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ABSTRACT

Stemming from the victims’ rights movement and the restorative justice movement, victims’ compensation is a program established to aid in addressing victims’ rights and needs. Much of the existing research on victims’ compensation programs has been descriptive and comparative in nature. Although newer studies on these programs have examined victims’ compensation and its relationship to other variables, research has not explored the effects of victims’ compensation has on negative outcomes, specifically revictimization. This dissertation will examine the possible link between victims’ compensation applicants’ satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its actors/programs and revictimization. Utilizing survey data from the Voice of the Victim: Statewide Analysis of Victim Compensation research project derived from the victims’ compensation program through the Criminal Justice Coordinating Counsel in the state of Georgia, bivariate and multivariate analyses were conducted regarding victims’ compensation applicants’ satisfaction with victims’ compensation and other entities in the criminal justice system and their relationship to revictimization. The findings suggest that applicants’ satisfaction with the police and victims’ specialists are important in reducing revictimization risk. In addition, being unemployed and drinking alcohol were found to be risk factors for experiencing revictimization among victims’ compensation applicants. Implications for policy and future research will be discussed.
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CHAPTER I
Introduction

Victimization is, unfortunately, a common occurrence in the United States. The Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) provide insight on the prevalence of victimization. According to the UCR, over 1,300,000 acts of violence and over 9,700,000 property crimes were reported to the police in 2008 (FBI, 2009). Although the FBI provides a depiction of the crimes reported to the police, it does not include those incidents that go unreported. To fill this gap, the NCVS offers a more comprehensive picture of victimization in the United States. This self-report survey collects information on victimization incidents experienced by people whether they reported the incidents to the police or not. In 2012, the NCVS reported that over 6,800,000 incidents of violent crime and over 19,600,000 incidents of property crime occurred in the United States (Truman, Langton, & Planty, 2013). The national-level numbers produced by these two data sources show ample evidence that crime and victimization are quite prevalent.

The UCR and the NCVS also provide depictions of the typical crime and victim profiles. According to the UCR, larceny-theft was listed as the crime most reported to the police. Aggravated assault was the most commonly seen violent crime reported to the police (FBI, 2009). Results from the self-reported NCVS find that simple assault was reported most often with regard to personal crimes, while the most common property crime reported in the survey was theft (Truman et al., 2013). Persons are asked in the NCVS if they reported their victimization to the police. Based on this question, 44% of violent crime victimizations and 34% of property crime victimizations reported in the survey were reported to the police. Approximately 5 per 1,000 incidents of serious violent victimization involved a weapon. In
addition, when involving violent victimizations, victims knew the perpetrator more often rather 
than the incident being perpetrated by a stranger (Truman et al., 2013).

With regard to who is most often the victim of crime, the NCVS, which collects data 
from individuals on their own victimization experiences, finds that young (ages 18 to 24), 
black/African American males are typically the victims of crime. Females, however, are more 
likely than males to experience incidents of sexual victimization (i.e. rape and sexual assault) and 
intimate partner violence (Truman et al., 2013). Moreover, a majority of victims were never 
mARRIED. In addition, those who lived in urban settings were at higher risk of being victimized 
than those who resided in rural settings (Truman et al., 2013). Households with lower income 
were more likely to be victimized by property crimes than those with higher income. For 
instance, property crime rates for the lowest income group (< $7,500) were 168.7 per 1,000, 
while the highest income group ($75,000 and above) had rates of only 20.8 per 1,000 (Truman, 
2011a).

Being the victim of a crime is oftentimes traumatic and detrimental in many ways, 
including producing physical and mental health consequences, as well as economic and social 
costs. Physical trauma is one of the most obvious outcomes of victimization. Injuries can range 
from minor cuts or scratches to serious injuries such as stab or gunshot wounds to death. 
According to the NCVS, in 2012 over 1.5 million incidents of violent crime were accompanied 
by an injury (Truman et al., 2013). The most serious outcome of a victimization is death. 
According to the UCR, more than 14,000 murders were reported to the police in 2008 (FBI, 
2009).

