Université de Montréal

Crime Victims' Psychological Trauma and Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System, Mediated by Coping Style

By

Sharon H. Gray

École de Criminologie

Faculté des arts et des sciences

Mémoire présenté à la faculté des études supérieures
en vue de l'obtention du grade de
maîtrise en sciences (M. Sc.)
en criminologie

Août 2005

Université de Montréal
Faculté des études supérieures

Ce mémoire intitulé:

Crime Victims' Psychological Trauma and Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System, Mediated by Coping Style

Présenté par:
Sharon H. Gray

A été évalué par un jury composé des personnes suivantes:

Dianne Casoni
.....
Présidente-rapporteuse

Jo-Anne Wemmers
.....
Directrice de recherche

Danielle Drolet
.....
Membre du jury

Summary

The purpose of the present research is to study the relationship between victims' trauma, coping when seeking social support, and satisfaction with the criminal justice system. To this end, using a post-test only design, Chi-square analysis is employed to determine if victims of sexual assault or domestic violence have a stronger tendency towards emotion-focused coping, as well as to assess whether certain personal or support variables are related to being both problem- and emotion-focused. The relationship between receiving instrumental support from criminal justice professionals and satisfaction is calculated for problem-focused as is receiving emotional support for emotion-focused victims.

Results show that information on victim services, the police showing interest and giving victims the chance to express their views, are only significantly related to satisfaction for emotion- and problem-focused victims, but not for those with neither focus. Receiving an explanation of how the court system works, being informed of the progress of the investigation and of upcoming court proceedings, and being treated with courtesy and respect by the police are significantly related to satisfaction for all victims, while being given the opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement is not related to satisfaction for any group. With a theoretical framework on coping proposed by Lazarus and Folkman, and based on the literature on trauma recovery, these findings are discussed in terms of promoting victim satisfaction.

Keywords: Trauma, posttraumatic stress disorder, coping, emotion-focused, problem-focused, instrumental support, emotional support, victim satisfaction.

Sommaire

Cette recherche a pour but d'étudier la relation entre le traumatisme vécu par la victime, le fait qu'elle recherche du soutien social pour affronter soit l'aspect informationnel (*problem-focused*) ou émotionnel (*emotion-focused*) du conflit, et la satisfaction qu'elle ressent face au système judiciaire. L'analyse Khi-carré est utilisée pour déterminer si les victimes d'agression sexuelle ou de violence conjugale ont plutôt tendance à être axées sur l'aspect émotionnel, ainsi qu'à évaluer la relation entre certaines caractèristiques liées à la personne ou aux types du soutien qu'elle possède et être axées à la fois sur l'aspect émotionnel et informationnel de la problématique. Nous avons également examiné la relation entre le soutien de type informationnel reçu des professionnels du système judiciaire et la satisfaction des victimes axées sur cet aspect, ainsi que la relation entre le soutien émotionnel donné et la satisfaction des victimes axées sur les émotions.

Les résultats montrent que les informations sur les services pour les victimes, le fait que les policiers font preuve d'intérêt, et la chance qu'ils donnent aux victimes de pouvoir s'exprimer, sont significativement liés à la satisfaction pour les victimes axées sur l'aspect émotionnel et informationnel de la problématique, mais pas pour celles appartenant à aucun des deux groupes. L'explication du fonctionnement du système judiciaire, l'information sur les suites des procédures et du procès, ainsi que d'être traité avec courtoisie et respect par les policiers, sont significativement liés à la satisfaction pour toutes victimes, tandis que l'opportunité de remplir une Déclaration de la victime ne l'est pour aucune. Avec un cadre théorique sur le « *coping* » proposé par Lazarus and Folkman, et basé sur les écrits sur le traumatisme et le rétablissement, nous terminons avec une discussion de ces résultats en termes de promouvoir la satifaction chez les victimes de crime.

Mots-clés: Traumatisme, stress post-traumatic, *coping*, *emotion-focused, problem-focused*, soutien informationnel, soutien emotionnel, satisfaction des victimes.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

One of the main goals of the criminal justice system is to protect citizens and promote a feeling of security throughout the population by enforcing the laws and imposing consequences for non-compliance. It is imperative to this sense of security that society formally denounces and manages the behavior it has pre-determined to be offensive. In order to justify the formal control of the accused, the victim must come forward, press charges, and supply the necessary evidence. The justice process is founded on principles that protect the rights of the accused and limit the power of the State so that they are balanced, and fair. Western society has laboured to create this formula for justice, while yet leaving victims and their concerns out of the equation. This lack of consideration of victims and their place in the justice process has since been regarded as an important issue in human rights, and attempts to address and remedy the situation are ongoing.

In 1985, the United Nations general assembly adopted its Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime, which clarifies the definition of the victim as well as rights and services that victims are entitled to receive from the criminal justice system and its professionals. These include access to justice and fair and respectful treatment, restitution and reparation from the offender, compensation from the State, and assistance or information about available services and resources for victims.

Inspired by this Declaration, Canadian justice ministers introduced the Canadian Statement of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime in1988, which has since been revised in 2003. These principles are meant to guide the treatment a victim should receive and ensure the treatment be fair. In addition to the items outlined by the UN, the Canadian principles include emphasis on minimizing inconvenience to victims, as well as ensuring their privacy, safety, access to information on the justice system and their role in it, and notification about the investigation, proceedings and the offender. It also declares that victims' views should be respected, their needs considered, and that there should be options for victims when their rights are not respected.

Also in 1988, the Canadian Criminal code was modified to include Act C-89 which was designed to improve the situation for victims within the criminal justice system. The intention of the Bill was to provide victims the opportunity to receive reparation for material and financial loses, to obtain a compensatory sum from the offender, and provide victims with an opportunity to relate how they were affected by their victimization through Victim Impact Statements to be read at sentencing (Lauren & Viens, 1996).

In Québec, the victim compensation board, IVAC (*Indemnisation aux victimes d'actes criminels)*, works with the CSST (*Commission de la santé et de la sécurité du travail)* so that those who are injured during the commission of a crime can be compensated up to 90% of their salary if they are not able to work. Victims may also be reimbursed for any incurred medical expenses, psychotherapy or other social readaptation programs. Applications for compensation must be completed within one year of the damaging incident, and are reviewed case by case as restrictions are made to those who have contributed largely to their own injuries. Although compensation may be important to victims' recovery, it may happen that they are not informed of such services and therefore do not benefit from them (Engel, 1990). Victims of all types of crime, regardless of whether or not the perpetrator is known, accused, or found guilty, may also receive free services from CAVAC[1] *(Centres d'aide aux victimes d'actes criminels)*. They offer telephone consultation, comfort and moral support, information on the judicial process and victims' rights, and recommendations for other judicial, medical, social and community services. There are 16 such centers in Québec, with only one in Montreal, and are managed by a board of directors and run by a team of professionals such as social workers, psychologists, and criminologists.

Although our present, retributive system still has flaws when it comes to balancing the rights of the victim with those of the offender, as Shapland (1985) points out: "victims stressed the criminal nature of the act committed against them and wanted

[1] Services for victims of domestic violence are given by « Côté-cours », an association located within the courthouse that provides resources and practical help for this particular clientele.

compensation, aid and support to come from within the framework of the criminal justice system" (p. 596).

It is imperative to keep working on providing and enforcing victims' rights, as well as consequences when those rights are not respected, in order for victims to be properly served by the criminal justice system. Changes in attitudes may take time to be reflected in the system and to have an impact on the behavior of its professionals (Lauren & Viens, 1996), but this may be at the victim's expense.

Victims' level of satisfaction affects their willingness to support authorities (Wemmers, 1996). When victims feel disrespected, unsupported or excluded from the process, it can lead them to change their level of participation in, and satisfaction with the criminal justice system. This, in turn, does not instill security on the individual level for the witness does not feel protected, or like a valued member of society, and translates to the social level as a belief in the existence of justice for some, but not all.

We will begin in chapter 1 with a review of the literature on trauma, coping, and the effects of the criminal justice system on victims' recovery, which have led us to propose certain hypotheses. Chapter 2 outlines the methodology used to conduct our analysis, and includes a description and characteristics of our sample. This is followed by a chapter on the results obtained of our hypotheses. The study concludes in chapter 4 with our interpretation of the results and a discussion of our findings, given certain limitations to the study.

Chapter 1: Literature Review

In order to reach a better understanding of the effects of criminal victimization, we shall define and examine the phases of trauma, how it affects an individual and its duration, as well as factors enabling or that can impede symptoms of and recovery from traumatic stress. Next, the concept of coping will be introduced with the required steps to help a person deal with trauma. The link between trauma and coping will be explained, building on a theoretical framework proposed by Lazarus & Folkman (1984), founding co-authors of this psychological construct.

Next we shall take a look at what it means for a victim to be satisfied with the criminal justice system, why it is important for the execution of justice and what it can mean to the victim if satisfaction is or is not achieved. The role of the criminal justice system and various treatment by its professionals will then be explored in terms of being able to promote victim satisfaction.

With this in mind, we shall present our hypotheses that serve to emphasize a need for subjectively significant treatment of victims from justice professionals.

1. Trauma

1.1 Defining trauma

Trauma is characterized as a reaction to an event that is overwhelming for it causes so much stress to the individual that he/she is unable to cope given his/her resources (Nadelson & Notman, 1982). It is a normal response to severe stress such as criminal victimization; an event which is deemed to be beyond normal life stresses (APA, 1994). If one is not prepared and has not yet a way to deal with the crisis, this stress may cause internal and external disequilibrium in the individual (Sales et al., 1984; Young, 1993; Lazarus, 1994).

A normal initial human reaction to trauma can be described by a pattern called the Crisis Reaction, and includes both physical and psychological responses (Herman, 1997), the latter of which we shall examine in when discussing coping. Physical responses to intense stress include "frozen fright", where the person experiences

physical shock, disorientation and numbness, and "fight-or-flight" reaction, where adrenaline pumps through the body, increasing cardiac and respiratory functioning, heightening some senses while others shut down, and ending finally with physical exhaustion. These types of reactions are due to an over-activation of the parasympathetic nervous system, the part of the brain responsible for our most basic survival instincts. In situations of acute stress, the body will shut down higher cognitive centers for the purpose of redirecting all of its energy to defend its integrity and promote physical safety above all else by either recognizing the felt saturation of shock and becoming numb to it as a way of de-emphasizing the direct experience of pain, or hyper-stimulated, giving one all one has in order to fight back.

Research involving responses from victims of all types of crimes has revealed that there are four phases of reactions to criminal victimization, which vary in duration and intensity (Engel, 1990): The first phase is shock, and is marked by negation and disbelief. During this stage, the victim may feel vulnerable, helpless and alone. The second phase is one of retrospection, where the victim tries to adapt to the situation, and may come to terms with the pain it has caused him/her. In other instances, the victim may deny the full extent of the harm, and the reality of the event may provoke responses of fear and behaviors such as impulsive talking. Often at this stage, victims feel as though the situation is out of their control. The first two stages are said to be more violent while the third and fourth stage will vary from one victim to another depending on their personality. Phase three is marked by the victim taking charge, and although it may be characterized by traumatic depression and self-accusation for some, this is the stage where victims appear able to be more logical in their attempt to integrate the experience into their life story. Phase four is described as the point where the victim develops defense mechanisms to prevent or reduce the risk of future victimization, and moves on.

Adverse mental health effects ensuing from stressful life events such as criminal victimization are caused by objective and subjective factors like physical injury and perceived life threat (Green, 1990), and can be diagnosed as posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), an anxiety disorder that is "based on the persistence of biological emergency responses"(Van der Kolk, 2003), and includes symptoms of re-

experiencing the event, avoidance, and arousal (APA, 1987), which we shall discuss further in Chapter 2. Symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder may come and go, depending on reminders of the event and individual resiliency (Horowitz, 1986), but may also be chronic and debilitating, as indicated by research by Resick et al. (1993) who report lifetime prevalence rates of 12% for a representative national sample of adult women, as compared to a rate of over 30% for those who have been victims of sexual assault, and almost 40% for victims of assault.

Symptoms of traumatic stress or crisis state are: anxiety, phobias, mental and social disorganization and come about rapidly, but do subside after two to three weeks at which time the individual may move to a problem-solving phase, and eventually, recovery (Sales et al, 1984).

1.2 Predictors of reactions to crime

1.2.1. Demographic pre-crime factors

Age: Some studies show that victims of crime cope more effectively when they are young. Research by Sales et al (1984) reveals that rape victims aged 30 years or younger experience more acute symptoms of relatively short duration, while older victims' symptoms are more serious and prolonged. For victims of robbery, burglary and non-sexual assault, research by Lurigio & Davis (1989) posits that younger victims are more likely than those over 30 years of age to report such somatic symptoms as headaches, nausea and trembling as well as depression immediately following the crime and at three months post-crime. In research conducted by Kilpatrick et al (1985), age was not a factor in terms of a victim's recovery. The research is therefore inconclusive when it comes to this factor.

Race: Some studies reveal this factor to be unrelated to crime victim recovery (Burnam et al, 1988; Kilpatrick et al, 1985) while others report it to be a significant predictor of victim trauma (Ruch et al., 1980). Research by Ruch & Chandler (1983) found that a rape victim's ethnicity had the highest impact of all demographic variables and has a direct effect on trauma as it is not significantly correlated to other independent variables affecting trauma. In a multi-cultural society such as Quebec,

there still exists a dominant set of values set forth by French speaking Caucasians. It is possible that a victim in Quebec whose cultural background differs from the majority may feel misunderstood or not respected in terms of those differences.

Education and Income: Research by Lurigio & Davis (1989) suggests that those with higher formal education and socio-economic status are less traumatized by their victimization than those with little formal education and low incomes; those with less income were more fearful and showed more negative emotions immediately following the crime and three months down the line, while more affluent victims tended to recover at a quicker rate. Research by Burgess and Holmstrom (1978) shows that 40% of rape victims who experience economic stress still showed trauma reactions four to six years post-crime, while Atkeson et al. (1982) report that lower socio-economic status is a predictor of depression 12 months post-crime. While more recent research conducted by Freedy et al. (1994) with rape victims shows no significant association between posttraumatic stress disorder prevalence and education or annual income, other research (Friedman et al., 1982) finds that socio-economic status is a greater predictor of post-traumatic adjustment at three months post-crime than immediately following the incident. The research is therefore inconclusive regarding education and income.

Marital Status: This has been revealed in a study by McCahill et al (1985) to be a factor in post-rape adjustment; married victims seemed to have more difficulty than those who are not married, because adjustment to such a crime may place a strain in a pre-existing intimate relationship and create more obstacles in the victim's recovery process. This factor was only found to have an influence for this specific type of crime (Sales et al., 1984, Lurigio & Resick, 1990, Young, 1993), and is therefore limiting for the present research because our sample is comprised of victims of all types of crimes.

Gender: This has been said to play a role in a crime victim's level of trauma. Women generally seem to display greater amounts of distress following crime than do men (Lurigio & Davis, 1989), and are reported to have twice the risk of developing posttraumatic stress disorder (Van der Kolk, 2003). However, this may be due to

crime type, namely sexual assault and violent crime. Reactions from men and women were highly comparable when crime type was taken into account (Freedy et al., 1994); victims of sexual assault exhibit similar symptoms, regardless of their gender, though men are reported to be more likely than women to develop a substance abuse problem following their victimization (Burnham et al, 1988). Findings from a study by Resick (1987) on victims of robbery reveal that though women tend to show more signs of distress immediately following the crime, that there were no differences between men and women on the measures of self-esteem, work adjustment and sexual functioning at three months post-crime. The most common cause for posttraumatic stress disorder for women is sexual assault, while for men it is combat and severe injury (Van der Kolk, 2003). Bohmer et al. (2002) report that due to the fact that the criminal justice system is geared to the way men think, there is a possibility that the language inherent to the system and the system itself supports a man's reality and does not reflect women as much, leaving them feeling less involved in, or ill represented by the process. It is debatable to what point women may have a greater ability to pinpoint and express their emotions after suffering from criminal victimization, and to what extent men are discouraged in society to express what they feel.

1.2.2 Psychosocial pre-crime factors

Personality Characteristics: Symonds (1980) states that preexisting neurotic and developmental problems exacerbated the impact of violent assaults, and Ruch & Chandler (1983) report a highly significant relationship between prior mental health states and/or substance abuse and trauma. Sales et al. (1984) purport that among rape victims, pre-rape indicators of psychological disturbance have a strong impact on post-rape reactions, but that the relation diminished greatly after a six month period. Research on this factor is limited to a retrospective view of a victim's symptoms; due to the difficulty of determining pre-assault psychological symptoms or problems, firm conclusions can not be drawn.

Life Stressors: There is a marked difference between chronic stress conditions like unemployment, limited income and the need for outside support which may inhibit

recovery, and temporary stressors such as moving which may increase the victim's coping skills, and major loss such as death of a loved one which may even facilitate recovery by superseding and therefore having a numbing effect on the stress caused by an assault (Sales et al, 1984). As far as previous victimizations, some research on rape victims has shown that a past criminal or domestic violence victimization may exacerbate traumatic symptoms (Resick, 1987), while other studies show that victims of a prior sexual assault are less traumatized than those with first time assaults (Ruch & Chandler, 1983).

Quality of Relationships: The availability of social support by friends and family, and the closeness a victim has with a member of the family, seem to increase a person's ability to deal with stress (Lurigio & Resick, 1990; Young, 1993). Of their sample of female rape victims, Ruch & Chandler (1983), found that those living with their parents tend to rely on their family for support and are less traumatized than those living with their spouse or alone, who relied rather on friends. The authors add that single women may fare better than those who are married because the quality of their relationships with their friends is higher which leads them to feel more supported emotionally.

1.2.3 Features of the crime

Seriousness of Crime: Some studies show that the severity of symptoms experienced by a victim immediately following the crime as well as three months later is directly related to the extent of violence or injury that occurred during the crime (Lurigio & Davis, 1989). Authors such as Freedy et al. (1994), Sales et al, (1984), and Ruch 7 Chandler, 1983) report that important predictors of a victim's development of symptoms are the extent of physical injury and the perceived threat of violence and even death which occurred during the crime episode. Resick's (1988) study puts emphasis on the within-assault perceptions of death and injury when predicting the level of fear and post-crime distress in female robbery or rape victims, as the amount of injury these victims sustained did not predict the extent of their reactions. The author reported no differences in perceptions of death and injury between male and female robbery victims.

Relationship between Victim and Offender: This influences the likelihood of reporting and getting treatment. While crimes committed by strangers tend to be more violent (Ruch & Chandler, 1983), when the offender is known to the victim, the victim is less likely to report the crime and seek treatment because there is more of a tendency for these victims to blame themselves and to be blamed by others for the offence (Lurigio & Resick, 1990), or to forgive the crime because of a sense of loyalty to the perpetrator and attempt to modify the situation privately (Tremblay, 1998). What's more, it has also been reported that trauma resulting from violence within intimate relationships is perceived, especially by women, to be more problematic than traumatic events caused by strangers or accidents (Van der Kolk, 2003).

