- emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- necessities, such as food, clothing services, such as clean-up and repairs
- health care
- child care
- drug/alcohol treatment
- funeral/burial services
- transportation
- hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- support groups
- conflict resolution between individuals
- job assistance/training
- public awareness campaigns
- other (specify) ________________

19. Are the needs of violent crime victims being met by the services available?

- yes (GO TO QUESTION 20)
- most
- some
- no
- don't know (GO TO QUESTION 20)
19a. What needs are not being met? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- interpreter
- counseling
- psychological/psychiatric services
- financial assistance
- explain police procedures
- explain medical procedures/
hospital accompaniment
- information on case
- advocacy with outside entities (e.g.,
employers, creditors, justice agencies)
- court accompaniment and other court-related services (e.g., explanation of the
criminal justice system, legal services, help with the court process)
- claims assistance
- educational services (e.g., self defense,
crime prevention)
- emergency shelter/hotel vouchers
- necessities, such as food, clothing
- services, such as clean-up and repairs
- health care
- child care
- drug/alcohol treatment
- funeral/burial services
- transportation
- hotline information/crisis counseling on the phone
- support groups
- conflict resolution between individuals
- job assistance/training
- public awareness campaigns
- other (specify) 

19b. How could these needs be met by your program,
or other agencies?

20. Are there barriers preventing access to services for
violent crime victims?

- yes 
- no (GO TO QUESTION 21)

20a. What barriers exist?

- too much bureaucracy
- takes too long to receive service
- ignorance about service existing
- cultural attitudes about violence
- programs target only a limited population
- qualifying standards too high
- transportation problems
- expense of service
- other (specify) 

21. What is the single most important service needed by
violent crime victims and witnesses?

22. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions
regarding services for victims and witness in San Diego
county?

General Questions

As part of our study, we would like to compile some
information on the types of people who work with victims and
witnesses. Therefore, the next questions ask about you.

23. How many years of school have you completed?

24. Are you a volunteer? 

25. Are you employed full-time, part-time, or not employed?
(PLEASE CHECK ONE)

- full-time
- part-time
- student (GO TO QUESTION 26)
- retired (GO TO QUESTION 26)
- not employed (GO TO QUESTION 26)

25a. What is your current position?

26. Do you consider yourself? (PLEASE CHECK ONE)

- White
- Hispanic
- Black
- Asian
- Other (specify) 

27. What language(s) do you speak? (PLEASE CHECK ALL
THAT APPLY)

- English
- German
- Spanish
- Chinese
- French
- Japanese
- Southeast Asian dialect (specify)
- sign language
- other (specify) 

28. How old are you?

29. Are you: 

Thank you for completing the survey. Please return the
survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope to:

Darinanne Hoctor
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 595-5375

X-33694.DHO (CRM)
QUESTIONS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT SURVEY
Victim/Witness Services

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is conducting a study of services available to crime victims and witnesses. The survey will assist in determining methods to improve the response by all agencies to crime victims and witnesses. Responses are confidential and will not be identified by name. Please complete this brief survey and return it to your supervisor.

Law Enforcement Referrals:

1. When you contact a violent crime victim or witness who needs services, how do you respond? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - provide pamphlet/list of referrals
   - contact an agency on behalf of a victim/witness
   - give name to someone else in Department who will contact victim/witness
   - call crisis intervention team
   - other (please specify)  

2. Please check if you are familiar with the following services and if you refer victims/witnesses to these agencies:

   Know Refer
   About To
   - SDPD Crisis Intervention Team
   - EYE Crisis Response Team
   - Center for Women’s Studies and Services (CWSS)
   - Women’s Resource Center
   - Trauma Intervention Program (TIP)
   - District Attorney’s Victim/Witness Program
   - other (please specify)  

The following section refers to your experiences with SDPD Crisis Intervention Team. Please GO TO QUESTION 8 if you are not familiar with this program.

3. How did you learn about the Crisis Intervention Team? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - during the academy
   - advanced officer training
   - training bulletins
   - information during "line up"
   - other (please specify)  

4. What are the goals of the Crisis Intervention Team? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - immediate crisis assistance
   - explain police procedures
   - emotional support
   - assist police (please specify)
   - referrals and information
   - help with court processes
   - advocacy
   - legal assistance
   - counseling
   - practical assistance (e.g., call relatives, paperwork, etc.)
   - other (please specify)  

5. Have you ever requested that a crisis interventionist respond to an incident?
   - yes (GO TO QUESTION 6)
   - no (GO TO QUESTION 6)

a. (IF YES) Approximately, how many times in the past year? (ONE NUMBER ONLY PLEASE)
   - times

b. What types of incidents? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - homicide
   - rape
   - robbery
   - assault/domestic violence
   - gang-related incidents
   - other types of crimes
   - natural deaths/SIDS
   - suicides
   - accidents
   - hostage situations
   - homeless cases
   - other (please specify)  

6. Why do you think some officers do not use the services of the Crisis Intervention Team? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - other support available to the victim
   - victims refuse the service
   - too long for CIT to arrive
   - did not think of it/does not know about it
   - do not like it
   - other (please specify)  

   (Over ->)
7. Are there benefits in having a Crisis Intervention Team available?
   - yes (GO TO QUESTION 8)
   - no (GO TO QUESTION 9)

   a. (IF YES) What are the benefits?

   b. (IF NO) What needs are not being met?

8. How did you learn about the DA's Victim/Witness Program?
   (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - during the academy
   - advanced officer training
   - training bulletins
   - information during "line up"
   - other (please specify)

9. Are there benefits in having the DA's Victim/Witness Program available?
   - yes (GO TO QUESTION 10)
   - no (GO TO QUESTION 11)

   a. (IF YES) What are the benefits?

   b. (IF NO) How could these needs be met?

10. Have you ever experienced problems in working with DA's Victim/Witness Program?
    - yes
    - no (GO TO QUESTION 11)

    a. (IF YES) Please explain.

    b. How could these problems be resolved or avoided?

11. Overall, how would you rate the services provided by the DA's Victim/Witness Program?
    - very good
    - good
    - fair
    - poor
    - very poor
    - no opinion

12. Are there ways the program could be improved?
    - yes
    - no (GO TO QUESTION 13)

    a. (IF YES) In what ways?

13. Do you think the needs of victims/witnesses of violent crimes are being met by existing services?
    - yes (GO TO QUESTION 14)
    - some
    - no
    - don't know (GO TO QUESTION 14)

    a. What needs are not being met?

14. What do you think is the most important factor related to victim/witness satisfaction with police response? (PLEASE CHECK ONE ONLY)
    - response time
    - whether an arrest is made
    - level of professionalism
    - level of compassion, empathy or support shown by officer
    - amount of information/referrals given
    - thoroughness of investigation
    - contact after incident for questions
    - case update information
    - other (please specify)

15. What is your agency?
    - San Diego Police Department
    - San Diego Sheriff's Department
    - Escondido Police Department

16. What is your assignment?
    - patrol
    - investigations
    - other (please specify)

17. What is your rank?
    - officer
    - detective
    - agent
    - sergeant
    - lieutenant
    - other (please specify)

18. How long have you been a police officer?
    - less than one year
    - one to five years
    - over five years

19. Do you have any additional comments regarding services for victims and witnesses in San Diego county?

Please place your completed survey in the attached envelope and give it to your supervisor.

Thank you for your cooperation!