Various mental health consequences are also associated with experiencing victimization. 
Research shows evidence of depression (Briere, Elliott, Harris, Cotman, 1995; Kilpatrick &
Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Resick, 1993; Sweeting, Young, West, & Der, 2006; Winick, 2007), anxiety (Resick, 1993; Storch, 2003; Winick, 2007), lack of self-worth (Grills & Ollendick, 2002), decreases in self-esteem (Resick, 1993; Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010; Winick, 2007), self-blame (Simon, 1995), humiliation (Winick, 2007), a sense of powerlessness (Winick, 2007), and helplessness (Simon, 1995) associated with victimization. Furthermore, Harvey and Herman (1994) found that victims of abuse in childhood suffered from symptoms of amnesia, partial amnesia, and delayed recall associated with the traumatic experience. Another serious mental health consequence that victims may experience is post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Herman, 1992; Kilpatrick & Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick, Edmunds, & Seymour, 1992; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Resick, 1993; Simon, 1995). Fear is also a common mental, emotional, and even a physical response to experiencing a victimization (Ferraro & LaGrange 1987; Resick, 1993; Winick, 2007). In addition, victimization can also be accompanied by pain and suffering as well as a lower quality of life (Miller, Cohen, & Wiersema, 1996).

Beyond the physical, mental, and emotional consequences of crime, victims and their loved ones often encounter financial obstacles after a victimization has occurred. These obstacles stem from financial costs including medical costs (Miller et al., 1996), mental health or counseling costs (Miller et al., 1996), missing work resulting in lost wages or loss of financial support (BJS, 2011), and property loss or damage (BJS, 2011; Miller et al., 1996). For instance, annual medical costs were estimated at over $6 billion for child abuse victims (Prevent Child Abuse America, 2000) and almost $3 billion for female victims of intimate partner violence (Wisner, Gilmer, Saltman, & Zink, 1999). Regarding mental health costs, as high as 20% of the cost expended by the mental health system is derived from crime (Miller et al., 1996). According to the 2008 NCVS, about 7% of those who reported being victims of violence missed
work due to their victimization experience (BJS, 2011). The loss of or damage to property cost victims approximately $15,500 for each arson incident (Welsh et al., 2008).

Although one victimization incident is detrimental to persons who fall victims of crime, there are individuals who experience more than one victimization incident, which is called revictimization. Revictimization occurs when an individual who has experienced a victimization incident experiences a subsequent victimization, of the same type or a different type in separate incidents, but during no particular time frame. Much of the research shows that revictimization is an all-too common phenomenon. For instance, findings from the 2010 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) show that approximately 3% of victims experience more than one victimization incident in the past six months (Truman, 2011b). The 2010/2011 British Crime Survey (BCS) concluded that within the given year, over a quarter of persons who were victims experienced more than one victimization incident (Crime in England and Wales, 2010/2011). Victims in Canada are also likely to experience revictimization. Results from the 2004 General Social Survey on Victimization indicate that 38% of persons who were victimized were revictimized (Perrault, Sauve, & Burns, 2010).

What the research has shown, however, is that some types of victimization are more likely to re-occur than others. Specifically, revictimization is especially common in personal crimes including assault, intimate partner violence, and rape as well as the property crime of burglary. For example, a study utilizing the National Youth Survey found that in the past year, approximately 60% of youth were assaulted more than once. In addition, 61% of robbery victims were also revictimized in the past year (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995). The British Crime Survey provides insight on the extent of burglary revictimization. The 2003-2004 surveys and the 2004-2005 surveys indicate that 16% and 14%, respectively, of those who reported being the
victims of burglary experience two or more incidents within one year. Furthermore, Sagovsky and Johnson (2007), in an examination of police reports in Australia from a two-year period, found that about 11% of burglaries were repeat incidents.