Type of Crime: According to Shapland et al. (1985), the victims who are most likely to suffer from major psychological and social effects are those of sexual assault, regardless of the degree of the assault, or the perception of the victim that the offense is minor. Lurigio (1987) reports no pattern of differences on several measures of psychological impact between victims of robbery, burglary or non-sexual assault Resick's (1988) longitudinal study compares the reactions of victims of rape and robbery, and concludes that in both groups, the greatest improvement occurred between 1 and 3 months post-crime, and that, with the exception of sexual functioning, reactions to rape were relatively similar but more severe to those of robbery. Lurigio (1987) reports no pattern of differences on several measures of psychological impact between victims of robbery, burglary or non-sexual assault. Victims of other serious crimes such as robbery, burglary and non-sexual assault may also suffer from adverse psychological consequences; in a study by Lurigio and Davis (1989), greater levels of distress and symptoms on several outcome measures were reported by victims of such crimes when compared to standardized norms.

1.2.4 Post-crime factors

Social Support: Friedman et al (1982) report that people are more likely to recover from victimization and the ensuing trauma when they have the support of family and friends. Family and friends can provide tolerance, sensitivity and reassurance during

the critical stage that follows being victimized (Lurigio & Resick). Sales et al. (1984) found that victims with fewer symptoms were those who experience a closeness with family members. Certain authors (Norris & Feldman-Summers,1981; Lurigio & Resick, 1990) found a relation between the victim's being less reclusive and having someone understanding to talk to. Resick's (1988) research on male and female robbery victims reveals that at one month post-crime, women talk more frequently and to more people about their experience than men. This variable was only predictive of better recovery for females, although it was not as important as their perceived social support. Moreover, the study also showed that for both sexes, there exists a positive association between more symptoms of trauma and talking about the crime to many people.

1.3 Duration of reactions

Research indicates that criminal victimization may have major and long-lasting effects (Kilpatrick & Veronen, 1987; Kendall-Tacket et al., 1993; Wright et al., 1997; Poupart, 1999), as it propels the individual to focus on survival and self-protection, although not every victim will develop effects that endure long-term (Van der Kolk, 2003).

Acute reactions to the trauma may last several months, the initial symptoms tending to stabilize after three months, but feelings of fear, anxiety, depression, problems with social adjustment, sexual functioning, low self-esteem, sleep disturbances, and memory and concentration problems may last a year or even more (Resick & Nishith, 1997). Other long-term symptoms of trauma include: drug and alcohol abuse, an increase in aggression against self and others, physical complaints, suicidal ideation, suspiciousness, and a sense of social isolation (Wiebe, 1996; Van der Kolk, 2003).

Rape is particularly traumatic; many studies have revealed the devastating and often permanent effects (Burgess & Holstrom, 1979; Katz & Mazur, 1979; Symonds, 1980; Norris & Feldman-Summers, 1981). Some long-term research of victims of rape would indicate the presence of a "core of distress" in the individual after six months or even a reactivation of symptoms, as well as persistent symptoms of fear, anxiety, confusion and suspicion which may persist after one year with those that still have

not returned to pre-assault levels of functioning after three years (Kilpatrick et al, 1981, Sales et al, 1984).

Sales et al. (1984) report on the behavioral functioning of victims of rape: during the crisis period, there is a withdrawal from social activities and interpersonal involvement. After six months there is an apparent return to normalcy as demonstrated by the return of previous level of social functioning or higher. This may occur before the victim recovers emotionally from the trauma, and perhaps this attempt at seeming to function adequately socially can actually aggravate traumatic symptoms.

1.4 Factors affecting recovery

The severity and duration of a crisis and its psychological trauma depend upon three conditions: 1) victims' perception that the assault posed a threat to their life, 2) their ability at that time to deal with a problem of such magnitude, and 3) the kind of intervention or help that they receive immediately following the victimization (Resick & Nishith, 1997; Resick, 1993). These conditions affect the way a person views the extent of the crisis and their ability to recover from it.

Recovery from such a crisis is marked by the victim feeling more powerful, autonomous, and in control of themselves and the situation (Herman, 1997; Cadell et al., 2001); "traumatised individuals need to have experiences that directly contradict the emotional helplessness and physical paralysis that accompany traumatic experiences. In many people with posttraumatic stress disorder, such helplessness and paralysis becomes a way of responding to stressful stimuli, further weakening their feelings of control over their destiny" (Van der Kolk, 2003, p. 185).

2. Coping

Coping is a process that, according to Lazarus & Folkman (1984), consists of any efforts made to "manage stressful demands" (p. 134) regardless of the outcome of the situation. Bard & Sangrey (1986) propose a model to describe the coping process

used by victims of crime that consists of three stages, and parallels an individual's physical responses as described previously:

In the first stage, called "impact and disorganization" which may last hours or days after the crime, the victim may experience intense emotions of numbness or shock, disbelief or denial, disorientation, and helplessness. At this point, the victim blocks out what has happened or convinces him-/herself that the event was not actually that bad. This is a defense mechanism that serves to protect a person from the full impact of what has happened, for it is too much for the person's system to bear at once.

Stage two is called "recoil", lasting from 3 to 8 months post-crime, is characterized by the development of defenses and a cataclysm of wide-ranging, contradictory emotions such as fear/terror, anger/rage, confusion/frustration, self-blame/guilt, sorrow/grief, violation/vulnerability, acceptance and desire for revenge, which are accompanied by physiological reactions.

Stage three is referred to as "re-organization", having a duration of 6 months to 1 year, and marks the reconstruction of equilibrium and emotional homeostasis, where the victim can begin examining him-/herself in order to find an emotional balance or recognize the purpose of having experienced such a hardship. It is at this stage where victims may regain control of their thoughts and feelings, as well as the ability to express them. This stage may last up to six years if the individual's efforts are maladaptive.

Coping is defined as "constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person" (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 141). According to these authors, there are two major types of coping, both involving cognitive processes and behavioral strategies for dealing with stressful situations. They are: problem-focused, in which the individual attempts to alter any person-environment relationship that causes distress; and emotion-focused, in which an individual makes an effort to control emotional reactions to the problem.

According to Lazarus & Folkman (1984), problem-focused responses can place emphasis on the environment, which is to say, environmental pressures or barriers, or

inward, directed towards motivational or cognitive changes. Emotion-focused responses involve cognitive processes designed to alleviate emotional distress, as in avoidance, minimization and distancing, or to discharge, as in self-blame or venting of emotions.

As to which response of either problem- or emotion-focused is more appropriate in situations of stress, Lazarus & Folkman (1984) state:

> "Emphasizing problem solving and mastery devalues other functions of coping that are concerned with managing emotions and maintaining self-esteem and a positive outlook, especially in the face of irremediable situations. Coping processes that are used to tolerate such difficulties, or to minimize, accept, or ignore them, are just as important in the person's adaptational armamentarium as problem solving strategies that aim to master the environment" (p. 139).

Ideally, one who is coping with stress employs both problem- and emotion-focused strategies to tackle different facets of the situation, although this seems like a lot to expect from individuals who may be traumatized. Given the possible imbalance of their physical, emotional and cognitive states, a tendency for these victims may be to favor the style that to them is more familiar and dominant within their personality.

Lazarus & Folkman (1984) purport that people use both problem- and emotion-focused forms of coping in virtually every stressful situation, and that it would be too simplistic to assign either focus as a trait characteristic, for coping processes do not develop linearly.

Although individuals tend to have characteristic approaches to controlling, avoiding and preventing distress, coping is not a fixed attribute; it varies in size and range, and may be enriched through life experience (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, Lazarus, 1994). For this reason, those possessing economic and support resources, as well as higher levels of education seem to fare better than those without, for there is a probability that they have more choices at their disposal, and have had experience using resources in the past in order to deal successfully with difficulties.

The creation of coping inventories and research on their applications has since been conducted, and many authors, such as Cook & Heppner (1997), tend to report a three-

factor model as being more representative of coping processes. These authors have added the construct of avoidance, and grouped being problem-focused with being task-oriented, and the expression of emotions with social support, while other authors argue that social support can have a problem-solving or emotional dimension, depending on the type of support received (Schwarzer & Schwarzer, 1996; Carver et al., 1989).

Carver et al.'s (1989) COPE inventory is comprised of 13 different scales that indicate problem-focused, emotion-focused or avoidant tendencies. Two such scales are seeking social support for instrumental or emotional reasons, which may reveal whether the victim is problem- or emotion-focused when seeking social support.

Research by the authors using the situational version of the COPE reveals that seeking social support for instrumental reasons is positively related to seeking social support for emotional reasons (.57, $p < .01$), and positive reinterpretation and growth (.28, $p < .01$), while being negatively associated with denial, mental disengagement, and drug and alcohol disengagement. Seeking social support for emotional reasons is, according to the authors, positively associated with focus on and venting of emotions (.49 $p < .01$), as well as positive reinterpretation and growth (.26 $p < .01$), and negatively related to mental disengagement, and drug and alcohol disengagement. This indicates that when seeking social support for instrumental or emotional reasons, one is less likely to need to escape through substance abuse or avoid how it has affected him/her. Since the victims from our sample are pursuing their case in the criminal justice system, we expect them to display signs of problem-focused or emotion-focused coping when seeking social support. As problem-focused coping responses may lead to further exploration of emotional responses, both problem- and emotion-focused coping responses may contribute to figuring out the meaning of the event, we expect many respondents to display signs of having both responses when seeking social support.

3. Linking trauma and coping

People assume that their world is safe, predictable and lawful, but after being victimized, they may feel vulnerability, anger, and the need to understand why the crime happened to them. If victims do not have the required coping mechanisms to deal with a problem of this magnitude, they may develop chronic stress disorders (Van der Kolk, 2003).

According to Lazarus & Folkman's (1984) framework, stress is defined as a "particular relationship between the person and environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her personal resources and endangering his or her well-being" (p. 19). Their theory is based on the concept of primary and secondary appraisals, which interact constantly and determine an individual's degree of stress, as well as the content and strength of his/her emotional reaction.

By primary appraisals, Lazarus & Folkman (1984) are referring to the perceived stakes of the outcome; whether the situation represents a loss or benefit, either in the present or in future, and in which way. If the situation is thought of as being non-threatening, the individual will perceive it as irrelevant. However, if the situation does represent a threat, the individual will perceive it as being stressful, and will then judge it as a harm or loss if the damage has already occurred, as a potential harm or threat where damage and loss are anticipated, or as a challenge and having the potential for gain and growth. Perceptions of threat are said to bring about an emotion-focused reaction, whereas those of a challenge are met with a problem-focused reaction.

Secondary appraisals are defined by the authors as consisting of "which coping options are available, the likelihood that a given coping option will accomplish what it is supposed to, and the likelihood that one can apply a particular strategy or set of strategies effectively"(p. 35). It involves the process of evaluating coping resources and options, where the greater the situational control beliefs, the more the person will rely on problem-focused coping. If the situation is perceived as being of little controllability, the person's reaction typically consists of an increase in

emotional distress and therefore a greater reliance on emotion-focused coping efforts. Problem-focused coping is said to reduce the chance of developing posttraumatic stress disorder (Van der Kolk, 2003), but this should not be confounded with emotional numbness, a response to stress that was once perceived as a healthy reaction, whereas now this emotional distancing is thought to be associated with the development of traumatic symptoms (Feeny et al., 2000).

Sales et al (1984) report that the level of violence of the crime episode is most predictive of coping, and suggest the possibility that the felt threat of an attack is more determinant of a victim's reaction than the violence that actually took place. Van der Kolk (2003) stresses the fact that many people develop symptoms such as depression, dissociation, and decline in family and occupational functioning "without meeting full-blown criteria for posttraumatic stress disorder" (p. 169), while others may experience symptoms that can seem timeless due to "maladaptive avoidance maneuvers" (p. 172) which are developed so as to circumvent the re-experiencing of the traumatic situation.

Victims of sexual assault, children, and those abused by their partners will labour primarily to alter their emotional states rather than the situation that brought them about, prone towards emotion-focused coping, and being more likely to develop substance abuse problems as a method of avoiding the stress and to alleviate physical discomfort (Van der Kolk, 2003).

According to Van der Kolk, (2003), the critical steps in helping those who show positive symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder are:

1) *Safety:* When the person is trapped in a sense of unreality at the onset of the trauma, as if he/she is sleepwalking. At this stage, one needs to acquire a feeling of security and care as well as a place to recover, either through natural support systems or institutions;

2) *Anxiety Management:* As the shock wears, victims may experience physical symptoms of discomfort and tiredness as well as emotional upheaval. They need to make use of psychological interventions to facilitate the identification

of the problem and possible solutions, as well as to counter anxiety through the development of coping skills; and

3) *Emotional Processing:* As victims begin to regain focus, they can begin to make sense of the event and reduce the feeling of helplessness regarding the situation.

Research has also shown the efficacy of cognitive-behavioral therapy, group therapy, and use of medication such as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors and other antidepressants in relieving traumatic symptoms (Lubin et al., 1998; Kent et al., 1998). Some specialized interventions such as exposure therapy consist of brief treatments that include education, various forms of relaxation therapy, *in vivo* exposure, that is, repeated exposure to the stressful stimuli, and cognitive restructuring, which is to say the replacing of harmful thought patterns associated with the stress with more adaptive statements (Foa et al., 1999).

4. Victim satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

Shapland et al. (1985) purport that arriving at the conclusion to prosecute in any crime is the outcome of a series of decisions: the victim to report the crime, the police who record and investigate the crime in the manner in which they see fit, police supervisors who oversee them, and the prosecution who determines the way in which they will present the findings. The authors state that "prosecution is a process, occurring over weeks or months [...] in which the victim makes an appearance at different stages, but only plays a peripheral role" (p.81).

Our present criminal system uses victims as its primary witnesses and may not endeavor to truly understand and take into account their special needs, or to give them any choices within the process. Indeed, the only choice the victim appears to have is whether or not to report the crime at all (Lauren & Viens, 1996). Beyond this, the needs of society to pursue the offender seem to prevail over those of the victim, and may even be to the victim's detriment.

This attitude is inherent in the legislation; sentencing is supposed to reflect a sense of proportionality between the crime and the punishment, and to do so objectively, while possibly ignoring the victim's emotional needs and without taking their perspective into account. Although there is a certain gradation in the apparent severity of the crimes and their corresponding punishments, this may not coincide with the victim's reality. In this way, the importance of the victim's subjective experience may be lost, for trauma and psychological state are not considered relevant to the proceedings. This may be considered by a victim as unfair, and result in the dissuasion of his/her future cooperation with the system.

Research by Shapland et al. (1985) demonstrates that victims want to be included in the prosecution process; to be informed of its progress and to help out with the police investigation when they are needed. The study concluded that the police, however, do not inform or consult them; rather, they take over after the charges are laid and tend to forget about the victim until it is time for them to give evidence. Victims are not valued by the police and consequently view themselves as such. In Shapland et al.'s (1985) study, victims were more satisfied when they were informed of the status of the case. The victim's view of the courts is different; the courts are "seen by victims as the final adjudicators, pronouncers upon the offender and their offence, not as providing any service for the victim" (p. 81). Victims do see themselves as being important witnesses, and require improvements to the facilities, such as private rooms and more security, to reflect just that. It is important to listen to the victim for it is they who play the most integral part in controlling the offender: "All these problems can be seen in terms of needs, but it is important to argue for their solution in terms of rights or entitlements and of a duty upon the state to provide adequate resources to meet them" (Maguire, 1985, p. 555).

Attempts have been made by the justice system to offer victims more rights, especially in cases such as sexual assault where it is recognized that the victim suffers during the judicial process. Many of these changes came into effect because of the obvious lack of attention and protection afforded to the victim by the justice system, as pointed out by various women's groups.

On October 1st, 1988, bill C-89 brought to the criminal code its first definition of "victim", and gave the victim an opportunity to have an influence on the outcome of the case. It allows victims to make a Victim Impact Statement (VIS) regarding financial losses, physical and psychological effects, and to specify the circumstances and consequences of the crime. A modification in 2000 allowed victims to read their statement at the moment of sentencing. It is believed that the Victim Impact Statement is a tool to give the victim a voice during the process, but will also allow the judge to make a more appropriate ruling at the time of sentencing by taking into account the particular consequences of the crime to the victim and thereby being more equipped to determine a fitting punishment (Lauren & Viens, 1996). Erez (1994) purports that filling out a Victim Impact Statement can also be cathartic for victims as it allows them the opportunity to express how the crime has affected them, and be a positive step in their recovery process. Unfortunately, the Victim Impact Statement is reported to not yet have such a great impact, as often victims are not made aware that they have this option, and do not get the chance to prepare and submit the declaration within the proper time delay (Lauren & Viens, 1996).

Although bill C-89 marks a definite improvement in how our society views victims of crime, and increases their chances for participating in the system, some judges and prosecutors limit or ignore its use (Lauren & Viens, 1996). This clearly demonstrates an out-dated view of victims having no say in the process that needs to change in order to keep up with an evolving system. It is imperative that criminal justice professionals labour to enforce victim's rights laws, such as the Victim Impact Statement, for those who are informed that rights exist may feel further victimized when they learn later on that there are few remedies when those rights are violated (Kilpatrick & Otto, 1987). Providing rights for victims without applying them increases the victim's feeling of helplessness and lack of control, exacerbating the problem (Kelly, 1990).

By treating crime victims with more consideration, dignity and respect through the adoption of new laws and procedures, it was hoped that the laws would demonstrate and, in turn, generate sensitivity on the part of the justice system, and a change in attitude among its professionals thereby reducing the possibility of secondary

victimization, while increasing the victim's likeliness to report the crime committed against them (Laurens & Viens, 1996).

As reported by Van Dijk et al. (1990), at least half of the people living in Canada, the United States and the Netherlands who have been victims of crime do not report the event to authorities. According to Tremblay (1998), this could be due to a victim's assessment of the severity of the crime and its consequences, as well as their relation to the assailant; crimes causing harm and injury to the victim are more likely to be reported, as are those that are committed by strangers. People are more convinced of requiring the assistance of legal authorities when they have been greatly harmed, but have difficulty reporting those crimes committed by those with whom they may have a relationship, and to whom they may have loyalty, feeling as though there is a possibility of resolving the issue in an informal fashion.

Many authors have revealed through their research that victims want a place and a voice, as well as to feel more included in the prosecution process (Shapland et al, 1985; Maguire, 1985). According to Wiebe (1996), regardless of the outcome of the case, crime victims who perceive that they have been heard, taken seriously, and treated with respect are more likely to be satisfied with their contact with the justice system.

Hart (1993) suggests strategies to facilitate victim participation in cases of domestic violence such as victims' rights and services, outreach and investigation, victim protection and advocacy, specialized and timely prosecution, making a Victim Impact Statement at sentencing, restitution, and being given information on the process, as well as the progress and outcome of the case.

5. Linking coping and satisfaction with the criminal justice system

It is important to involve victims in the judicial process, for "participation in the justice process is therapeutic when it helps victims to better understand what happened, allows them an opportunity to tell their story, and validates their loss and

sense of being wronged. When victims are ignored, their feelings of trauma may be intensified and prolonged" (United States Department of Justice, 1998, p. 219).

The idea that an involvement with the criminal justice system may have therapeutic or anti-therapeutic consequences for a victim was proposed by Wexler & Winick (1991), who term the study of the role of the law as a therapeutic agent as "therapeutic juresprudence". Therapeutic juresprudence examines the law's impact in terms of rules, procedures and behavior from legal professionals on the mental and physical health of those it affects "with the tools of the social sciences to identify [therapeutic and anti-therapeutic consequences] and to ascertain whether the law's antitherapeutic effects can be reduced, and its therapeutic effects enhanced, without subordinating due process and other justice values" (Winick, 1997, p, 185).