Revictimization is also prevalent among victims of unwanted sexual experiences. Research shows that females who have experienced an incident of sexual victimization were at an increased risk of experiencing a subsequent sexual victimization (Classen, Palesh, & Aggarwal, 2005; Norris, Nurius, and Dimeff, 1996). Specifically, in a review of the literature, Classen et al. (2005) concluded that approximately two thirds of the sexually victimized women reported experiencing multiple sexual victimizations during their lifetime with rates of revictimization ranging from 10% to as high as 69%. Other research supports this finding of sexual revictimization. A study using the National Violence Against Women Study data concluded that female rape victims in the sample reported being raped 2.9 times, on average, a year (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006). Another national-level study of violent and sexual victimization among college females showed that victims were experiencing repeat sexual victimization at higher rates than repeat violent victimization (Daigle, Fisher, & Cullen, 2008). Daigle and colleagues found that 7% of the college women who reported an initial sexual victimization incident of rape, sexual coercion, unwanted sexual contact with force, unwanted sexual contact without force, or threats experienced more than one of these incidents during the school year (Daigle et al., 2008).

Revictimization is accompanied by many of the same consequences as the initial victimization. These will be discussed in more detail in Chapter IV. With the suffering and harm that crime victims encounter related to their victimization and possible occurrences of
revictimization, it is important for there to be laws and policies in place to provide victims with rights and services that will accommodate their needs.

One such need and right is providing financial compensation for the consequences following a victimization such as injury or psychological trauma. It may be that by alleviating these consequences, compensation can reduce the likelihood of an individual becoming a victim again. Specifically, by aiding persons to receive physical and mental health treatment or to make up for lost wages or economic support, for example, victims’ compensation can help individuals to regain balance in their lives following the disruption a victimization experience can induce, and in turn reduce the risk and risk factors associated with subsequent victimization.

Research shows that various characteristics and behaviors can predict being the victim of a crime. For example, drug (Cass, 2007; Fisher & Wilkes, 2003; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2002) and alcohol use (Abbey, Zawacki, Buck, Clinton, & McAuslan, 2001; Combs-Lane & Smith, 2002; Schwartz & Pitts, 1995; Siegel & Williams, 2003; Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999) have been associated with victimization risk. Likewise, there are risk factors that place individuals at risk of being revictimized, such as substance use (Daigle et al., 2008; Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010b; Raghavan, Bogart, Elliott, Vestal, & Schuster, 2004), unemployment (Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998), and socioeconomic status (Lauritsen and Quinet, 1995; Outlaw, Ruback, & Britt, 2002). Moreover, some of the negative consequences that accompany an initial victimization may also serve as risk factors for revictimization. These negative outcomes may include mental health issues such as depression and anxiety (Burnam, Stein, Golding, Siegal, Sorenson, Forsythe, & Telles, 1988). Risk factors and negative consequences such as these create an imbalance for victims. The criminal justice system may be able to help victims remedy this imbalance by providing services that help to alleviate negative consequences following a
victimization—such as reducing mental health consequences by providing money for counseling.
If participation in the criminal justice system, through compensation for example, can aid in
restoring victims’ imbalance caused by the initial victimization, then the system may also be
lessening the risk for revictimization.
CHAPTER II
Victims’ Rights

Historically, the criminal justice system has been offender-based, with offenders as opposed to victims as the focus of the system. Until the emergence of the sub-field of criminology known as victimology, victims were given little attention in the criminal justice system, and programs for these individuals were lacking. Deriving from the notion of understanding the victim-offender relationship, victimology began to be acknowledged in the mid-1900s (Young & Stein, 2004). In 1947, Mendelsohn, known as the father of victimology, labeled the study of victims as *victimology*. Furthermore, in 1948, Hans von Hentig, in his book, *The Criminal and His Victim*, suggested that victims may contribute to their victimizations (Dussich, 2007; Young & Stein, 2004). Hentig’s work encouraged the study of victims and their roles in crime. The field of victimology moved from this early position of examining the victim’s role in crime, and began to focus on the impact crime had on victims—as well as the needs and rights of victims—due to the increasing awareness of how often victimization occurred and victims’ distrust of the criminal justice system (Young & Stein, 2004). Thus, the field of victimology focuses on the study of the causes and consequences of victimization along with how the criminal justice system and other actors interact with and provide for victims (Dussich, 2007; Young & Stein, 2004).

As mentioned, a major influence on the study of victims was the expansion of knowledge surrounding the prevalence of victimization. The National Crime Survey (NCS), now known as the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), was implemented in 1966 due to the concern of raising crime rates (BJS, 2014; Dussich, 2007). This survey was a recommendation of the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Since not all crimes are reported to the police, the survey went beyond the scope of the Uniform Crime
Reports (UCR) by asking respondents to indicate any victimizations they experienced, regardless of whether they reported the incidents to the police or not (Felson & Boba, 2010). Therefore, the survey provided a better, more accurate picture of how much victimization, thus crime, was actually occurring.

The awareness of victimization provided by the NCS was not the only influence on the expansion of studying crime victims. During this same time period – the 1960s, both the women’s rights movement and the civil rights movement were taking place, which provided groundwork and momentum for the victims’ rights movement. With the recognition of the power, status, and influence of women during the women’s rights movement, crimes against women such as rape, sexual victimization, and domestic violence were acknowledged. In addition, the way in which the criminal justice system handled these crime victims was brought to light as well (Young & Stein, 2004). Similar to the women’s rights movement, the civil rights movement was also concerned with how individuals were treated by the criminal justice system (Smith, Sloan, & Ward, 1990). Specifically, the civil rights movement focused on the rights of minorities, women, the young, and poor people (Sloan et al., 1990). Because of these similar interests regarding the criminal justice system, both the women’s rights movement and the civil rights movement fueled the victims’ rights movement.

Victims’ rights were first granted in the late 1960s. The overarching goal of these rights is to provide and advance the privacy of victims, the protection of victims, and the participation of victims in the criminal justice system (Garvin, 2010). Individual states implemented victims’ rights through either constitutional amendments or through legislation (Davis & Mulford, 2008). Wisconsin was the first state to establish and provide rights to victims (Davis & Mulford, 2008; Young & Stein, 2004). In addition to states’ recognition of victims’ rights, victims were also
acknowledged on the federal level. In 1982, the Presidential Task Force of Victims of Crime was assembled under President Reagan in order to address and improve on legislation pertaining to victims (Davis & Mulford, 2008; Henderson, 1985; Smith et al., 1990). This task force suggested increased participation and restitution be granted to crime victims involved in the criminal justice system. This task force, along with other federal legislation guaranteed that victims’ rights would be maintained on the federal level (Davis & Mulford, 2008; Young & Stein, 2004). Importantly, victims are able to attempt to have their rights enforced (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012).

To activate their rights, including the right to be informed, victims must report their victimizations to the police (Davis & Mulford, 2008; National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). Not only does this right to be informed include information for contacting criminal justice agents and knowledge of the available resources and services, in a majority of states it also includes being notified about the offender’s arrest, arraignment, and bail as well as whether charges are dismissed; plea bargaining is taking place; when the trial, sentencing, and any appeals are occurring; and whether the offender has probation or parole hearings and/or has escaped or been released. All of this information in reference to the right to be informed can be provided in various ways to crime victims: including mailing the victim the information, having automated systems to call or email victims, or in some cases, victims must inquire about these updates themselves (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). Another way in which these notifications can be obtained is through a victim witness assistance provider (VWAP) often in collaboration with the prosecutor. The prosecutor is required to discuss decisions with the victim in some states; however, the prosecutor has the final say in all important decisions regarding the case (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012).
Beyond notification, victims have numerous other rights. One such right is the right to participation and consultation. This right, given by most states, allows victim participation in the court process through victim impact statements and consultations with the prosecutor (Davis & Mulford, 2008; National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). Additionally, in about half of the states, victims have a right to a speedy trial (Davis & Mulford, 2008; National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). This right ensures that the trial process will be free of unreasonable delay. The court may consider the impact a delay could have on the victim when ruling on a continuance.