After exposure to an unexpected, uncontrollable event, when one is later placed in a situation where he/she does have some control, one will react to that second situation with increased passivity (Van der Kolk, 2003). Moreover, victims in the criminal justice system may also repeatedly encounter trauma related stimuli that may trigger symptomatic responses. It is therefore imperative for victims to receive humane treatment from criminal justice professionals in order to foster their optimum cooperation with the process (Freedy et al., 1994). Moreover, full participation in criminal proceedings which includes being involved in decisions regarding plea bargaining, sentencing and being given the opportunity to attend trial procedures, may also enhance a victim's feelings of being in control, the perception of which being so important to promote recovery (Kelly, 1990).

Sales et al. (1984) point out that good relationships between the victim and police officers, with whom the victim usually has first contact, can promote better readjustment for the victim, but that contact with the criminal justice system can also be an additional burden. The authors claim that attaining the goal of prosecution can be a validating experience for victims, as it demonstrates the belief in their veracity by an institution representing society, but it can also hinder victims' healing process by prolonging the role of the victim that was imposed upon them by the offender, which can then keep victims from moving past the experience. Victims often believe

that their actions will have little to no impact on court proceedings, and this apathy and helplessness is increased when the idea is reinforced by criminal justice professionals (Sales et al., 1984). Some victims avoid contact with the justice system because they have associated the fear and other negative emotions of the offence with the circumstances surrounding it the offence. When these circumstances are later recalled in memories, the presentation of evidence, and confronting the defendant, the victim may experience conditioned responses of fear and anxiety (Kilpatrick & Otto, 1987).

According to Van der Kolk (2003), it is difficult for traumatized individuals to verbalize precisely what they are experiencing, particularly when they become emotionally aroused. Often, such victims are too hyper- or hypo-aroused to be able to process and communicate what they are going through. This is due to a decline in left-hemisphere representation; "the part of the brain necessary for generating sequences and for the cognitive analysis of experiences is not functioning properly" (p. 187). Moreover, those experiencing traumatic symptoms tend to develop higher levels of hormones such as natural opiates in response to stress, which may then hinder the discernment of their emotions (Yehuda, 1998). It is important to help those with posttraumatic stress disorder to find a language that they can use to come to an understanding, with which they are able to communicate, and through which they can assign a meaning to the traumatic event.

Long-term stress or crisis reaction may be made better or worse by the actions of others. When those actions fall short of the victim's expectations or are sensed by the victim as negative, whether that was the intent or not, they are deemed as being the secondary victimization of the individual (Engel, 1990), also referred to as the "second injury" to the victim (Symonds, 1980).

Secondary victimization is that which is not a direct result of the crime itself, but rather it refers to victimization which occurs through the response of institutions and individuals to the victim (Young, 1993; Doerner & Lab, 1995). Victims often report feelings of guilt about the crime while admitting that they are all the while unfounded and inappropriate; the feelings are probably the result of the reaction of the people

in the victim's entourage who may blame the victim for what happened (Shapland et al, 1985).

Institutionalized secondary victimization includes sources such as hospitals and emergency room personnel, health and mental-health professionals, social service workers and the victim support services, but the most obvious is within the criminal justice system (Young, 1993; Doerner & Lab, 1995). Largely, this is due to difficulties in balancing the rights of the victim with those of the offender and because the criminal justice professionals responsible for ordering procedures do so without taking into account the perspective of the victim.

Tomz & McGillis (1997) give the following examples, among others, of secondary victimization which they define as "the insensitive treatment at the hands of the criminal justice system" (p. 4):

- "insensitive questioning by police officers;
- "police or prosecutor attitudes suggesting that the victim contributed to his or her own victimization;
- "fear of reprisal by the defendant;
- "lack of information about the status and outcome of the case;
- "frustration and inconvenience related to waiting for court appearances or appearing in court only to have the case continued or dismissed;
- "difficulty finding transportation and child care and taking time off from work in order to come to court;
- "lost wages due to time spent testifying in court; and
- "anxiety about testifying in open court, including hostile questions from defense attorneys and threatening behavior by the defendant's family or friends" (p. 4).

Crimes through which the perpetrator seek dominance and control over the victim, such as sexual assault and domestic violence inevitably change many aspects of such victims' lives as it affects the way they conduct themselves in their relationships with others (Shapland et al., 1985). Van der Kolk (2003) places emphasis on the importance of helping those with posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms, whose sympathetic nervous systems are over-activated to counter the effects of stress, to find a voice and harness the use of language to be able to process and communicate

what they are experiencing. A momentary lack of verbal skills could further impede victims' ability to assert their position or receive help from others; this state of being "frozen" makes it difficult for victims to relay their needs, concerns, as well as any important details of the crime and its effects, and it could also lead to the "second injury" of the victim at the hands of criminal justice professionals (Symonds, 1980).

Women victimized by their current or former partners are more likely than those assaulted by non-partners to experience discrimination within the criminal justice system and to suffer secondary victimization, mostly at the hands of police and prosecutor (Byrne et al., 1999). This is because of attitudes that victims provoke their own abuse, should deal with it themselves, or that spousal violence is a family matter that should be dealt with privately rather than within the criminal justice system (Byrne et al., 1999). Research by Stith (1990) reveals that the response of justice professionals' to domestic violence depends on their views of egalitarianism between the sexes, as well as their method of handling conflict in their own family.

According to Damant et al. (2000), victims of domestic violence tend to report the crime to authorities once they understand the violent and criminal nature of their recent, severe victimization. The authors claim that the regaining of the feeling of control over their lives occurs after this realization. Moreover, the victims that were strong enough to see their cases through to the end had been empowered before the commencement of their formal denunciation; it is hypothesized that that the ability to judicially pursue the case is an indicator of their feeling more empowered and capable of facing and handling the situation. Their study also reveals that being believed by members of the justice system validated the victim's experience and strengthened their will to follow through with the penal procedure. Other members of the justice system were reported to have helped the victims even more by giving the women emotional support when it was really necessary, denouncing conjugal violence, and giving the victims information that was personally relevant. Some women in the study had suffered from negative effects of the judicial system, including: being held accountable for their own victimization, a lack of information on other forms of violence and their consequences, a lack of resources, problems

related to the gathering of evidence, and a sense that a woman can only ask for protection after being severely physically hurt.

Victims of sexual assault who start the process by bringing charges against their assailant, and whose cases are accepted by the prosecutor, show fewer symptoms of trauma and better scores in several areas of social adjustment than victims whose cases were not accepted; this may be due to the fact that pursuing the case judicially serves to "legitimize" the victimization (Sales et al., 1984, Cluss et al., 1983). However, victims seem to show a worsening of symptoms with further progress in the trial, which indicates that the criminal justice system may put additional demands on the victim (Sales et al., 1984).

In research conducted with victims of rape, Cluss et al. (1983) reveal that those choosing to prosecute showed higher threat indices than those who did not, but scored higher on self-esteem tests; this may be an indication that victims who choose to prosecute have a higher level of self-worth before the incident occurred and were more assertive. It is possible that rape victims who do not report are in a period of self-blame, while prosecution puts the blame on the accused. What's more, the greater the physical injuries, the less these victims have to worry about the jury mistaking the offence as consensual, and the less they denigrate themselves for the act.

The way the victim is treated by legal authorities, with an emphasis on police agents, who typically are the victim's first and only contact with criminal justice professionals, not only influences their perception of fairness, but also how they cope with their victimization (Wemmers, 1996). Victim participation within the criminal justice system and restitution are related to the victim's level of satisfaction with the justice process, which, in turn, has been found to be positively associated with posttraumatic adjustment (Byrne et al., 1999).

Research by Wemmers (1996) indicates that notification is imperative for victims; being informed of the developments of their case and the possibility for restitution is more important to the victim's judgment of fairness of the judicial process than the outcome of the case. Victims want to be treated with dignity and respect when

reaching out to the justice system. Legal authorities communicate these notions to the victim through "treating victims in a friendly and considerate manner and showing an interest in the position of the victim" (p. 206).

Wemmers (1996) states that for those who are problem-focused, informational or instrumental support may be important to recovery; "[t]he information provided by authorities regarding the developments of the case and the possibilities for compensation and restitution may assist this type of victim in coping with the stress following their victimization" (p. 207). With respect to emotion-focused individuals, the author states that emotional support may be required; "[t]he respect and interest shown by authorities who carry out the guidelines, may assist this type of victim by helping him/her regain his/her self-esteem" (p. 207).

6. Conclusion

Criminal victimization may result in a vulnerability due to trauma and shock that the victim can re-live that may make it difficult to directly and accurately convey the facts of the case to the police, attorneys or other case workers, or to entirely grasp the information they offer in return (Lauren & Viens, 1996, Van der Kolk, 2003). This may create a certain impression to the case worker regarding the validity of the victim's account and their credibility, and may contribute to an attitude of victim-blaming as well as other forms of secondary victimization (Fattah, 1991). Although the victim may need time, the investigation must persist in a timely fashion in order to bear results, regardless of the victim's ability to cope with and adapt to the situation at that moment.

Some victims are more vulnerable than others, especially those of sexual assault and family violence crimes, and may require more support (Maguire, 1985). Between 1960 and 1990, there was an increase in criminality but not a proportional increase in the number of agents who may control it; although the crime rate has decreased or remained stable since the 1990's, there is still a backlog of cases, which has

diminished the time and resources required to handle cases in a humanized fashion and on an individual level (Wemmers, 1996).

According to Freedy et al. (1994), posttraumatic stress disorder prevalence may be higher for victims involved in criminal prosecution than for crime victims in general because these cases are more likely to be violent, involving life threat or injury.

Attempts have been made by the criminal justice system to give the victim more rights and to impel a change in attitude among its professionals in an effort to reduce possible secondary victimization. These rights include being notified about the status of their case, being given the option to attend legal proceedings, to express how the crime has affected them, to give their opinion regarding the offender, and to receive restitution for their losses (Byrne et al., 1999). This is especially true in cases of domestic violence, which, at times are regarded as a problem of a relational rather than criminal nature, and sexual assault where it is recognized that victims suffer during the judicial process and that the system must offer them the additional consideration and protection they need in order to count on their cooperation in the process leading to the formal control of the offender (Lauren & Viens, 1996; Byrne et al., 1999).

Victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, in addition to experiencing strain from the criminal justice system, may also feel more helpless and powerless than victims of other crimes, due to over- or under-active cognitive processes that ensure immediate security while possibly exacerbating problems in communication or relationships. If individuals in need of social support do not receive it from their entourage, it is imperative that it be offered to them by the justice system to facilitate their recovery. There is a need for more individualized treatment for victims of crime by criminal justice professionals; a penchant for a particular coping style over another indicates a victim's need for subjectively relevant treatment in order for the experience to be considered personally significant, and satisfactory.

7. Research Hypotheses

1) Victims of sexual assault or domestic violence will tend to have developed emotion-focused coping responses;

2) Victims with personal resources such as higher education or socio-economic status, and support resources like a family member or therapist, will have a more diverse range of coping styles despite crime variables;

3a) Problem-focused individuals who receive instrumental support from the criminal justice system will tend to be more satisfied;

3b) Problem-focused individuals who do not receive instrumental support from the criminal justice system will tend to be less satisfied;

4a) Emotion-focused individuals who receive emotional support from the criminal justice system will tend to be more satisfied;

4b) Emotion-focused individuals who do not receive emotional support from the criminal justice system will tend to be less satisfied.

As victim participation is imperative in the prosecution of offenders, the present study will use Lazarus & Folkman's (1984) framework to study the relationship between the victim's trauma as a consequence of crime type and the tendency to develop emotion-focused coping. We shall then see if being in possession of certain resources influences coping style. Next, with a therapeutic jurisprudence approach, we shall examine the relationship between a victim's coping focus when seeking social support, and their satisfaction with the criminal justice system, in the hopes of pinpointing elements inherent to the system which may enhance victims' ability to cope and should therefore be emphasized and developed, or which may further harm the victim and are to be avoided.

Chapter 2: Methodology

The purpose of the present study is to examine the relationship between certain types of victimization or psychological trauma, particular resources and the individual's coping response, as well as to assess his/her satisfaction with the criminal justice system based on such responses.

1. Design

The present research is part of a larger study initiated by Dr. Jo-Anne Wemmers, who has obtained funding from the *Fonds Québecois de la recherche sur la société et la culture* (FQRSC) to carry out research with victims of crime in Québec on the needs of crime victims in the criminal justice system.

Since we are attempting to evaluate the association between victims' reactions to crime, their coping focus and their level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system based on the treatment they may have received by criminal justice professionals, we are focused on the relation between the variables rather than being able to determine causality, and so we will be using a post-test only design.

2. Procedure

Potential respondents were contacted through the Ministry of Justice, with the help of the *Bureau des victimes d'actes criminels* (BAVAC) and the *Palais de justice.* The information received from the Ministry of Justice pertained to cases from the months of January, February and March, 2004, and included the names of victims, their address, and to some extent, the name of the offender as well as the article from the Criminal Code with which the accused was charged. Access to information was given by the *Commission de l'accès sur l'information du Québec,* along with their authorization to conduct interviews with victims of crime in Québec.

An introductory letter describing the study was sent to potential respondents in Montreal, Trois-Rivières, and Sept-Iles, with the intent of making the study representative of the urban, provincial, and rural areas of the province. Those wishing

to participate were asked to confirm this by signing and returning a stamped, self-addressed card to the researchers. Follow-up letters were sent three weeks later as a reminder to those who did not yet respond. Those not wishing to participate in the study were not required to take any action and could merely ignore our letters.

Those who agreed to be interviewed were contacted by phone in order to make an appointment to speak at their earliest convenience. Interviews were conducted by phone in order to minimize costs and travel time, and, due to the sensitivity of the data to be gathered, by experienced interviewers in an attempt to minimize the risk of secondary victimization to the participant.

The questionnaire was prepared in French and English and required an average time of 60 minutes to complete, and this, including any answers to open questions.

Respondents were assured before the administration of the questionnaire that all information collected would be kept in the strictest of confidence, that it would have no bearing on their criminal case. Care was taken throughout the interview to ensure their understanding of the objectives and procedures of the study. Moreover, the interviewers had information regarding available support services for victims should they be desired or requested by the respondent.

3. Sample

The subjects involved in the present study are restricted to victims of all types of crimes where the public prosecutor has agreed to pursue the case, and appearing in adult court. The victims are limited to those over 14 years of age and shall exclude organizations.

It was estimated that approximately 800 victims would be contacted through letters inviting them to participate in the research, and, based on indications from prior studies involving victims, a response rate of 20% was expected. Instead, we found ourselves with the names of 3263 people whose cases were accepted by the crown prosecutor. Based on the individuals' names, the researchers were able to determine that from this total number of victims, 1623 are female, 1188 are male, and there

were 452 people whose names were not familiar enough to the researchers to be able to speculate as to gender.

The response rate was surprisingly low; there were 2725 victims who either answered in the negative or not at all, and 306 that we were unable to reach because the victim had moved (182 cases) or because the address we were given was incomplete (124 cases). Even six months after our last mailing, we were still receiving our introduction letters back with the post mark of "return to sender", so there is no way to determine how many people actually did receive our letter and were not interested in participating, and how many letters simply never reached the victim.

There were 232 people who replied as wanting to participate, for a response rate of 7.1%. As the interviews progressed in February through June 2004, 45 victims who had previously consented to being interviewed either had changed their minds, or we were not able to reach them by phone. In the end, we had a total of 188 victims in our sample with whom to conduct the interviews, which gives us a final response rate of 188/3263 or 5.8%. This response rate is somewhat similar to that of a U.S. study that used a similar procedure to access victims (Brickman, 2003). Although the study had a response rate of 17.4%, the researchers were also given victims' phone numbers enabling them to track victims down if the mailing address was wrong, and they used a passive consent technique, where not hearing from the victim meant his/her consent. We relied rather on active consent, where victims had to reply to us in order for us to have their phone numbers. Although our study's response rate is considerably lower, out of ethical concerns and respect for victim's privacy, we feel that active consent is more appropriate. Whether or not the sample is representative is a big concern as it may influence our ability to generalize our findings to the population at large, and shall be addressed later on.

Our sample includes 114 female respondents (60.6%) and 74 male respondents (39.4%), whose ages range from 15 to 77 years, the average age being 38 years, and with a median of between 36 and 37 years of age. Most respondents (81.4% or 153 cases) describe themselves as Caucasian or white, 15 respondents (8%) as of African descent or black, 7 (3.7%) as American-Indian or Metis, 6 (3.2%) as Latino, 3 (1.6%)

as Egyptian, 3 as Asian or South West Asian, and one respondent has an East Indian and British background. There are 26 respondents (13.7%) who prefer to carry out the interview in English, while the rest of our sample prefer French. Our sample is predominantly comprised of urban residents, as seen in Table 2.1. The breakdown of the type of crime implicated in our sample is seen in Table 2.2.

Table 2.1: Distribution of respondents, by region

Region	Frequency	Percent
Montreal	159	85
Trois-Rivieres	25	13.4
Sept-Iles	3	1.6
Total	188	100

Table 2.2: Distribution of crime type, by category

Crime Type Category	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percent
Assault (levels 1,2,3)	56	29.8	29.8
Threats	23	12.2	42
Sexual Assault (levels 1,2,3, other**)	14	7.5	49.5
Robbery	26	13.8	63.3
Harassment	16	8.5	71.8
Breaking and Entering	16	8.5	80.3
Motor Vehicle Theft	4	2.1	82.4
Theft of more than $5000	4	2.1	84.5
Theft of $5000 or less	6	3.2	87.7
Fraud	10	5.3	93
Mischief	3	1.7	94.7
Other Crime*	10	5.3	100
Total	188	100	

* This category includes 4 cases of driving while impaired, 3 cases of breaking parole conditions, and1 case of extortion, hit and run and plotting.

** Other sexual offenses refers to the sexual exploitation of a young person (age 14-18) while in a position of trust or authority.

Table 2.3: Distribution of respondents' revenue, by category

Amount	Frequency	Percent
5000$ or less	6	3.2
Between 5001$-10 000$	33	17.6
Between 10 001$-25 000$	45	23.9
Between 25 001$-50 000$	37	19.7
Over 50 000$	49	26.1
Refused, uncertain	18	9.5
Total	188	100

Most respondents in our sample (103 cases or 54.8%) revealed that they had been the victims of crime in the past, with one respondent (0.5%) who refused to answer.

In most cases (84%), there was one person responsible for the crime, and in 118 cases (62.8%), the perpetrator was known by the victim. The breakdown of the relationship between victim and offender is demonstrated in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: Distribution of victim-offender relationship, by category

Relationship	Frequency	Percent
Family, boy/girlfriend**	48	40.7
Friend	10	8.5
Colleague	5	4.2
Neighbour	15	12.7
Other***	39	33.1
Missing*	1	0.8
Total	118	100

* Although one respondent was not allowed to disclose the details of the case, we do know that the perpetrator was someone whom the victim knew.

** Includes husband (14), wife (1), ex-husband (23), ex-wife (2), boyfriend (3), brother (1), sister (1), brother's girlfriend (1), child's father (1), son-in-law (1).

*** Includes social acquaintances (17), work-related acquaintances (6), ex-boy/girlfriend (5), family member's ex-boy/girlfriend (4), current partner's ex-boy/girlfriend (2), ex-boyfriend's brother (1), roommate (1), tenant (1), landlord (2).

In 51 cases (27.1%), a weapon was used by the perpetrator during the commission of the crime, and many (69.7%) victims either felt threatened (29 cases) or actually were threatened (102 cases). Most respondents (113 cases or 60.1%) reported that while the crime was taking place, they felt that they or someone else were in real danger of being seriously injured or killed. There are 74 respondents (39.4%) who were hurt as a result of their victimization, and they describe the severity of their injuries as shown in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5: Distribution of severity of injuries, by category

Seriousness of injuries	Frequency	Percent
Very serious	18	24.3
Somewhat serious	18	24.3
Not too serious	31	41.9
Not at all serious	7	9.5
Total	74	100

Most respondents (132 cases or 70.2%) claim that their relationships were affected as a result of their victimization, and only 42 respondents (22.3%) sought psychological counseling following the criminal episode. Not one respondent from Sept-Iles had contact with victim services, or CAVAC. Most respondents from Montreal (128 cases or 80.5%) did not have contact with the CAVAC, and from those who did have contact (31 cases), only 6 (19.4%) reported that the contact was initiated by this service for victims. Respondents from Trois-Rivieres fared better with 14 cases (56%) where the victim had contact with the CAVAC, and 9 of these cases (64.3%) having been initiated by the service itself.

For the most part, respondents felt that they had the support they needed from friends and/or family members, the results of which can be seen in Table 2.6.

Table 2.6:
Distribution of perceived support by friends and/or family, by category

Received support	Frequency	Percent
Yes, absolutely	95	50.5
Yes, enough	37	19.7
I don't mind	15	8
Not really	26	13.8
Not at all	15	8
Total	188	100

It was our intention to hold interviews with those willing as soon as possible in order to capture the respondent's situation, reaction and evaluation of the criminal justice system in the aftermath of their victimization. In some cases there was a delay due to the respondent's unavailability for an interview, to the crime having been reported much later, to the inability of the police to solve the case, how soon the police caught the offender and were able to send the dossier to the Crown, as well as other delays in the prosecution process. The approximate time between the crime incident and the interview is illustrated in Table 2.7.

Table 2.7: Distribution of time between crime and interview, by category

Time (in months)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Between 1-3	66	36.5	36.5
Between 4-6	63	34.8	71.3
Between 7-9	26	14.4	85.6
Between 10-12	20	11	96.7
More than 1 year	6	3.3	100
Total	181	100	

The (7) missing values include cases where the crime was ongoing and covered a long period of time.

When asked to what extent respondents felt competent and able to go through the criminal justice system, 60.1% replied as being very or quite, while 30.0% felt somewhat or not at all, and 9.6% did not know or were neutral.

4. Representativeness

Through our questionnaire we were able to obtain information regarding the victim's crime type, region and gender. For the purposes of comparing our sample to the general population, let us look at the provincial victimization rates in Quebec for 1999. The breakdown of violent and property crimes are shown in Tables 2.8 and 2.9.

According to *Ministère de la Sécurité Publique* (2004), only 49.4% of criminal victimization involving violent crimes went to court, as only 10% of property crimes. Of these two crime types, the proportion of violent crime cases that went to court is slightly higher (55%) than for property crimes (45%). The results of the survey of the population by Statistics Canada relay that the risk of being a victim of violent crime in Canada in 1999 was higher in urban communities than in rural areas; 85% of victims of violent crime were among the urban population, as opposed to 15% residing in rural areas. Statistics Canada also reports that victims of violent crime in Canada in 1999 were 48.4% male and 51.6% female.

Table 2.8: Distribution of violent crimes charged in Quebec, 2003, by crime type

Crime Type	Frequency	Percentage
Assault	21 923	60.2
Sexual Assault	1 691	4.6
Robbery	2 290	6.3
Harassment	2 004	5.5
Threats	7 643	21.0
Other Violent Crime*	877	2.4
Total Violent Crime	36 428	100

* Includes homicide, criminal negligence, attempted murder, abduction and other.

Source: Ministère de la Sécurité Publique, 2004.

Table 2.9:
Distribution of property crimes charged in Quebec, 2003, by crime type

Crime Type	Frequency	Percentage
Arson	3 762	1.2
Breaking and Entering	84 679	26
Vehicle and Parts Theft	45 087	13.9
Theft of $5000 or more	4 199	1.3
Theft of $5000 or less	117 927	36.3
Possession of stolen goods	2 638	0.8
Fraud	16 518	5.1
Mischief	50 456	15.4
Total Property Crime	325 266	100

Source: Ministère de la Sécurité Publique, 2004.

Our sample is comprised of 71.8% victims of violent crime and 22.9% victims of property crime. Our sample is also made up of 85% of residents from Montreal, 13.4% from Trois-Rivieres and 1.6% from Sept-Iles, and its gender ratio for crimes of violence is comprised of 42.1% men and 57.9% women.

In terms of our sample's under representation of property crimes and over representation of violent crimes, this is understandable given that our sample is comprised of victims whose cases are going to court, and that there is a higher clearance rate for violent crime. It is also possible that this response bias is in part due to self-selection on the potential respondent's part. Victims of violent crime may be more in need to discuss the situation, while victims of property crimes may not feel that their victimization was serious enough to warrant further examination, or interesting enough for the purposes of research.

In comparing the percentage rates of charged offenses in Quebec by crime type with our sample, we notice that the proportion of victims of violent crimes is somewhat similar; our sample of 135 victims of violent crime is comprised of 41.5% victims of assault, 17% threats, 10.4% sexual assault, 19.3% robbery, and 11.9% harassment, whereas for Quebec in 2003, the proportions of charged offenses are 60.2%, 21%, 4.6%, 6.3%, and 5.5% respectively. Our sample is slightly over represented in

robbery, sexual assault, and harassment, and under represented in assault and threats. Again, it would seem that victims of some forms of serious crime are more likely to respond to our letter and agree to be interviewed than of other types of victimization.

As for property crimes, our sample of 43 victims of property crime is comprised of 37.2% victims of breaking and entering, 9.3% motor vehicle theft, 9.3% theft of more than $5000, 14% theft of less than $5000, 23.3% fraud, and 7% mischief, whereas for Quebec in 2003, the proportions of charged offenses are 17%, 8.5%, 1.1%, 42.1%, 14.1%, and 10.4% respectively. Our sample is over represented in breaking and entering, theft of more than $5000, motor vehicle theft and fraud, while being slightly under represented in arson and possession of stolen goods, and greatly under represented by theft of less than $5000. As it is true that the more serious the crime in terms of financial loss, the more likely it will be reported (Tremblay, 1999), it would seem that the same holds true for participation in our research when it comes to property crimes.

Our sample's proportion of victims living in urban communities is in keeping with the national rates. It is logical that most of our respondents are urbanites given that the majority of the information we received from which to solicit potential respondents regarded cases before the courts of Montreal.

Our sample is comparable to the national gender rates for victims of violent crime, with women being slightly over represented in our sample, which may be due to the nature of the research appealing more to women than to men.

5. Operational definitions

5.1 Independent Variables

Psychological trauma: The Modified PTSD Symptom Scale: Self-Report (MPSS-SR) was used (Falsetti et al., 1993). This instrument is based on the posttraumatic stress disorder Symptom Scale (PSS) developed by Foa et al., which itself showed "satisfactory internal consistency, high test-retest reliability, good concurrent validity, and excellent convergent validity with the Structured Clinical Interview for

DSM-III-R PTSD Module" (Falsetti et al., 1993, 161) when validated using subjects who are crime victims, but only measured the frequency of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms.

The MPSS-SR includes 17 items used to indicate the frequency and also the severity of symptoms experienced in the past two weeks that correspond to those as relayed by the DSM-IV to be indicative of post-traumatic stress. According to the authors, Falsetti et al. (1993), the modified PTSD Symptom Scale has a good overall internal consistency with alphas of .96 for the treatment sample and .97 for the community sample, and it too has a good concurrent validity with the SCID PTSD Module. The test's subscales of re-experiencing, avoidance and arousal also have good internal consistency. Although it would seem that a clinical evaluation is necessary to assess a state characteristic of posttraumatic stress disorder, studies have shown success using this test for interviews by telephone (Freedy et al., 1994).

Respondents were introduced to this particular section of the questionnaire by an explanation of its purpose and were reminded throughout that the questions pertained to the past two weeks, in order to assess posttraumatic stress disorder as a state rather than trait characteristic.

The questions used to diagnose for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder after having experienced an event that may have been threatening and may have instilled fear or helplessness in the person are based on the presence of certain criteria representing posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms, which can only be diagnosed from at least one month post-trauma. The test is comprised of four sections.

I. It begins with queries regarding the *re-experiencing of the event*, of which a minimum of one symptom is required to be present:

(1) "Have you had recurrent or intrusive thoughts or recollections about the event?",

(2) "Have you been having recurrent bad dreams or nightmares about the event?",

(3) "Have you had the experience of suddenly reliving the event, flashbacks of it, acting or feeling as if it were re-occurring?", and

(4) "Have you been intensely emotionally upset when reminded of the event, including reactions to anniversaries)?".

II. It then looks at the criterion of *avoidance*, of which a minimum of three symptoms is required to be present:

(5) "Have you persistently been making efforts to avoid thoughts or feelings associated with the event we've talked about?",

(6) "Have you persistently been making efforts to avoid activities, situations, or places that remind you of the event?";

including signs of amnesia, diminished interest, estrangement from others, restricted affect, and sense of shortened future,:

(7) "Are there any important aspects about the event that you cannot recall?";

(8) "Have you markedly lost interest in free time activities since the event?";

(9) "Have you felt detached or cut off from others around you since the event?";

(10) "Have you felt that your ability to experience emotions is less, for example, unable to have loving feelings, feeling numb, can't cry when sad, etc.?"; and

(11) "Have you felt that any future plans or hopes have changed because of the event, for example, no career, marriage, children, long life?".

III. In examining the *arousal* criterion, of which a minimum of two symptoms is required to be present, the test looks for evidence of insomnia, irritability, concentration deficits, hyper-vigilance, and elevated startle response:

(12) "Have you been having persistent difficulty falling or staying asleep?";

(13) "Have you been continuously irritable or having outbursts of anger?";

(14) "Have you been having persistent difficulty concentrating?";

(15) "Are you overly alert, for example checking to see who is around you, since the event?"; and

(16) "Have you been jumpier, more easily startled since the event?".

IV. It concludes with an element to ascertain *impairment in functioning*:

(17) "Have you been having intense physical reactions, for example, sweatiness or heart palpitations, when reminded of the event?".

Symptom frequency is calculated with a 4-point scale ranging from 0 = "not at all" to 3 = "5 or more times per week", with the total score ranging from 0 to 51. Symptom severity is based on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 = "not at all distressing" to 4 = "extremely distressing", with the total score ranging from 0 to 68. In accordance to the scoring method of the MPSS-SR as prescribed by Falsetti et al. (1993) for a community sample, those whose total scores are 46 and above are assessed as being posttraumatic stress disorder positive.

Severe and/or Prolonged Abuse: This independent variable is determined by identifying those who were victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse such as sexual assault, and/or of domestic violence. The reason for the distinction between these types of victimization and the rest is because these types of crimes are typically associated with an increased risk for developing traumatic symptoms (Freedy et al., 1994).

Many authors (Resick & Nishith, 1997; Resick, 1993; Sales et al., 1984; Cluss et al., 1983; Ruch & Chandler, 1983) place emphasis on the enduring traumatic effects, damage to self-image, and negative social repercussions through which many victims of sexual assault seem to suffer. There is also a consensus among researchers that victims of domestic violence require special consideration for they may feel trapped in a violent relationship and may also fear retaliation and an increase in violence from their abuser if they attempt to break the vicious cycle and report the abuse to the police (Damant et al., 2000; Hart, 1993; Dobash & Dobash, 1992).

There is a tendency for these victims to blame themselves and be blamed by others for their own victimization (Shapland et al., 1985), and since the offense is of an

intimate or relational nature, it may give way to particular emotional devastation, trouble in communication and much difficulty moving past the event, perhaps even incapacitating the ability to handle future traumatic situations (Van der Kolk, 2003). Victims of these crimes are also reputed to have the most trouble with long-term posttraumatic adjustment (Kilpatrick et al., 1981; Sales et al., 1984), and are more prone to develop coping mechanisms that are maladaptive and avoidant (Van der Kolk, 2003). Because of the particular nature of and consequences to this type of victimization, it seems necessary to examine these victims separately from the rest.

Since sexual abuse can cause damaging effects regardless of the objective gravity of the offense (Shapland et al., 1985), we shall define all types of such abuse as sexual assault, referring to regular and aggravated sexual assault, as well as any unwanted sexual contact, and abuse of a position of power for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

Since domestic violence is not indicated by any criminal code article, this is assessed by examining the type of crime, as in assault, harassment, threats or breaking of parole conditions, as well as the relationship between the victim and offender as being or having been partners at one time with the perpetrator. We will also verify whether or not the victim has suffered sexual assault or domestic violence victimization in the past. Those meeting these terms are placed in the severe/prolonged victimization category.

Upon the classification of our subjects, it was determined that there are 3 types of victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse; that is:

1) The current case is one of sexual assault or domestic violence, but the respondent had not been a victim of such a crime in the past;

2) the current case involves a crime of a different nature, such as assault from a non-partner, threats, as well as harassment, theft, plotting, fraud, and breaking and entering. but the victim has suffered from domestic or sexual abuse in the past; and

3) the current case is one of sexual assault or domestic violence and the victim had also suffered from such victimization in the past.

One victim of domestic violence did not care to divulge the nature of his/her previous victimization and is considered as a current victim of domestic violence.

Personal and Support Variables: These independent and dichotomous variables will serve to perhaps explain the variances in victims' coping responses.

Personal variables include:

Education: Respondents were asked what was the highest level of education they have attained. Those having had any schooling beyond high school are categorized as possessing higher levels of education. In this way, we shall also include those whose degrees are in progress.

Socio-Economic Status: Respondents were asked which category best describes their household income before taxes. Those answering $25 000 or less are considered as having lower socio-economic status.

Support variables include:

Friends and Family: Respondents were asked if they feel they have the support they need from friends and/or family members. Those answering positively were considered to be in possession of this kind of informal support.

Therapist: Respondents were asked if, following the crime, they used the services of a counselor or therapist for help. Those who said yes were considered to be in possession of this kind of formal support.

Treatment: This independent variable is comprised of two parts: 1) instrumental support, and 2) emotional support. It is assessed by asking the respondents whether or not they received specific support from criminal justice professionals.

Instrumental support refers to an explanation of the judicial process, and information with regard to the progress of the case, on compensation and support services for victims. It is represented by 4 items in the questionnaire:

(Question 10) "How satisfied are you with the explanation you received of what to expect and how the court system would work?";

(Question 11) "Were you kept informed about the progress of the police investigation?";

(Question 16) "How satisfied are you with your being informed about what services are available to victims?"; and

(Question 17) "How satisfied are you with your being informed about upcoming court proceedings?".

Questions 10, 16 and 17 are scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = "Very dissatisfied" to 5 = "Very satisfied" and will be recoded to form a dichotomous variable; scores of 4 or 5 are coded as 1 (yes), and scores ranging from 1 to 3 inclusively or 8 (don't know) will be coded as 0 (no). Question 11 has answers of yes, no, or uncertain; those coded as yes will remain as such (1), while answers of no or uncertain are considered as no (0). The instrumental support index is determined based on the total score of these items; those with a score of 3 or 4 are categorized as having received the support, while those scoring 0-2 inclusively are considered as not.

Emotional support refers to the manner and attitude of the police towards the victim, which includes demonstrating an interest in the case, consulting with the victim on decisions about the case, and having the opportunity to complete a Victim Impact Statement. It is represented by 4 items in the questionnaire:

(Question 29) "Did the police seem interested in catching the offender?";

(Question 30) "Did the police treat you with courtesy and respect?";

(Question 32) "Did the police give you a chance to express your views on what happened?"; and

(Question 34) "Were you given an opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement for this case?".

Questions 29, 30 and 32 are scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = "No, not at all" to = "Yes, definitely", and are recoded to form a dichotomous variable; scores of 4 and 5 are coded as 1 (yes), and scores ranging from 1 through 3 are coded as 0 (no). Question 34 has a yes or no answer form; the yes answer shall remain the same (1),

while those answering no or uncertain are recoded as no (0). The emotional support index will be determined based on the total score of these four items; those with a score of 3 or 4 are considered as having received the support, while those scoring 0-2 inclusively are considered as not.

5.2 Dependant Variables

Coping Style: This dependant variable is measured using the "Seeking social support" scale of the COPE Inventory (Carver et al., 1989). The COPE is used to determine dispositional or situational responses to stress and includes 13 different scales of coping, some of which are either emotion- or problem-focused, or even avoidant in nature.

For the purposes of the present research, only the "Seeking social support" scales were employed in our questionnaire because they were created to differentiate between instrumental and emotional reasons for seeking social support. The scales therefore allow for the dichotomous categorization, that is, problem- or emotion-focused, of an individual's reasons for reaching out to others, including the criminal justice system, for help and support.

The items are phrased in the past tense in order to be situation-specific, as prescribed by the authors of the test. We also took care to phrase the items in such a way as to insinuate not only what the respondent actually did, but also what they might have wanted to do. For example, when the original statement read "I talked to someone to find out more about the situation", it was rephrased to read "I tried to talk to someone to find out more about the situation".

Respondents were introduced to this particular section of the questionnaire by saying that it contains different methods that people use in order to cope with stressful life events. We asked that the respondent indicate after each statement was read to them to what extent it applies to their own approach when dealing with their victimization, based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = "Not at all", to 5 ="Extremely".

Three statements representing an *emotion-focused* approach are:

(1) "I tried to get emotional support from friends or relatives",

(2) "I wanted to talk to someone about how I feel", and

(3) "I tried to get moral support, sympathy and understanding from someone".

The COPE also includes the statement "I discuss my feelings with someone", which was not included in our version because we felt that it too closely resembles statement 2, and that any subtleties between the two would be lost, especially in the translation to French.

Four statements representing a *problem-focused* approach are:

(1) "I tried asking someone who has had a similar experience what they did",

(2) "I tried getting advice from someone",

(3) "I tried to talk to someone to find out more about the situation", and

(4) "I tried to talk to someone who could do something concrete about the problem".

Two separate indexes were created with the data collected through these questions: one to evaluate the extent to which the respondent is emotion-focused, and the other to evaluate the extent to which the respondent is problem-focused.

The scores from the three emotion-focused statements are averaged to form a total emotion-focus score ranging from 1 to 5, as in our Likert scale. A dichotomous variable is then created by categorizing those whose score is 1 or 2 as not emotion-focused, and those scoring 4 or 5 as emotion-focused. In order to determine where to include scores of 3, we tested our fourth hypothesis, namely that emotion-focused individuals who receive emotional support from the criminal justice system will tend to be more satisfied, which revealed that the score of 3 was closer to that of 4 and 5 than of 1 and 2, and should therefore be categorized in the positive. The same procedure is used for the problem-focused scale and the dichotomous categorization of that variable using our third hypothesis, that problem-focused individuals who receive instrumental support from the criminal justice system will tend to be more satisfied, to justify the categorization of a score of 3 as positive.

The new dichotomous emotion- and problem-focused variables were then combined to create a classification of a respondent's *general coping focus*. A new index was created, reflecting the four resulting categories: only emotion-focused, only problem-focused, both, which would indicate a diverse coping style, or neither, which could be indicative of avoidance or that the "seeking social support" aspect of coping is not of primary importance for the respondent, for the focus of their coping is more internal.