Victims are also guaranteed protection. This victims’ right provides protection from threats, intimidation, and retaliation. Protection is provided by keeping victims isolated from their perpetrators in and out of court, limiting the disclosure of their personal information, and providing protection orders if necessary (Davis & Mulford, 2008; National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). Although most states have this victims’ right in place, the amount of protection may vary from state to state and jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Providing police escorts, witness protection programs, restraining orders, and relocation are all examples of protection services that may be provided to victims (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). Crime victims also have the right to restitution from the offender as well as the right to prompt return of personal property. Restitution can be granted to the victim in most states. In this case, the court holds the offender responsible for paying some or all of the financial losses they caused (e.g., property damage or loss). In addition, restitution may be granted for actual monetary loss such as lost wages or the repayment of insurance deductibles (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012).
An additional right provided to crime victims is financial compensation for expenses caused by the victimization incident (Davis & Mulford, 2008; National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). This right is given to victims in every state.

There are various consequences that may result from a victimization experience. One such consequence is injuries. According to the NCVS, 1,573,460 incidents of violent crime and 762,170 incidents of serious violent crime involved an injury to the victim in 2012 (Truman et al., 2013). Beyond the obvious consequence of injuries when becoming the victim of a crime, there are also other tangible costs—medical costs and lost earnings, for example—related to victimization. These tangible costs per victimization range from an estimated $480 to $737,517 and are related to the type of crime the victim experienced (McCloski, French, & Fang, 2010). To help counteract these monetary costs, victims’ compensation was first established in California in 1965 (Ramker & Meagher, 1982). Within about ten years, most states had recognized California’s efforts for crime victims and began victims’ compensation programs of their own (Henderson, 1985). Today, every state provides the opportunity for victims to receive compensation. The goal of victims’ compensation is to ease the victim’s financial burdens associated with experiencing a crime. The expectation is that providing monetary aid through this program assists crime victims as well as their loved ones through the physical and emotional trauma a victimization experience can create (CJCC, 2012; National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Board, 2012). Meeting this particular need of victims is important because the system is acknowledging the harm the victim has endured, and is aiding in the recovery of the victim’s well-being. As discussed previously, victims experience physical and emotional consequences associated with being victimized. These consequences are often accompanied by financial burdens. Victims’ compensation, then, can help to alleviate these
negative outcomes by providing the financial means to obtain services such as counseling for mental health issues and medical attention for injuries. By fulfilling the monetary needs to counteract the trauma victims commonly experience following a victimization incident, victims’ compensation attempts to lessen the financial costs victims often face.

In general, financial compensation can be obtained for expenses directly related to the victimization experience such as medical and funeral costs, loss of wages or economic support reimbursement, crime scene clean up, and counseling expenses. In addition to these major categories, some states’ victims’ compensation programs also provide emergency funds as well as reimbursement for relocation costs, evidence, security expenses, child care, travel expenses to treatment and court, property damage and replacement, and pain and suffering (Daigle, Reed, Mummert, Azimi, & Topalli, 2013). In 2009, approximately $478 million dollars was dedicated to victims’ compensation nationally in the United States (National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Board, 2012). Federal grants provide about one-third of the funding for victims’ compensation with other financial resources provided through offenders’ court fees. For example, in the state of Georgia, about five percent of the offender’s court fees are applied to the state’s victims’ compensation fund (CJCC, 2012). Although there are various sources of funding, victims’ compensation programs limit the amount compensation that can be awarded, even though victims may have expenses that are very high, the mode for the total cap for compensation programs in the United States is $25,000 (Daigle et al., 2013). The national average total cap is $31,000 for victims’ compensation (Daigle et al., 2013). Texas provides the highest maximum cap for victims’ at $125,000 (for catastrophic events), and Arkansas, Louisiana, Nebraska, and Vermont provide the lowest cap at $10,000 (Daigle et al., 2013). Nationally, victims’ compensation payments were commonly dispensed for medical costs at
54%, although payments were also made for economic support (15%), funeral costs (11%), and mental health/counseling costs (9%) (National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards, 2012). About half of the claims for victims’ compensation came from victimization experiences of assault, with other claims being filed as a result of incidents of domestic violence (25%), child abuse (20%), sexual assault (16%), and homicide (10%).

Although varying from state to state and program to program, there are general eligibility requirements for victims to receive compensation. Generally, the victim must have reported the crime to the police within a specified time period, participate and cooperate with the police and prosecutor, apply for victims’ compensation within a given time period (usually 1 year), not have contributed to their victimization in any way, and have tangible costs associated with their victimization that are not covered by another party (e.g. insurance) (National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards, 2012).