Satisfaction: Because the trial is still pending in 58 (30.9%) cases of our sample and 72 (38.3%) respondents are not aware of what happened to the case, this dependant variable is assessed by including three items in the questionnaire representing facets of the criminal justice system affecting those at the beginning of their case, namely, asking the victim for their level of satisfaction with 1) the police, 2) the procedure used to handle the case, and 3) with the criminal justice system in general. Originally, we had also included questions to evaluate the respondents' level of satisfaction with the prosecution and victim services, but since 124 respondents (66%) did not yet have any contact with the prosecutor, and 143 (76.1%) had not yet had contact with victim services, many felt that they could not properly answer, and so a response of "do not know", a missing value, was recorded despite the fact that some missing data may very well indicate dissatisfaction due to a lack of interest shown by these justice professionals.

Answers are based on a Likert-scale ranging from 1 = "strongly dissatisfied" to 5 = "very satisfied". The scores from the three questions were averaged to form a total satisfaction score ranging from 1 to 5, as in our Likert scale. The particular response of "do not know" was recoded as neutral, or 3. In order to create a dichotomous categorization for this variable, we consider those with a score of 4 or 5 to be satisfied, and those with scores ranging from 1 through 3 to be not satisfied.

6. Method of analysis

6.1 Chi-square analysis

The purpose of our study is to show whether or not there are significant differences between certain categorical variables. For this, we require a method of analysis that will permit us to quantify and determine the strength of the relationship between variables of categorical data. The chi-square method is ideal as it is a non-parametric measure and will "assist us in ruling out associations that may not represent genuine relationships in the population under study" (Babbie, 1992, p. 455).

The magnitude of the Chi-square value allows for the estimation of the probability that the discrepancy between the observed distribution of the sample and the one to expect if the variables are unrelated was not simply due to a normal sampling error (Babbie, 1992). Use of the chi-square method will allow us to determine whether or not the relationship between the variables is statistically significant. Using an SPSS program for statistical computation, the statistical significance is given by the p-value.

The effect size quantifies the strength of the significance; identifying the extent to which conclusions can be made about the strength of the relationship among the variables. In order to analyze two variables of a nominal nature, Lambda is a good measure of association, whereas if the variables are dichotomous, Phi is the measure of preference.

Applying a chi-square method allows for a cross-tabulation of the variables and yields a table of observed and expected frequencies. Statisticians suggest that the expected frequency be at least 5 in each cell for the test to be considered reliable, that results are questionable using the test for too small a sample. It is for this reason that we have had to create dichotomous variables in many instances; the data may appear to be less precise than in scale form, but given our sample size, it was necessary in order to maintain the reliability of the calculations. A sample size of 188 victims is quite sufficient for the results of our calculations to be valid.

7. Conclusion

Our post-test only design allows us to examine the relationship between certain variables without being able to ascertain which variable may influence the other. We are attempting to evaluate how the variables are interconnected at one given moment.

Those who agree to being interviewed may not constitute an adequate and representative sample of the population at large, nor reflect the full array of experiences to be had. Respondents are limited to those who we were able to contact through the criminal justice system, whose cases are pursued in the judicial process. Moreover, the data gathered in the study may be biased in the sense that certain types of victims may feel the need to talk about their situation, to vent perhaps, while others may not wish to discuss the matter any further.

Although our response rate was low, we managed to obtain a sample that includes victims of a variety of crimes as well as different characteristics of victimization, such as the relationship between the victim and offender, presence of weapon, perception of threat, and severity of injuries. For most respondents, their relationships with others were affected by their victimization, though most had support from friends and family and very little had formal psychological support or contact with victim services, which may indeed reflect the reality of people's reactions to victimization. Our sample is multi-racial/-cultural and although it includes mostly French speaking Caucasians, this is in keeping with the make-up of the general population of Quebec. Our sample also reflects victims of diverse ages, socio-economic status, and education. All of these factors lend to the credibility of our study, as they are indications that the responses to our questions are based on what may be very different points of view.

Chapter 3: Results

In order to explore the relationship between the traumatic effects of criminal victimization, focus of coping when seeking social support, and satisfaction with the criminal justice system, let us take a look at the results of out four hypotheses using chi-square analysis with this particular sample population.

1. Trauma

1.1 Posttraumatic Stress Disorder

1.1.1 Internal Consistency

In order to assess the rate of internal consistency between the 17 items that comprise the scale, let us examine the scale's correlation matrix (See appendix I). In examining the reliability of the posttraumatic stress disorder scale, we see that most of the scale items are significantly related, with R-values varying between .2450 and .6156, which can be due to the fact that each one indeed tests for different dimensions of posttraumatic stress disorder without being redundant. The item that appears less related is question 7, "Are there any important aspects of the event that you still cannot recall?". In relation to our sample, this aspect of posttraumatic stress disorder does not appear to occur frequently; even though this item relates poorly to the rest, varying between .0592 and .2179, it should still be considered as it an important indicator of avoidance.

The alpha value for our sample of 188 subjects is .9184 when applying this test for signs of posttraumatic stress disorder, indicating a high internal consistency.

1.1.2 External Validation

In order to establish an external validation of the posttraumatic stress disorder scale, we have examined its results in relation to whether or not the respondent was in fear of being seriously injured or even killed at the time of their victimization. The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level; that is, results from the Pearson correlation test show that the two variables are significantly and directly proportional with a coefficient of $p = .040$. The mean scores for posttraumatic stress disorder of the

113 subjects who reported being in fear for their lives is 51.79, whereas the 72 subjects who were not in fear had a mean score for posttraumatic stress disorder of 24.42. This serves to augment the reliability of the posttraumatic stress disorder scale, for past research indicates that fear of one's life is a strong predictor of post event trauma (Sales et al., 1984), which is also true for our sample as fear for life was predictive of posttraumatic stress disorder with a relational power of .40.

1.1.3 Frequency

After calculating the respondents' scores on the symptom frequency and severity scales and applying the prescribed cut-off rate for being posttraumatic stress disorder positive of 46 and above, we are able to assess that from our sample, 85 of the subjects (45.2%) can be categorized as having symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, while the remaining 103 subjects (54.8%) do not.

1.2 Severe and/or prolonged abuse

This specific group was constructed in order to examine further the relationship between victims of sexual assault and/or domestic violence and their ensuing focus of coping. The breakdown of our sample of victims in terms of severe abuse (SA) and/or prolonged abuse (PA) is illustrated in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Distribution of victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse, by category

Category	Frequency	Percent
Not severe/prolonged	126	67
SA, (1-3. other) case	10	5.3
SA History	2	8
Past and Present SA	4	1.1
DV case	15	4.3
DV History	8	2.1
Past and Present DV	23	12.2
Total	188	100

Because our sample is not large enough to properly consider each category separately in relation to coping response, we shall create a dichotomous variable by collapsing

all types of sexual assault and domestic violence victimization, which will allow us to apply the chi-square test for statistical analysis. This yields results of 33%, or 62 cases that are categorized as severe/prolonged, and 67%, or 126 cases that are not.

1.2.1 Gender

Results from the cross-tabulation of this variable with the victim's gender is represented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Distribution of victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse, by gender

		Severe/ Prolonged		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Gender	**Male**	66 89.2%	8 10.8%	74 100%
	Female	60 52.6%	54 47.4%	114 100%
Total		126	62	188

Almost one third (33%) of our sample has been identified as being a victim of severe and/or prolonged abuse using this method. What's more, of the 33% whom we have determined as being such, only 8 respondents (12.9%) are male, while the remaining 54 subjects (87.1%) are female. From these numbers, it appears that women are over-represented in this category. This is not surprising as women are more likely than men to suffer from this kind of victimization (Freedy et al, 1994). There may also be a response bias due to the nature of the research and social desirability; it is possible that women feel more comfortable talking about, or admitting to states such as victimization than do men (Fagot & Leinbach, 1989), and would therefore be more candid, willing, and feel more free to participate in our research.

1.2.2 Victimization

If we examine the relationship between posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms and type of victimization, that is, severe/prolonged abuse or not, we can see that the connection is quite strong (See Table 3.3).

Table 3.3: Distribution of victims with posttraumatic stress disorder, by victimization type

		PTSD Symptoms		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Severe and/or prolonged Abuse	**No**	87 69%	39 31%	126 100%
	Yes	16 25.8%	46 74.2%	62 100%
Total		103	85	188

(Chi-square = 31.366, df = 1, p = .000, Phi = .408)

Table 3.3 shows that 69% of respondents (87 cases) who are not victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse also test negatively for posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms, whereas 74.2% (46 cases) of victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse test positively. Results of chi-square analysis yield a value of 31.366 (p = .000), with a Phi value of .408, revealing that the relationship between the variables is statistically significant, that severe and/or prolonged abuse is related to posttraumatic stress disorder.

2. Coping

Carver et al. (1989) report a high reliability rate for the situational "Seeking social support" scales, with an alpha value of .85 for the emotional sub-scale with a mean score of 2.77, and an alpha value of .75 for the instrumental sub-scale with a mean score of 2.422. Similarly, the results from our sample show a mean score of 2.97 for the emotional sub-scale and a mean score of 2.64 for the instrumental sub-scale, as well as comparable alpha values. Although our sample's scores are slightly higher,

2 The scores from the COPE are based on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 = "Not at all" to 4 = "A lot", with 3 indicating "a medium amount". In order to be as precise as possible during the interviews by phone, we felt that a 5-point scale would provide the respondent with a clearer understanding of the mid-point (3 out of 5 rather than 4), and appear less confusing as the scale is consistent with other items from the questionnaire. In order to calculate the mean scores for emotion-and problem-focused coping from our sample and compare them to mean scores from the COPE, we have recoded the response of 5 ("extremely") to 4 ("A lot"). All total mean scores are based on a range of 0-4.

this is not surprising given the criminal nature of the events that have affected the respondents, their scores are in kind to those obtained by the authors of the test, which serves to show that the test was administered appropriately.

2.1 Emotion-focused

2.1.1 Internal Consistency

When validating this scale, we tested for inter-item correlation and found the items to be related at a rate of between .5866 and .7622. This range tells us that the items are strongly related to each other and may well represent the different aspects of emotion-focused coping when seeking social support, while not being so highly associated, as in over 80%, as to be redundant and measuring the same aspect. The scale has an alpha value of .8732, indicating a high rate of internal consistency.

2.1.2 External Validity

Since the goal of having a focus that is emotional in nature is to receive moral support, sympathy and understanding from someone (Carver et al., 1989), the scale's external validity is determined by comparing the dichotomous categorization of emotion-focused or not with the results from a question regarding informal support: "How important is it for you to receive support from friends and/or family members?".

We can see from Table 3.4 that most respondents (95%) with high levels (4 or 5) of emotion-focused coping find support from friends and family to be very and somewhat important, as do 84% of respondents with a mid level (3) of emotion-focused coping. Many respondents (81.8%) with scores of 2 for emotion-focused coping find that kind of support to be important as well. The largest difference is in the 30 subjects who scored 1 on the emotion-focused scale; for them, there does not seem to be a such a strong emphasis placed on informal support, for there are 46.7% of respondents who find it to be very or somewhat important, and 53.3% who are neutral about its importance or for whom it was not really or not at all important.

Table 3.4:
Distribution of importance of informal support, by level of emotion-focus

		Importance of support					
		Very	**Some-what**	**Neutral**	**Not really**	**Not at all**	Total
Level of Emotion-Focus	**1**	5	9	8	6	2	30
	2	11	16	2	3	1	33
	3	11	10	4	0	0	25
	4	29	19	3	2	0	53
	5	36	11	0	0	0	47
Total		92	65	17	11	3	188

(Pearson R = .487, p = .000)

The relationship between the development of emotion-focused responses and the importance of support is significant; that is, it has a Pearson's R value of .487, (p = .000), indicating that the two variables are strongly related. This goes to show that the higher the score on the emotion-focused coping scale, the stronger the need for informal support, which indicates that this scale is apt for the determination of emotion-focused coping responses when seeking social support.

2.1.3 Frequency

The results for our sample employing our emotion-focus index are shown in Table 3.5. The large number (66.5%) of victims who scored high, that is, 3, 4 or 5, on the emotion-focused index, is perhaps explained by the nature of the research. To participate in an interview and to discuss the case and its personal consequences may appeal more to those with a strong penchant for this type of coping response.

We created a dichotomous variable of emotion-focused or not for the purpose of conducting analysis using the chi-square test, and have therefore combined categories 1 and 2, and collapsed categories 3 through 5, the results of which are shown in Table 3.6.

Table 3.5: Distribution of emotion-focused coping responses, by category

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
1-Not at All	30	16	16
2-A Little	33	17.5	33.5
3-Somewhat	25	13.3	46.8
4-Very Much	53	28.2	75
5-Extremely	47	25	100
Total	188	100	

Table 3.6: Distribution of victims with emotion-focused coping responses (EF)

	Frequency	Percent
0-No EF	63	33.5
1-EF	125	66.5
Total	188	100

2.2 Problem-focused

2.2.1 Internal Consistency

When validating the problem-focused scale, we tested for inter-item correlation and found the items to be related at a rate of between .2329 and .6272. Again, this range tells us that the items are related to each other. However, the lowest correlation was observed for the first item, namely, "I tried asking someone who has had a similar experience what they did". This may be explained by the fact that we are questioning those whose experiences may not be common enough to be able to identify with this aspect of being problem-focused. The problem-focused scale has an alpha value of .7563, which tells us that the scale has a high enough rate of internal consistency.

If we exclude the first item and base our scale on the remaining three problem-focused statements, our rate of internal consistency rises, giving an alpha value of .8114, which is very good. The remaining items now correlate at a rate of between .5492 and .6272.

2.2.2 External Validity

Now that we have determined which items will represent the scale, to determine the scale's external validity, we have compared its results with those from a question regarding the victim's interaction with the police, asked to those who had not been kept informed about the progress of the investigation (N = 111): "Would you have appreciated to be notified by the police?". This question is pertinent to problem-focused coping as any coping response is based upon the needs and expectations of the individual (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The findings from this cross-tabulation are shown in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7:
Distribution of problem-focused coping, by wanting information from police

		Level of problem-focus					
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	Total
Wanting Info	**Yes**	17	16	21	27	20	101
	No	5	1	0	0	0	6
	Not sure	1	1	2	0	0	4
Total		23	18	23	27	20	111

(The missing values in this table are due to those victims (77) who had already been informed of the progress of the investigation)
(Pearson's R = 19.876, p = .011, Eta = .341)

The results as seen in Table 3.7 indicate that respondents who did not need to receive any information regarding the status of the case also scored either 1 or 2 on the problem-focus scale. This is consistent with the notion that those who do not expect notification will not be problem-focused. Among those who would have appreciated to receive information from the police regarding their case (90.6% of respondents), 32.7% scored lower (1 or 2) on the problem-focus scale while the remaining 67.3% scored higher, as in 4 or 5. The relationship between these two variables is statistically significant, with a Pearson's R value of 19.876, (p = .011), which indicates that among those who had not already been notified of the case, the lower the score on the problem-focused coping scale, the lower the need for such

information. It strengthens our conviction that this scale is appropriate for the determination of problem-focused coping responses when seeking social support.

2.2.3 Frequency

The scores from the three problem-focused statements were averaged to form a total problem-focus score ranging from 1 to 5, the results of which are presented in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8: Distribution of problem-focused coping responses, by category

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-Not at All	40	21.3	21.3
2-A Little	38	20.2	41.5
3-Somewhat	41	21.8	63.3
4-Very Much	38	20.2	83.5
5-Extremely	31	16.5	100
Total	188	100	

In order to facilitate data analysis, a dichotomous variable of problem-focused or not was created. To this end, we have combined categories 1 and 2, and collapsed categories 3 through 5, which bears results as shown in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9: Distribution of victims with problem-focused coping responses (PF)

	Frequency	Percent
0-No PF	78	41.5
1-PF	110	58.5
Total	188	100

2.3 General Coping Focus

Using the emotion- and problem-focused scales in combination based on the dichotomous categories for these variables produces 4 categories of a respondent's general coping focus. The distribution of our sample is as shown in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10: Distribution of general coping focus, by category

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Emotion-focused	35	18.6	18.6
Problem-focused	20	10.6	29.2
Both	90	47.9	77.1
Neither	43	22.9	100
Total	188	100	

Almost one half of respondents (47.9%) show signs of having both emotion- and problem-focused coping responses, while less than one quarter of respondents (22.9%) do not test positively for either style. This may be because the event was not traumatic and did not require any coping effort on the victim's part, or it may also be due to the fact that seeking social support is not where the respondent places the most emphasis when dealing with his/her victimization, and has rather chosen other methods to deal with the traumatic event.

With regard to the creation of a classification of general coping focus, the emerging category that we were not expecting, representing 22.9% of our sample, was that of neither emotion- nor problem-focused. In order to reach a better understanding of our respondents with neither coping focus, let us use the chi-square method to examine the relationship between this category and the development of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms. The results are reflected in Table 3.26.

Table 3.11: Distribution of victims' general coping focus, by posttraumatic stress disorder

		General coping focus				
		EF	**PF**	**Both**	**Neither**	Total
PTSD	**No**	19 18.4%	9 8.7%	46 44.7%	29 28.2%	103
	Yes	16 18.8%	11 12.9%	44 51.8	14 16.5%	85
Total		35	20	90	43	188

(Chi-square = 4.048, df = 3, p = .256, Phi = .147)

This table illustrates that out of 43 respondents with neither emotion- or problem-focused coping responses, 29 do not exhibit symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder. One could assume that the desire to seek social support in order to cope is not necessary for a person who is not traumatised, that the situation does not entail a difficulty for the individual and does not call for a process of recovery.

In looking at the posttraumatic stress disorder scores of the remaining 14 respondents with neither coping focus but with symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, we discover that all in all 14 cases, the respondent showed more than the required 3 out of 7 symptoms, with 11 victims scoring 5 or more, and qualified for the criteria of avoidance, a sub-scale for the measure of posttraumatic stress disorder. This being said, it is understandable that one who is in a phase of avoidance will not seek social support when coping.

Overall, we are satisfied that the coping scales do measure different aspects of coping when seeking social support. With alpha values of .8732 for the emotion-focused and .8114 for the problem-focused scales, their level of internal reliability and the logical explanation for having neither focus lend to the impression that the scales are quite sound. However, we do not know to what extent a person's coping focus is the same for the criminal justice system as it is for other types of social support. We shall keep this in mind especially when looking at the relationship between coping focus and treatment from criminal justice system professionals.

3. Trauma and Coping

In order to explore hypothesis 1, we will use chi-square analysis to test the null hypothesis that the proportion of victims with emotion-focused coping responses is the same despite the type of victimization, that is, severe and/or prolonged or not. Table 3.12 illustrates our findings.

Table 3.12:
Distribution of victims with emotion-focused coping, by victimization type

		EF Coping		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Severe and/or prolonged abuse	**No**	47 37.3%	79 62.7%	126 100%
	Yes	16 25.8%	46 74.2%	62 100%
Total		103	85	188

(Chi-square = 2.464, df = 1, p = .116, Phi = .114)

The Pearson chi-square test = 2.464, with df = 1, resulted in a p-value or significance level of .116. This is not statistically significant, and our decision is to not reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no detectable difference between emotion-focused coping when seeking social support and type of victimization. From the distribution of observed frequencies, we can see that most victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse (74.2%) are indeed emotion-focused, but the same can be said for victims of other crimes, though to a lesser extent (62.7%).

We employ chi-square analysis for hypothesis 2 to test whether or not victims with personal resources such as higher education or socio-economic status and support resources, that is, friends and family or therapist, will have a more diverse range of coping styles despite crime variables. Tables 3.13 through 3.16 illustrate our findings.

Table 3.13: Distribution of general coping focus, by level of education

		General Coping Focus				
		EF	**PF**	**Both**	**Neither**	Total
Higher Education	**No**	10 16.7%	6 10%	25 41.7%	19 31.7%	60 100%
	Yes	25 19.5%	14 10.9%	65 50.8%	24 18.8%	128 100%
Total		35	20	90	43	188

(Chi-square = 3.903, df = 3, p = .1272)

Table 3.14:
Distribution of general coping focus, by level of socio-economic status

		General Coping Focus				
		EF	**PF**	**Both**	**Neither**	Total
Higher SES	**No**	15	8	39	22	84
		17.9%	9.5%	46.4%	26.2%	100%
	Yes	18	9	43	16	86
		20.9%	10.5%	50%	18.6%	100%
Total		33	17	82	38	170

(Missing cases are due to those who refused or did not know)
(Chi-square = 1.451, df = 3, p = .694)

Table 3.15: Distribution of general coping focus, by support from friends/family

		General Coping Focus				
		EF	**PF**	**Both**	**Neither**	Total
Support from friends/ family	**No**	6	9	18	23	56
		10.7%	16.1%	32.1%	41.1%	100%
	Yes	29	11	72	20	132
		22%	8.3%	54.5%	15.2%	100%
Total		35	20	90	43	188

(Chi-square = 20.560, df = 3, p = .000)

Table 3.16: Distribution of general coping focus, by support from therapist

		General Coping Focus				
		EF	**PF**	**Both**	**Neither**	Total
Support from therapist	**No**	34	17	61	34	146
		23.3%	11.6%	41.8%	23.3%	100%
	Yes	1	3	29	9	42
		2.4%	7.1%	69%	21.4%	100%
Total		35	20	90	43	188

(Chi-square = 13.394, df = 3, p = .004)

When calculating the relationship between general coping focus and education (see Table 3.13), the results of the Pearson chi-square test indicates a p-value or

significance level of .272. At $p < .05$, .272 is not statistically significant, and our decision is to not reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference between general coping focus when seeking social support and level of education.

The calculation of the relationship between general coping focus and socio-economic status (see Table 3.14) gave way to the same conclusion; the Pearson chi-square test gives a p-value or significance level of .694. We conclude that there is no significant difference between general coping focus when seeking social support and level of socio-economic status. Although we might have anticipated that general coping focus would vary based on different levels of education and socio-economic status, our tests did not find these results to be present.

When calculating the relationship between general coping focus and support from friends and family (see Table 3.15), however, the results of the Pearson chi-square test show a p-value or significance level of .000. At $p < .05$, this is statistically significant, and so our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that victims' general coping focus is related to informal support from friends and family. Namely, that victims in the "emotion-focused" or "both" categories will be more likely to have such support, while those in the "problem-focused" or "neither" categories are less likely.

The relationship between general coping focus and support from a therapist (see Table 3.16) yielded statistically significant results as well; results of the Pearson chi-square test show a p-value or significance level of .004. At $p < .05$, our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a statistically significant between general coping focus and having support from a therapist. Those who are emotion-focused are less likely to have support from a therapist, while those who are both emotion-and problem-focused are more likely to have this support.

4. Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

4.1 Internal Consistency

The scale that was originally developed to measure victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system included many aspects that were deemed as an important part of overall services to victims. We were unable to include measures of satisfaction with the prosecution and victim services in our total satisfaction with the criminal justice system scale. Although we do feel that it is important to include these items in the overall evaluation of the criminal justice system, our data do not reflect this, as many victims chose not to give an answer because they had not yet had any contact with them, even though they should have. We are led to the understanding that perhaps many victims do not realize they are entitled to certain communications and assistance, or recognize the fact that they are part of the justice system's services.

We verified that the remaining items making up this scale are internally consistent and that it is a reliable measure of satisfaction with the criminal justice system for our sample. The inter-item correlation matrix for this index now reveals that the items correlate at a rate of between .4258 and .5488. The items are related, but not so strongly related as to be redundant in measuring for different facets of satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Since this scale is based on different aspects and services of the criminal justice system, it stands to reason that each item is somewhat independent of the others. The reliability coefficient for the 3 items in this index shows an alpha value of .7513, a good rate of internal consistency.

4.2 External Validity

When we compare the results of the scale to another pertinent question in the questionnaire regarding the possibility of experiencing secondary victimization at the hands of criminal justice professionals, which would negate satisfaction with the justice system, "Do you feel that, at any time, your credibility was questioned?", we are able to externally validate this index (see Table 3.17).

Table 3.17: Distribution of satisfaction, based on victims who feel their credibility was questioned

	Satisfaction					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Total**
Credibility questioned	8 12.9%	19 30.6%	20 35.3%	14 22.6%	1 1.6%	62
Not questioned	8 6.3%	15 11.9%	38 30.2%	54 42.9%	11 8.7%	126
Total	16	44	58	68	12	188

(Chi-square = 18.247, df = 4, p = .001)

As seen in Table 3.17, among the 62 victims who feel that their credibility was questioned, 75.8 % scored low, that is, between 1 and 3 on the satisfaction scale, which is consistent with other research stating that when a victim feels that they are not believed by criminal justice professionals, it may be deemed as secondary victimization. The two variables are significantly related to each other (p = .001), as we have anticipated, which lends more credibility to our scale.

4.3 Frequency

Calculation of the total satisfaction score yields results as shown in Table 3.18.

Table 3.18:
Distribution of Satisfaction with the criminal justice system, by category

	Frequency	**Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
1-Not at All	16	8.5	8.5
2-A Little	34	18.1	26.6
3-Neutral	58	30.9	57.4
4-Very Much	68	36.2	93.6
5-Extremely	12	6.4	100
Total	188	100	

In order to facilitate statistical analysis, a dichotomous categorization for this variable was created. Therefore, we consider those with a score of 4 or 5 to be satisfied, and

those with scores ranging from 1 through 3 to be not satisfied. This finds us with 80 subjects (42.6%) who are satisfied with the criminal justice system and 108 (57.4%) who are not satisfied.

5. Treatment

Although it was our intention to construct separate instrumental and emotional support indexes, the combination of items representing these forms of treatment had a weak inter-correlation given our data. The low rates of internal consistency for both the instrumental and emotional support scales render them unsatisfactory for the purposes of statistical analysis, as a scale comprised of such items would not prove to be reliable or valid. Instead, we shall consider each instrumental and emotional support item separately in relation to satisfaction with the criminal justice system and coping focus.

6. Coping, Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System, and Treatment

6.1 Problem-Focused Victims

In order to explore our third hypothesis, we will use chi-square analysis to test the null hypothesis that the proportion of problem-focused victims who are satisfied with the criminal justice system is the same regardless of having received certain treatment by criminal justice professionals that we classify as instrumental support. The results are shown in Tables 3.19 through 3.22, inclusively. To further explore the relevance that being problem-focused has on the relationship between a victim's satisfaction and particular instrumental support items, each table will be followed by results of the same variables using the non-problem-focused group (N = 78).

Table 3.19a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on explanation of criminal justice system, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Explanation of CJS	**No**	45 66.2%	23 33.8%	68 100%
	Yes	18 42.9%	24 57.1%	42 100%
Total		63	47	110

(Chi-square = 5.770, df = 1, p = .016, Phi = .229)

Table 3.19b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on explanation of criminal justice system, for non problem-focused individuals (N = 78)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Explanation of CJS	**No**	37 67.3%	18 32.7%	55 100%
	Yes	8 34.8%	15 65.2%	23 100%
Total		45	33	78

(Chi-square = 7.014, df = 1, p = .008, Phi = .300)

When calculating the relationship between victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not they received an explanation of how the court system works (see Table 3.19a), results of the Pearson chi-square indicate a p-value or significance level of .016 for victims who are problem-focused. At $p < .05$, this is statistically significant, and our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that problem-focused individuals who receive instrumental support from the criminal justice system are more satisfied.

The results from the non-problem-focused (see Table 3.19b) group are statistically significant as well, with a p-value or significance level of .008. The strongest relationship between this form of instrumental support and satisfaction with the

criminal justice system was found within the non problem-focused group, with 65.2% of victims who are more satisfied having received the information, compared to 57.1% occurring within the problem-focused group.

When studying the relationship between victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not they were kept informed about the progress of the police investigation (see Table 3.20a), results of the Pearson chi-square test show a p-value or significance level of .001 for victims who are problem-focused. At $p < .05$, this is statistically significant, and our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a detectable difference between the two variables for victims who are problem-focused.

Table 3.20a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information from police, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info from police	**No**	48 69.6%	21 30.4%	69 100%
	Yes	15 36.6%	26 63.4%	41 100%
Total		63	47	110

(Chi-square = 11.431, df = 1, p = .001, Phi = .322)

Table 3.20b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information from police, for non problem-focused individuals (N = 78)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info from police	**No**	29 70.7%	12 29.3%	41 100%
	Yes	16 43.2%	21 56.8%	37 100%
Total		45	33	78

(Chi-square = 6.021, df = 1, p = .014, Phi = .278)

Results using the non-problem-focused (see Table 3.20b) group are also statistically significant, with p-values or significance levels of .014. The strongest relationship between this form of instrumental support and satisfaction with the criminal justice system was found within the problem-focused group, with 63.4% of victims who are more satisfied having received information from police, compared to 56.8% occurring within the non problem-focused group.

Table 3.21a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information on victim services, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info on victim services	**No**	36 73.5%	13 26.5%	49 100%
	Yes	27 44.3%	34 55.7%	61 100%
Total		63	47	110

(Chi-square = 9.472, df = 1, p = .002, Phi = .293)

Table 3.21b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information on victim services, for non problem-focused individuals (N = 78)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info on victim services	**No**	29 65.9%	15 34.1%	44 100%
	Yes	16 47.1%	18 52.9%	34 100%
Total		45	33	78

(Chi-square = 2.792, df = 1, p = .095, Phi = .189)

The calculation of the relationship between victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not they received information on victim services (see Table 3.21a), results of the Pearson chi-square test indicates a p-value or significance level of .002 for victims who are problem-focused. At $p < .05$, this is statistically

significant, and our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a detectable difference between the two variables for victims who are problem-focused.

As for the non-problem-focused (see Table 3.21b) group, results show that the relationship is not statistically significant, having a p-value or significance level of .095. This indicates that receiving information on services for victims is more important to problem-focused victims than to those who do not have this focus of coping when seeking social support.

Table 3.22a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information on court proceedings, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info on court proceedings	**No**	52 69.3%	23 30.7%	75 100%
	Yes	11 31.4%	24 68.6%	35 100%
Total		63	47	110

(Chi-square = 14.011, df = 1, p = .000, Phi = .357)

Table 3.22b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information on court proceedings, for non problem-focused individuals (N = 78)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info on court proceedings	**No**	43 67.2%	21 32.8%	64 100%
	Yes	2 14.3%	12 85.7%	14 100%
Total		45	33	78

(Chi-square = 13.171, df = 1, p = .000, Phi = .411)

When calculating the relationship between victims' satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not they received information on upcoming court proceedings (see Table 3.22a), results of the Pearson chi-square test show a p-value or significance level of .000 for victims who are problem-focused. At $p < .05$, this is statistically significant, and our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a detectable difference between the two variables for victims who are problem-focused.

Results obtained using the non-problem-focused (see Table 3.22b) group, are also statistically significant, with a p-value or significance level of .000. The strongest relationship between this form of instrumental support and satisfaction with the criminal justice system was found within the non-problem-focused group, with 85.7% of victims who are more satisfied having received the information, compared to 68.6% occurring within the problem-focused group.

6.2 Emotion-Focused Victims

In order to explore hypothesis 4, we will use chi-square analysis to test the null hypothesis that the proportion of emotion-focused victims who are satisfied with the criminal justice system is the same regardless of certain treatment by criminal justice professionals that we classify as emotional support. Tables 3.23 through 3.26 illustrate our findings. Once again, with the aim of further understanding the influence that being emotion-focused has on the relationship between satisfaction and particular emotional support items, each table will be followed by results of the same variables using the non-emotion-focused group ($N = 62$).

When calculating the relationship between victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not they felt they were treated with respect by police (see Table 3.23a), results of the Pearson chi-square test show a p-value or significance level of .002 for victims who are emotion-focused. At $p < .05$, this is statistically significant, and our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference between the two variables for victims who are emotion-focused.

Results using the non-emotion-focused (see Table 3.23b) group are also statistically significant, with a p-value or significance level of .048. The strongest relationship between this form of emotional support and satisfaction with the criminal justice system was found within the problem-focused group, with 89.5% of victims who are not satisfied and have not received this support from police, compared to 83.3% occurring within the non emotion-focused group.

Table 3.23a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on respect by police, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Respect by police	**No**	17 89.5%	2 10.5%	19 100%
	Yes	53 50.5%	52 49.5%	105 100%
Total		70	54	124

* The missing value (1) is due to the respondent not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 9.953, df = 1, p = .002, Phi = .283)

Table 3.23b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on respect by police, for non emotion-focused individuals (N = 63)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Respect by police	**No**	10 83.3%	2 16.7%	12 100%
	Yes	26 52.0%	24 48.0%	50 100%
Total		36	26	62

* The missing value (1) is due to the respondent not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 3.902, df = 1, p = .048, Phi = .251)

Table 3.24a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on chance to express views, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Chance to express views	**No**	17	2	19
		89.5%	10.5%	100%
	Yes	53	52	105
		50.5%	49.5%	100%
Total		70	54	124

The missing value (1) is due to the respondent not having contact with polic
(Chi-square = 9.953, df = 1, p = .002, Phi = .283)

Table 3.24b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on chance to express views, for non emotion-focused individuals (N = 63)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Chance to express views	**No**	10	4	14
		83.3%	16.7%	100%
	Yes	26	22	48
		52.0%	48.0%	100%
Total		36	26	62

* The missing value (1) is due to the respondent not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 1.326, df = 1, p = .249, Phi = .146)

The calculation of the relationship between victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not they were given chance by police to express their views on what happened (see Table 3.24a), results of the Pearson chi-square test indicate a p-value or significance level of .002 for victims who are emotion -focused. At $p < .05$, this is statistically significant, and our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference between the two variables for victims who are emotion-focused.

When calculating this relationship using the non-emotion-focused (see Table 3.24b) group, results are not statistically significant, with a p-value or significance level

of .249. It would seem that being given the chance to express views to the police is more important to emotion-focused than non-emotion-focused victims.

The calculation of the relationship between victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not the police demonstrated an interest in catching the offender (see Table 3.25a), the Pearson chi-square a p-value or significance level of .000 for victims who are emotion-focused. At $p < .05$, this is statistically significant, and our decision is to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a detectable difference between the two variables for victims who are emotion-focused.

When calculating this relationship using the non-emotion-focused (see Table 3.25b) group, results are not statistically significant, with a p-value or significance level of .169. This indicates that this form of emotional support is more important to emotion-focused victims than to those who are non-emotion-focused.

Table 3.25a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on interest by police, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Interest by police	**No**	27 90%	3 10%	30 100%
	Yes	43 45.7%	51 54.3%	94 100%
Total		70	54	124

The missing value (1) is due to the respondent not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 18.118, df = 1, p = .000, Phi = .382)

Table 3.25b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on interest by police, for non emotion-focused individuals (N = 63)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Interest by police	**No**	11 73.3%	4 26.7%	15 100%
	Yes	25 53.2%	22 46.8%	47 100%
Total		36	26	62

* The missing value (1) is due to the respondent not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 1.895, df = 1, p = .169, Phi = .175)

Table 3.26a: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on opportunity for Victim Impact Statement, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Opportunity for VIS	**No**	13 61.9%	8 38.1%	21 100%
	Yes	58 55.8%	46 44.2%	104 100%
Total		71	54	125

(Chi-square = .268, df = 1, p = .605, Phi = .046)

Table 3.26b: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on opportunity for Victim Impact Statement, for non emotion-focused individuals (N = 63)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Opportunity for VIS	**No**	8 57.1%	6 42.9%	14 100%
	Yes	29 59.2%	20 40.8%	49 100%
Total		37	26	63

(Chi-square = .019, df = 1, p = .891, Phi = -.017)

When calculating the relationship between victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and whether or not they felt they were given an opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement (see Table 3.26a), results of the Pearson chi-square test show a p-value or significance level of .605 for victims who are emotion-focused. At $p < .05$, this is not statistically significant, and our decision is not reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference between the two variables for victims who are emotion-focused. Although we anticipated that satisfaction with the CJS would vary among emotion-focused individuals based on having been given an opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement, our tests did not find this.

The same can be said for the results using the non-emotion-focused (see Table 3.26b) group, with a p-value or significance level of .891. The relationship between this form of emotional support and satisfaction with the criminal justice system remains unclear in terms of the victim's coping focus when seeking social support.

7. Summary

The objective of our first hypothesis was to test the relationship between being a victim of sexual assault or domestic violence and having an emotion-focused coping response, which was not found to be statistically significant. Although a large portion (74.2%) of victims of these types of crimes are emotion-focused when seeking social support, the same holds true for 62.7% of victims of other crime types. In order to explore this finding, in Chapter 4 we shall consider different variables such as gender, posttraumatic stress disorder, level of injuries and perceived threat, which may account for or serve to better explain this occurrence.

Our second hypothesis was designed to see if victims with personal or support resources also have diverse, or both emotion- and problem-focused coping responses. Among the four groups in our classification of general coping focus, the "both" group either has, or is comparable to, the highest proportion of respondents who have such resources. This being said, the relationship between general coping focus and having personal or support resources was only found to be significant with regard to support

from friends and/or family, and support from a therapist. This shall be discussed in Chapter 4 in terms of indications from past research.

The aim of our third and fourth hypotheses was to determine the statistical significance of the relationship between satisfaction with the criminal justice system and certain forms of instrumental and emotional support, in terms of being problem- or emotion-focused. The results show that the relationship between being informed of services for victims and satisfaction is not statistically significant for non problem-focused individuals. The same is true of the relationship between satisfaction and the police seeming interested in catching the offender or giving victims a chance to express their views for non emotion-focused individuals. All other relationships were found to be statistically significant for all groups, except being given the opportunity to complete a Victim Impact Statement, which was not statistically significant for any. These findings shall be discussed in Chapter 4 with regard to their meaning within the context of the criminal justice system. Differences within the problem- and emotion-focused groups shall be highlighted, and recommendations based on our research for promoting victim satisfaction will be presented.

Chapter 4: Analysis and Interpretation

1. Trauma and Coping

1.1 The link between severe and/or prolonged abuse and emotion-focused coping

There is a tendency for those who perceive their situation as threatening but feel as though they have little control over it to be emotion-focused in their coping style (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Lazarus, 1994). For this reason, we have proposed our first hypothesis which supposes that there is a relationship between being a victim of severe and/or prolonged abuse and a tendency to have developed emotion-focused coping responses. The results of our study show that, for our sample, this relationship is not statistically significant. Victims of sexual assault or domestic violence are not more likely to be emotion-focused than other victims.

Out of 62 respondents victims of sexual assault or domestic violence, 16 (25.4%) are not emotion-focused. On the other hand, out of the remaining 126 respondents, 79 (62.7%) are emotion-focused despite not being victimized in this way.

According to our theoretical framework, it is possible that a victim of sexual assault or domestic violence may see the situation as a challenge and having potential for growth rather than simply as a threat, or that the situation seems more controllable, which would call for a problem-focused approach to coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Bard & Sangrey (1986) relay that following victimization, a person may be in a phase of recoil, experiencing a whirlwind of emotions that can last form 3 to 8 months. One then moves on to a phase of re-organization, gaining the ability to make some sense of the event as soon as 6 months after victimization, regardless of crime type. With this in mind, let us further examine our sample.

We assessed a respondent's inclusion in the category of sexual assault or domestic violence based on their present victimization, as well as well as having a history of such victimization. A more in-depth look at the16 respondents who were not emotion-focused yet were victims of severe and/or prolonged abuse, reveals that 14 are present victims of such an offense, and 2 are victims of assault or threats from a friend and who have a history of sexual assault or domestic violence victimization.

This suggests to us that the definition we have created for this category of victims is not responsible for the discrepancy between what was expected as a coping reaction and what was found; that it is not simply those who have had such a victimization in the past but are not faced with it in their present case in the criminal justice system that are not as focused on emotions.

Further analysis of the 16 cases indicates that there are only 5 cases where the criminal event took place more than 6 months before, with the rest qualifying in terms of time for the phase of recoil. Also, 13 out these 16 cases involve an offender with whom the victim has a relationship, there were 11 victims who were afraid of being seriously injured or killed at the time of the crime, 14 respondents showing signs of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms and 14 are female. These variables, all said to have an influence on the development of emotion-focused coping responses (Van der Kolk, 2003; Bard & Sangrey, 1986; Sales et al, 1984), do not seem to be of major influence for our sample.

Instead, we find that the greatest component shared by this group of 16 which may explain why a victim is not emotion-focused, is that of prior sexual assault or domestic violence victimization, true for 12 of the 16 cases. The remaining 4 cases involve victims of sexual assault by non-partners, with 3 victims who did not know their assailant at all and one who was abused by someone in a position of authority. It is consistent with the literature that those who have a history of being a victim of domestic violence may at one point begin to see the violent act for what it is and can then feel justified in reporting the crime, a first step in taking control of the situation (Damant et al., 2000). What's more, victims of sexual assault by non-partners do not fear being blamed for their victimization as much as those assaulted by someone known (Cluss et al., 1983).

Let us see if these respondents, along with the strength to report the crime, have put aside their emotional considerations and are in need to view their survival of sexual assault or domestic violence as a challenge, perceiving the situation as more within their control. It seems that 8 of these 16 respondents are only problem-focused, while 7 scored on neither coping scale but show signs of posttraumatic stress disorder

symptoms and so may be in a phase of avoiding the trauma, or, as the remaining respondent, had a need to use other methods to cope besides seeking social support.

As for the 79 respondents who are not sexual assault or domestic violence victims but are emotion-focused, there does not seem to be one predominant factor to explain the person's use of this particular coping style. Only 35.4% have symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, slightly more than half (53.2%) knew their offender, 65.8% had no injuries at all to report, and the time since the incident varied greatly. There are 47 of the 79 respondents (59.5%) who feared death or injury during the commission of the crime and as many who are female. The only types of crime found in our sample that are not found among this group are 2 cases of mischief by non-partners, comprising 1.1% of our sample, and extortion and plotting, representing 0.5% each.

Not all victims of sexual assault or domestic violence exhibit emotion-focused coping responses when seeking social support. It is possible for a victim of such a crime, especially one who has filed charges against the perpetrator, to perceive the situation as a challenge rather than threatening, or perhaps, as coping is not a fixed attribute, many of these victims have regained a sense of control over the event. Prior experience with this type of victimization may lend to the conviction that such a situation is more controllable, that recovery is possible. What's more, certain aspects of the crime, as in when sexual assault is carried out by a stranger, may reduce the victim's propensity towards self-blame and therefore promote the healing process.

1.2 The link between resources and coping focus

Our second hypothesis proposes that personal and support variables do make a difference in a person's coping response, that those in possession of such resources will adopt a more flexible general coping response that is both emotion- and problem-focused. Our results show no relationship between higher education or socio-economic status and chosen coping response to recover from traumatic stress.

This is inconsistent with the literature. In relation to coping, these variables are said to have an influence on the use of both emotion- and problem-focused coping

(Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Higher education and socio-economic status are linked to having less traumatic symptoms (Lurigio & Davis, 1989) especially at 3 months post-crime (Friedman et al., 1982), suggesting more successful coping.

The relationship between having support from friends and family and general coping response was found to be statistically significant. Those in the general coping focus category of emotion-focused or both are more likely to have this type of informal support. This is consistent with the literature on coping and trauma recovery that states that emotion-focused coping is linked to the venting of emotions, (Carver et al., 1989) and that support that a victim receives from a person who is close to them may facilitate their recovery from the trauma (Friedman et al., 1982; Sales et al., 1984) and their moving on to incorporate a problem-focused approach when coping.

The relationship between having support from a therapist and general coping response was also found to be statistically significant, with the greatest difference between expected and observed counts appearing in the categories of "emotion-focused" and "both". Emotion-focused victims are less likely to seek or have this form of formal support than the other groups, while those in the both group are more likely. The fact that respondents with the help from a therapist are also more likely to have both coping focuses is consistent with what Carver et al. (1989) purport on coping that indicates that seeking social support for instrumental reasons is linked to seeking social support for emotional reasons as well as a focus on positive reinterpretation and growth.

The results of our test show that while education and socio-economic status are not significantly related to coping, it may be because the informal support that friends and family provide is a more important resource that is not limited by education or income.

There are 49.9% of respondents from the "both" group who are posttraumatic stress disorder positive, out of which 40.9% sought out help from a therapist. This rate is much higher than that found within the problem-focused group, with 55% of posttraumatic stress disorder positive respondents and 27% of them seeking therapy, and the emotion-focused group, with 45.7% of posttraumatic stress disorder positive

respondents, none of whom sought therapy. Of those in the "neither" category, only 32.6% of respondents are posttraumatic stress disorder positive, but of them, 50% sought therapy. Although the proportion of posttraumatic stress disorder positive respondents who sought help from a therapist is higher for the "neither" group than for the "both" group, this can be explained by the fact that only 3 of 14 victims (21.4%) in the neither group with posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms acknowledge that they received informal support from friends and family, which makes formal support all the more important. There is a higher proportion of respondents who are posttraumatic stress disorder negative and sought therapy among the "both" group (23.9%), as compared to the "neither" (6.9%), emotion-focused (5.3%), and problem-focused (0%) groups. This may be indicative of progress in the healing process of a victim with both coping responses based on formal therapeutic intervention.

2. Coping and Satisfaction

2.1 Problem-focused victims: the link between their satisfaction with the criminal justice system and treatment by its professionals

Individuals who are problem-focused in their coping are said to have perceived their stressful situation as a challenge, and more within their control; they require tools such as information with which to tackle their problem at its source Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). They are also less likely than those who are emotion-focused to exhibit symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (Van der Kolk, 2003). Our data do not conform to this, as there is a higher proportion of posttraumatic stress disorder positive victims among the problem-focused group (55%), as compared to the emotion-focused group (45.7%). It could be that the problem-focused victims in our sample are not receiving the instrumental support they need.

In our third hypothesis, we examine the relationship between the obtainment of satisfactory services from criminal justice professionals that we have deemed as being instrumental in nature, and satisfaction with the criminal justice system for victims who are problem-focused when seeking social support.

The relationship between satisfaction and all four items representing instrumental support was found to be statistically significant. When running the same calculations for non-problem-focused individuals, each item was also found to be statistically significant except for receiving information on victim services, which was not. problem-focused victims are more likely to be less satisfied when not receiving information on victim services than non-problem-focused victims. It would seem that this service is perceived as being particularly important to problem-focused victims, for having this information may contribute to, or promote their problem-solving ability, as well as their sense of control.

2.2 Emotion-focused victims: the link between their satisfaction with the criminal justice system and treatment by its professionals

It is said that people develop emotion-focused responses when coping because they perceive their stressful situation as threatening, of little controlability (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Victims of crime with this focus need to feel validated in their interpersonal contact and supported in order to deal with the emotional distress that ensued from the problem (Wemmers, 1996). They tend to exhibit symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder more than those who are problem-focused, which is not the case for our sample. It could be that the emotion-focused victims in our sample are receiving the emotional support they need more from informal sources such as friends and family than from the criminal justice system.

Our fourth hypothesis serves to study the relationship between satisfaction with the criminal justice system and receiving certain treatment from criminal justice professionals, with an emphasis on the police, which we have deemed as emotional support, for victims who are emotion-focused when seeking social support.

Our results conclude that the relationship between satisfaction and each item is statistically significant, except for having been given the opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement, which was not. When performing the same calculations with the non-emotion-focused group, we see that the results are only statistically significant with regard to being treated with respect by the police, an element that seems important for everyone. What is unique to the emotion-focused group is the

interest shown by the police in catching the offender, and the ability of victims to express their views. All in all, the emotion-focused group has a stronger tendency to be less satisfied if they do not receive the support than the non-emotion-focused group, which suggests that being emotion-focused when seeking social support is markedly different than not being emotion-focused.

2.3 Required support for all victims

Being informed by the police of the progress of the investigation, receiving an explanation of what to expect and how the court system works, and being informed about upcoming court proceedings are important to all victims, whether they are problem-focused or not. These forms of instrumental support matter to victims because they need to know how the case is being handled and what is to be expected of them; not having this information may be regarded by the victim as a loss of control over the situation that required the criminal justice system's intervention.

Being treated with courtesy and respect by the police is also important for all victims, whether emotion-focused or not. This goes to show that victims need the police to exhibit this common courtesy, that victims may regard such consideration as a professional manner.

2.4 Emotion-focused versus problem-focused

With the idea of further evaluating how being problem-focused pertains to satisfaction with the criminal justice system and receiving specific instrumental treatment, let us determine the significance of the relationship between these two variables using the emotion-focused group (see Tables 4.1 through 4.4, inclusively).

Table 4.1: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on explanation of criminal justice system, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Explanation of CJS	**No**	56	31	87
		64.4%	35.6%	100%
	Yes	15	23	38
		39.5%	60.5%	100%
Total		71	54	125

(Chi-square = 6.680, df = 1, p = .010, Phi = .231)

Table 4.2: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information from police, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info from police	**No**	52	24	76
		68.4%	31.6%	100%
	Yes	19	30	49
		38.8%	61.2%	100%
Total		71	54	125

(Chi-square = 10.671, df = 1, p = .001, Phi = .292)

Table 4.3: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information on victim services, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info on victim services	**No**	43	19	62
		69.4%	30.6%	100%
	Yes	28	35	63
		44.4%	55.6%	100%
Total		71	54	125

(Chi-square = 7.902, df = 1, p = .005, Phi = .251)

Table 4.4: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on information on court proceedings, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Info on court proceedings	**No**	61 66.3%	31 33.7%	92 100%
	Yes	10 30.3%	23 69.7%	33 100%
Total		71	54	125

(Chi-square = 12.829, df = 1, p = .000, Phi = .320)

With p values of .010, .001, .005, and .000, the relationship between satisfaction with the criminal justice system and each instrumental support item is statistically significant for emotion-focused victims as well.

Because our satisfaction scale includes a victim's evaluation of the police, and the items contained in the emotional support category pertain mostly to the treatment they received by the police, the relationship between these two variables seems important to examine with regard to the problem-focused group (see Tables 4.5 through 4.8, inclusively).

Table 4.5: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on respect by police, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Respect by police	**No**	21 95.5%	1 4.5%	22 100%
	Yes	40 46.5%	46 53.5%	86 100%
Total		61	47	108

* The missing values (2) are due to the respondents not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 17.072, df = 1, p = .000, Phi = .398)

Table 4.6: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on chance to express views, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Chance to express views	**No**	17	4	21
		81.0%	19.0%	100%
	Yes	44	43	87
		50.6%	49.4%	100%
Total		61	47	108

* The missing values (2) are due to the respondents not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 6.351, df = 1, p = .012, Phi = .242)

Table 4.7: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on interest by police, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Interest by police	**No**	26	3	29
		89.7%	10.3%	100%
	Yes	35	44	79
		44.3%	55.7%	100%
Total		61	47	108

* The missing values (2) are due to the respondents not having contact with police
(Chi-square = 17.750, df = 1, p = .000, Phi = .405)

Table 4.8: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on opportunity for Victim Impact Statement, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Opportunity for VIS	**No**	12	5	17
		70.6%	29.4%	100%
	Yes	51	42	93
		54.8%	45.2%	100%
Total		63	47	110

(Chi-square = 1.457, df = 1, p = .227, Phi = .115)

The results show that, just like the emotion-focused group, the relationship between satisfaction with the criminal justice system and each emotional support item is statistically significant for the problem-focused group, except for being given the opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement, which is not.

Since many of the respondents from our sample (47.9%) have both focuses of coping, it is hardly surprising that the proportions of problem-focused and emotion-focused victims who are satisfied or not whether or not they received the support are very similar. As there are 35 respondents from our sample (18.6%) who are only emotion-focused, and 20 (10.6%) who are only problem-focused, any major difference distinguishing these two groups may be difficult to determine.

2.4.1 Distinctive features of problem-focused and emotion-focused coping

The only marked difference between emotion-focused and problem-focused groups was the strength of the relationship between satisfaction and being treated with respect by police; with a Phi value of .398 for the problem-focused group over a value of .283 for the emotion-focused group, there is a higher potential for prediction of outcomes between these variables among victims who are problem-focused.

It would seem that being shown respect by the police is more important to problem-focused victims than emotion-focused victims in terms of satisfaction with the criminal justice system. This conforms to the literature on coping and victims in the criminal justice system that states that being problem-focused results from feeling more in control over the situation, and that emotion-focused victims may feel less empowered, more aware of their emotional state, and therefore place more emphasis on being able to express their views to the police than if they are treated with respect.

3. Discussion

3.1 Victim Impact Statement

The only item not significantly related to satisfaction for either group is being given the opportunity to make a Victim Impact Statement. Because filling out a Victim Impact Statement is reputed to be beneficial for victims as it allows them to express themselves in terms of the felt consequences of the crime, the relationship between completing a Victim Impact Statement and satisfaction with the criminal justice system was examined for both problem-focused and emotion-focused groups, yielding results that are not significant (see Tables 4.9 and 4.10).

This suggests that, contrary to the literature on victims and the criminal justice system, this is not an important element that can change a victim's perception of satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Perhaps the aim of the Victim Impact Statement is not being met, and victims do not feel that it gives them the chance to express themselves. Let us examine the relationship between satisfaction and whether or not the Victim Impact Statement allowed problem-focused and emotion-focused victims to say what is important to them (see Tables 4.11 and 4.12).

The relationship between these variables was found to be statistically significant for problem-focused victims as well as for emotion-focused victims, with p-values of .048, and .007, respectively. For both groups, those who felt they were not able to express themselves are more likely to be less satisfied with the criminal justice system. This is especially true of emotion-focused individuals, for the strength of the relationship between satisfaction and the ability to express oneself through the Victim Impact Statement is slightly higher for this group, with a Phi value of .379, than for the problem-focused group, having a Phi value of .313.

It is important to victims, particularly to those who are emotion-focused, that they have the chance to share the consequences of their victimization with the court; it is imperative to this end that victims be encouraged to add anything to their statement that they may find relevant, especially since, for many respondents, this is the only

opportunity they have to communicate to the crown prosecutor how the crime has affected their lives.

Table 4.9: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on completion of Victim Impact Statement, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Completed VIS	**No**	16 51.6%	15 48.4%	31 100%
	Yes	35 56.5%	27 43.5%	62 100%
Total		35	46	93

The missing values (17) are due to the respondents who were not given the opportunity to make VIS
(Chi-square = .195, df = 1, p = .658, Phi = .046)

Table 4.10: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on completion of Victim Impact Statement, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Completed VIS	**No**	17 50%	17 50%	34 100%
	Yes	41 58.6%	29 41.4%	70 100%
Total		58	46	104

The missing values (21) are due to the respondents who were not given the opportunity to make VIS
(Chi-square = .682, df = 1, p = .409, Phi = .081)

Table 4.11: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on whether Victim Impact Statement allowed victims to express themselves, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
VIS allowed expression	**Yes**	16 44.4%	20 55.6%	36 100%
	No	17 77.3%	5 22.7%	22 100%
	Don't know	2 50%	2 50%	4 100%
Total		35	27	62

The missing values (48) are due to the respondents who were not given the opportunity to make VIS, or chose not to complete one
(Chi-square = 6.059, df = 2, p = .048, Phi = .313)

Table 4.12: Distribution of victims' satisfaction, based on whether Victim Impact Statement allowed victims to express themselves, for emotion-focused individuals (N = 125)

		Satisfaction with CJS		
		No	**Yes**	Total
VIS allowed expression	**Yes**	15 41.7%	21 58.3%	36 100%
	No	24 80%	6 20%	30 100%
	Don't know	2 50%	2 50%	4 100%
Total		41	29	70

The missing values (55) are due to the respondents who were not given the opportunity to make VIS, or chose not to complete one
(Chi-square = 10.038, df = 2, p = .007, Phi = .379)

3.2 Posttraumatic stress disorder and problem-focused individuals

As mentioned earlier, there is a slightly larger proportion of problem-focused victims who are posttraumatic stress disorder positive than emotion-focused victims, which is perhaps due to them not receiving the information that they judge as being important. Our questionnaire included an open question about what, if anything was the least satisfying about the way the case was handled. Let us examine the relationship between the mention of a lack of information and being posttraumatic stress disorder positive for problem-focused victims (see Table 4.13).

This relationship is not significant, as half of those who mention a lack of information are posttraumatic stress disorder positive, the same proportion as those who do not mention the lack. Even though we do not have a large enough sample of victims who are only problem-focused to employ chi-square analysis, we can see from Table 4.14 that of the 20 respondents who are, most who mention not receiving information are also posttraumatic stress disorder positive (87.5%). This may be an indication that problem-focused individuals continue to display signs of posttraumatic stress disorder because they are not given the opportunity to share important and relevant information with criminal justice system professionals, which may be perceived as a lack of control over the situation.

Table 4.13: Distribution of victims' posttraumatic stress disorder, based on lack of information, for problem-focused individuals (N = 110)

		Symptoms of PTSD		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Mentioned lack of information	**No**	29 50%	29 50%	58 100%
	Yes	26 50%	26 50%	52 100%
Total		55	55	110

(Chi-square = .000, df = 1, p = 1.000)

Table 4.14: Distribution of victims' posttraumatic stress disorder, based on lack of information, for individuals who are only problem-focused (N = 20)

		Symptoms of PTSD		
		No	**Yes**	Total
Mentioned lack of information	**No**	8 66.7%	4 33.3%	12 100%
	Yes	1 12.5%	7 87.5%	8 100%
Total		9	11	20

3.3 On promoting satisfaction

When we look at the observed frequencies, we can see that the proportion of problem-focused individuals who are satisfied with the criminal justice system and have received instrumental support is always lower than for those who are not satisfied and have not received the support. This is especially true for receiving information on victim services (see Table 3.21), where the proportion of those who are satisfied with the criminal justice system and have received this support is 55.7%, as opposed to 73.5% of problem-focused victims who are not satisfied and have not received the support.

The results of observed frequencies with regard to each emotional support item indicates that the proportion of emotion-focused victims who are not satisfied and have not received the emotional support (89.5% or 90%) greatly outweighs those who are satisfied and have received the support (49.5% or 54.3%). The indication of a strong association between the absence of emotional support and being less satisfied with the criminal justice system conforms to the literature review on coping that states that emotion-focused individuals need this type of support. It also supports the idea that victims may regard the absence of support as mistreatment by criminal justice professionals, and experience it as secondary victimization, which, in turn, affects their level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system.

What is interesting to note is that satisfaction with the criminal justice system is hardly affected by whether or not the victim received emotional support. Some variables examined in order to try to explain similar results of satisfaction despite having obtained certain support or not are gender, sexual assault or domestic violence crime type, and language. The only variable more pronounced among those not satisfied is that of being a current victim of sexual assault or domestic violence (approx. 25% of those not satisfied, approx. 6% of those satisfied), which may contribute to our understanding of coping reactions to this type of victimization as discussed in our first hypothesis, and indicate that emotional support is especially important for those having suffered from this type of victimization but who have no experience of it in their past.

Victims who are problem-focused are less satisfied even having received an explanation of the criminal justice system or information about upcoming court proceedings than non-problem-focused victims, and are more satisfied having been kept informed by the police about the case. When examining certain variables such as the victim's language, gender, type of victimization and education and socio-economic status, only the proportions of those with higher levels of education and socio-economic status were found to be more prominent among those less satisfied even having received the support. Perhaps problem-focused victims with higher levels of education or socio-economic status are more critical of the information they receive and of the police and what is to be expected of them.

4. Study limitations

Although it was necessary to create dichotomous variables in many instances, and to omit certain items from our scales, they are internally reliable and were all successfully externally validated. The sample is especially representative of those who are more severely affected by their victimization. Our sample size is ample for chi-square analysis, and its diversity reflects a variety of different experiences and points of view, which may be generalizable to the population at large.

As for all quantitative analyses using self-report, psychometric measures, there is unanimity in the scientific community regarding biases that may occur therein, including: intentional omission, forgetfulness, and others linked to social desirability such as down-playing certain details of events or psychological state (Jo et al., 1997). This may have an impact on our use of the posttraumatic stress disorder and coping scales, which may have compromised the veracity of our findings. As to the assessment of mental health and states, the fact that these change over time, and perhaps rapidly, suggests that one cannot determine or limit an individual to be of one simplified label.

One important limitation to the study is that we are unable to test for or determine causality between the variables because they are based on one interview. The goal of the present study is to capture a glimpse into a victim's relationship with the criminal justice system at the beginning of their process, given their level of trauma, situational coping focus, and satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its professionals.

Even though we have questioned the ability of our problem-focused and emotion-focused scales to capture focus of coping when seeking social support within the criminal justice system, there were some differences in the significance of results between problem-focused or emotion-focused, and non-problem-focused or emotion-focused groups. Of all the instrumental support items, only having information on victim services was found to be significant for the problem-focused group and not for non-problem-focused victims, while of all the emotional support items, the results of whether or not victims got the chance to express their views and the police's interest in catching the offender were significant for emotion-focused victims and not for the non-emotion-focused group. The presence of differences lends more credibility to our study and the application of the scales to the criminal justice system.

5. Contribution, conclusion

Our analysis tells us that having an emotional component when seeking social support in order to cope is not dependent on gender, the perception of threat, level of education and socio-economic status, or being a victim of severe and/or prolonged abuse. Those with a history of sexual assault or domestic violence victimization can very well be in a problem-focused phase, while victims of other crimes may focus on the emotional aspects of coping when seeking social support. Our findings also reveal that informal support is very important to victims' trauma recovery, and that the absence of support from friends and family may lead victims to require formal services from a therapist.

The findings of our study indicate that some elements are especially important to all victims of crime and should therefore be emphasized when working with or providing services for this particular clientele. Receiving an explanation of how the criminal justice system works, being informed about the progress of the investigation and court proceedings, and the respect shown to the victim by officers are elements that are important to all victims, regardless of coping focus. It is therefore imperative that these services are readily given in order to promote victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Although receiving information on victim services, the chance to express one's view to the police, and the interest the officers show are all important to victims who are problem- or emotion-focused, the distinction between these two groups is not glaringly obvious. It is therefore not necessary to be able to ascertain victims' coping focus in order to provide them with personally relevant treatment. What victims require is having choice, to be given options, to be supported in their decisions, and to be aware of the necessary steps to take in order to be heard when these services are not provided.

Alternative methods for working with victims include placing emphasis on their empowerment to promote healing and demonstrate or foster cooperation between them and the criminal justice system. This means providing victims with a range of information that will allow them to make their own choices and to support the victim's decisions, all in a manner that relays a respect for the individual's pace, and

a belief that the victim knows best what he/she needs (Damant, 2000). It is with this spirit that the criminal justice system should approach the Victim Impact Statement to give the control of its content to the victim, and evaluate the efficiency of existing services for victims such as the CAVAC, with whom victims from our sample did not have much contact.

As was demonstrated in our study, those with informal support systems tend to have both coping focuses and are less prone to have neither, so if this resource is not available to the victim, it becomes imperative for the system to be able to provide the victim with counseling services for trauma recovery. As pointed out by Maguire (1985):

> "One of the necessary prerequisites for a fully effective victims assistance program is the existence of an outreach element, whereby victims are individually offered information about the kinds of services available and help in understanding the possible relevance of such services to their own situation" (p. 555).

In giving access to resources and assisting victims in providing and carrying out their own strategies, the victim becomes a focal point of attention in society as a person with real needs and a right to have them be regarded as important, rather than simply being the State's witness.

One of the most interesting findings of our study is that while not receiving instrumental or emotional support from criminal justice system professionals seems greatly related to non-satisfaction with the criminal justice system, receiving the support does not seem to have much effect on a victim's satisfaction. It seems that for our sample of victims, most of whom are in the first stages of prosecution, the lack of notification, information and appropriate manner of the police is strongly related to non-satisfaction, which could have an impact on their future level of participation in the criminal justice system, but of all the items regarding instrumental and emotional support, there is none that stands out and seems to promote satisfaction. Perhaps that an assessment of satisfaction with the criminal justice system is more difficult to make at the beginning of the criminal process, that a victim's level of satisfaction changes, its magnitude influenced by the progress or outcome of the process.

It would seem that longitudinal data with victims of all types of crimes is necessary in order to examine causality between treatment variables and satisfaction with the criminal justice system, to lead to pinpointing elements that may have a positive impact on the victim's interaction with the criminal justice system, and enhance the victim's evaluation of satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its professionals.

Bibliography

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders,* (4th ed., revised). Washington, DC: Author.

Atkeson, B., Calhoun, K., Resick, P. & Ellis, E. (1982). Victims of rape: Repeated assessment of depressive symptoms . *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 50, 96-102.

Bard, M., & Sangrey, D. (1986). *The crime victim's book.* (2nd ed.) Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press.

Bohmer, C., Brandt, J., Bronson, D. & Hartnett, H. (2002). Domestic violence law reforms: Reactions from the trenches. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 71, 17, 96-102.

Brickman E. (2002). Development of a national study of victim needs and assistance. Final report submitted to the National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Burgess, A. & Holmstrom, L. (1978). Recovery from rape and prior life stress. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 1, 165-174.

Burnam, M., Stein, J., Golding J., Siegel, J., Sorenson, S., Forsythe, A., & Telles, C. (1988). Sexual assault and mental disorders in community populations . *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56, 843-850.

Byrne, C., Kilpatrick, D., Howley, S. & Beatty, D. (1999). Female victims of partner versus nonpartner violence: Experiences with the criminal justice system. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 3, 275-292.

Cadell, S., Karabanow, J. & Sanchez, M. (2001) Community, empowerment, and resilience: Paths to wellness. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, 20, 1, 21-35.

Carver, C., Scheier, M. & Weintraub, J. (1987). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 2, 267-283.

Cook, S. & Hepner, P. (1997). A psychometric study of three coping measures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 6, 906-923.

Cluss, P., Boughton, J., Frank, E., Duffy-Stewart, B. & West, D. (1983). The rape victim: Psychological correlates of participation in the legal process. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 10, 3, 342-357.

Damant, D., Paquet, J., & Belanger, J. (2000). Analyse du processus d'empowerment dans des trajectoires de femmes victimes de violence conjugale à travers le système judiciaire. *Criminologie*, 33, 1, 73-95.

Dobash, R. & Dobash, R. (1992). *Women, violence, and social change.* London: Routledge.

Doerner, W & Lab, S. (1995). *Victimology.* Cincinnati, OH.: Anderson Publishing.

Engel, F. (1990). Victimes d'actes criminels: une intervention professionnelle. *Criminologie,* 23, 2, 5-22.

Erez, E. (1994). Victim participation in sentencing: And the debate goes on. *International Review of Victimology,* 3, 17-32.

Falsetti, S., Resnick, H., & Kilpatrick, D. (1991). *The modified PTSD symptom scale: Self-report.* St-Louis, MO: University of Missouri, Charleston, SC: Crime Victims Treatment and Research Center, Medical University of South Carolina.

Fattah, E. (1991). *Understanding criminal victimization.* Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada.

Feeny, N., Zoellner, L., & Fitzgibbons, L., Dansky, B. & Tidwell, R. (2000). Exploring the roles of emotional numbing, depression, and dissociation in PTSD. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 13 (3), 489-498.

Foa, E., Rothbaum, B., Riggs, D. & Murdock, T. (1991). Treatment of posttraumatic stress disorderin rape victims: A comparison between cognitive-behavioral procedures and counseling. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 715-723.

Freedy, J., Resnick, H., Kilpatrick, D., Dansky, B. & Tidwell, R. (1994). The psychological adjustment of recent crime victims in the criminal justice system . *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 9 (4), 450-468.

Foa, E., Dancu, C., Hembree, E., Jaycox, L., Meadows, E. & Street, G. (1999). A comparison of exposure therapy, stress inoculation training and their combination for reducing posttraumatic stress disorder in female assault victims . *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 194-200.

Friedman, K., Bischoff, H., Davis, R. & Pearson, A. (1982). *Victims and helpers: Reactions to crime.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Green, B. (1990). Defining trauma: Terminology and generic stressor dimensions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 1632-1642.

Hart, B. (1993). Battered women and the criminal justice system. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 5, 624-638.

Herman, J. (1997) *Trauma and recovery.* NY: Basic Books.

Horowitz, M. (1986). *Stress response syndrome* (2nd ed.). Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Jo, M., Nelson, J., & Kiecker, P. (1997). A model for controlling social desirability bias by direct and indirect questioning. *Marketing Letters*, 8(4), 429-437.

Katz, S., & Mazur, M. (1979). *Understanding the rape victim: A synthesis of research findings.* NY: Wiley.

Kelly, D. (1990). Victim participation in the criminal justice system. In Lurigio, A., Skogan, W., & Davis, R. (Eds), *Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs* (pp. 172-187). London: Sage.

Kendall-Tacket, K., Williams, L., & Kinkelhor, D. (1993). Impact of sexual abuse on children: A review and synthesis of recent empirical studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113 (1), 164-180.

Kent, J., Coplan, J., & Gorman, J. (1998). Clinical utility of the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors in the spectrum of anxiety. *Biological Psychiatry*, 44 (9), 812-824.

Kilpatrick, D., Best, L., Veronen, A., Amick, E., Villeponteaux, L., & Ruff, G. (1985). Mental health correlates of criminal victimization: A random community survey. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 873-886.

Kilpatrick, D. & Otto, R. (1987). Constitutionally guaranteed participation in criminal proceedings for victims: Potential effects on psychological functionning. *Wayne State Law Review*, 34, 1, 7-28.

Kilpatrick, D., Resick, P., & Veronen, L. (1981). Effects of a rape experience: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37(4), 105-122.

Kilpatrick, D., Saunders, B., Veronen, L., Best, C. & Von, J. (1987). Criminal victimization: Lifetime prevalence, reporting to police, and psychological impact. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, 479-489.

Lauren, C., & Viens, C. (1996). La place de la victime dans le système de justice pénale. In J. Coiteux, P. Campeau, M. Clarkson & M-M. Cousineau (Eds), *Question d'équité: l'aide aux victimes d'actes criminels. (*pp. 109-134). Montreal: Association québecoise plaidoyers-victimes.

Lazarus, R. (1994). *Emotion and adaptation.* NY: Oxford.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping.* NY: Springer.

Lubin, H., Loris, M., & Burt, J. (1998). Efficacy of psychoeducational group therapy in reducing symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder among multiple traumatized women . *American journal of Psychiatry*, 155 (9), 1172-1177.

Lurigio, A., & Davis, R. (1989). Adjusting to criminal victimisation: The correlates of post-crime distress. *Violence and Victims,* 11, 1, 165-174.

Lurigio, A. (1987). Are victims all alike? The adverse, generalized, and differential impact of crime. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, 452-467.

Lurigio, A., & Resick, P. (1990). Healing the psychological wounds of criminal victimization; Predicting post-crime distress and recovery. In Lurigio, A., Skogan, W., & Davis, R. (Eds), *Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs* (pp. 50-68). London: Sage.

Maguire, M. (1985). Victims' needs and victim services: Indications from research. *Victimology: An International Journal,* 10, 1-4, 539-559.

McCahill, T., Meyer, L. & Fischman, A. (1979) *The aftermath of rape.* Lexington, MA: Heath.

Ministère de la santé publique. (2004) Données du Programme DUC 2 recueillies par les corps de police municipaux , la Sûreté du Québec et de la police régionale Kativik, extraites le 1er avril 2004. Available at www.msp.gouv.qc.ca, consulted on June 14, 2005.

Nadelson, C., & Notman, M. (1982) *Aggression, adaptations, and psychotherapy.* NY: Plenum Press.

Norris, J., & Feldman-Summers, S. (1981). Factors related to the psychological impact of rape on the victim. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 90, 562-567.

Poupart, L. (1999). La victime au centre de l'intervention. *Guide de formation à l'intention des policiers.* Montreal: Association québecoise plaidoyers-victimes.

Resick, P. (1987). Psychological effects of victimization: Implications for the criminal justice system. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, 468-478.

Resick, P. (1988). *Reactions of female and male victims of rape or robbery.* Final report of National Institute of Justice Grant No. 85-IJ-CX-0042. Washington, DC.

Resick, P. (1993). The psychological impact of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8 (2), 223-255.

Resick, P., & Nishith, A. (1997). Sexual assault. In Lurigio, A., Skogan, W., & Davis, R. (Eds), *Victims of crime*. (2nd ed.). (pp. 202-230). London: Sage.

Ruch, L. & Chandler, S. (1983). Sexual assault trauma during the acute phase: An exploratory model and multivariate analysis. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24, 174-185.

Ruch, L., Chandler, S., & Harter, R. (1980). Life change and rape impact. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 21, 248-260.

Sales, E., Baum, M. & Shore, B. (1984) Victim adjustment following assault. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40, 1, 117-136.

Shapland, J. (1985). The criminal justice system and the victim. *Victimology*, 10, 585-589.

Statistics Canada (1999). Un profil de la victimisation criminelle: résultats de l'Enquête sociale générale. Catalogue no. 85-553.

Stith, S. (1990). The relationship between the male police officer's response to victims of domestic violence and his personal and family experiences. In E. Viano (Ed), *The victimology handbook: Research, findings, treatment, and public policy.* (pp. 77-93). NY: Garland Publishing.

Swarzer, R., & Swarzer, C. (1996). A critical survey of coping instruments. In M. Zeidner & N. Endler (Eds), *Handbook of coping.* (pp. 107-150). NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Symonds, M. (1980). The second injury to victims. In L. Kivens (Ed), *Evaluation and change: Services for survivors.* (pp. 36-38). Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Research Foundation.

Tomz, S. & McGillis, P. (1997). *Serving crime victims and witnesses*. (2nd ed.) Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Tremblay, P. (1998). La demande pénale directe et indirecte: une analyse stratégique des taux de renvoi. *Revue internationale de criminologie et de police technique et scientifique*, 1, 18-33.

United Nations General Assembly (1985). Declaration of basic principles of justice for victims of crime and abuse of power. New York: Author.

United States Department of Justice (1998). New directions from the field: Victims' rights and services for the 21st century. Washington, DC: Author.

Van der Kolk, B. (2003). Posttraumatic stress disorderand the nature of trauma . In M. Solomon & D. Siegel (Eds), *Healing trauma: Attachment, mind, body and brain.* (pp. 168-195). NY: Norton & co.

Van Dijk, J., Mayhew, P. & Killias, M. (1990). *Experiences of crime across the world.* Kluwer: Deventer.

Wemmers, J. (1996) *Victims in the criminal justice system.* Amsterdam: Kugler Publications.

Wiebe, R. (1996). The mental health implications of crime victims' rights. In Wexler & Winninck (Eds), *Law in a Therapeutic Key: Developments in Therapeutic Juresprudence*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Winnick, B. (1997). The juresprudence of therapeutic juresprudence. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 3, 1, 184-206.

Wright, J. et al. (1997). Les défis de l'évaluation et du traitement, en centre jeunesse, des enfants victimes d'abus sexuel. *Les violences sexuelles: actes du colloque tenu à Montréal le 14 mai 1996 dans le cadre du 64e congrès de l'ACFAS.* Collection Réflexions, 6, 77-114.

Yehuda, R. (1998). Psychoneuroendocrinology of post-traumatic stress disorder . *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*,21 (2), 359-379.

Young, M. (1993). Victim assistance: Frontiers and fundamentals. Washington, DC: National Organization for Victim Assistance.

Appendix 1: Correlation matrix for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder scale

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	---																
2	.4717	---															
3	.4578	.5284	---														
4	.5980	.4729	.5226	---													
5	.5228	.3372	.3829	.6156	---												
6	.4465	.3284	.2450	.4306	.4226	---											
7	.2179	.1754	.0592	.2112	.1505	.1734	---										
8	.5289	.4426	.3999	.5119	.4271	.4433	.0895	---									
9	.4428	.4322	.2756	.5017	.4081	.4659	.1830	.5693	---								
10	.3507	.3350	.3240	.3975	.4283	.3607	.1050	.4745	.4015	---							
11	.4362	.3470	.2920	.4259	.3353	.3816	.1735	.4700	.4596	.3856	---						
12	.5014	.5508	.4364	.5652	.4263	.3173	.2075	.4703	.4542	.3843	.4417	---					
13	.4443	.3824	.4046	.4556	.3499	.3462	.1546	.3605	.3742	.3176	.3017	.4517	---				
14	.5307	.4857	.3850	.5989	.5381	.4200	.1182	.6034	.5325	.6103	.4371	.5551	.4298	---			
15	.4089	.3772	.4326	.4903	.4190	.5029	.1463	.3804	.3221	.2902	.3108	.3145	.3385	.3275	---		
16	.5238	.4074	.4611	.5031	.4522	.4316	.0998	.4989	.3131	.4333	.3614	.4354	.4271	.5356	.5075	---	
17	.4378	.3828	.3712	.5011	.4116	.4061	.1108	.4197	.3745	.3768	.3972	.4360	.2816	.4838	.4005	.5573	---