In Georgia, the state in which the current research was conducted, through the Crime Victims Bill of Rights (O.C.G.A. 17-17-1 C16) of Georgia, crime victims are entitled to the right to apply for victims’ compensation. This victims’ compensation program is administered by the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) of Georgia. Similar to common national standards, Georgia victims of violent crime\(^1\)—including sexual assault, child abuse, domestic violence, vehicular homicide, child pornography, child exploitation, assault, robbery, kidnapping, hit and run, homicide, and DUI/DWI where a physical injury or serious mental/emotional trauma resulted—can be compensated for medical expenses, counseling services, funeral costs, loss of wages or economic support, crime scene clean up, DUI memorial signs, and sexual assault forensic medical examinations (CJCC, 2012). Victims’ compensation

\(^{1}\) Individuals other than victims can also apply for victims’ compensation. These persons include those who witnessed or were threatened with violence, those who were injured while aiding a victim of violence, a parent/guardian of a victim of violent crime, and a dependent of a victim (CJCC, 2012).
funds can be utilized for these expenses after all other funds have been exhausted, including but not limited to health insurance, worker’s compensation, and civil cases resulting in financial restitution from the offender. It is important to note that Georgia does not provide monetary benefits for pain and suffering. Additionally, there is a financial cap or limit for each area of victims’ compensation as well as for the total amount of compensation that can be received (CJCC, 2012). The total cap for victims’ compensation is $25,000, the medical cap is $15,000, counseling is capped at $3,000, funeral is capped at $3,000, loss of wages or economic support is capped at $10,000, and crime scene clean-up is capped at $1,500 (CJCC, 2012).

Eligibility requirements for victims’ compensation in Georgia are similar to the standards of other states. These restrictions include: time requirements such as the incident must be reported to the police within 72 hours unless with good cause and the time to apply for victims’ compensation is restricted to one year unless good cause is presented. Victims must also cooperate with the police and the prosecutor. Additionally, if the victim is under criminal justice supervision or contributed to his/her own victimization, he or she is not eligible to receive compensation (CJCC, 2012; Robinson, 2012).

According to the CJCC, in 2009, the victims’ compensation program in Georgia obtained over 1 million dollars for victims’ compensation services through the Recovery Act grant funds. That same year, the victims’ compensation program dispensed a total of $965,177 to victims through compensation (CJCC, 2012). There are approximately 3,000 new applicants for victims’ compensation in Georgia each year. Unfortunately, these new applicants only account for approximately 2% of Georgia crime victims who are eligible applicants for victims’ compensation. This percentage of participation is over 3.5% lower than the national rate (5.7%) of eligible crime victims that apply for victims’ compensation (Daigle et al., 2013). The victims’
compensation program should aid in rebalancing and restoring victims after they have suffered a victimization experience. Thus, what could be most detrimental is that victims are not receiving these compensation funds, thus they are not receiving the benefits of this program.

Soon after the emergence of the victims’ rights movement, another movement was also taking place in the criminal justice system. In the 1970s, the restorative justice movement was first introduced in Canada and then in the United States. The ideals of restorative justice had been used in practice before this time, when earlier justice systems put the responsibility of reparation from the offender on the victims and their families (Tobolowsky, 1999). This victim-centered approach towards justice allowed for victims and those affected by the victimization (e.g., loved ones, the community, the state) as well as the offender to play a role in restoring the peace after victimization occurred (Johnstone, 2002). This restoration is done by the parties involved working together to come to a decision regarding how to alleviate the harm and repair the damage caused by the offender (Achilles & Zehr, 2001; Bazemore, 1998; Marshall, 1999).

Specifically concerning victims, restorative justice is focused on the needs of crime victims and whether these needs are met by the criminal justice system (Achilles & Zehr, 2001; Zehr, 2002). Crime victims and others who are affected by the crime (e.g. the victims’ families, the community) are looking to restore power/control and order in their lives as well as rebuild relationships and trust (Achilles & Zehr, 2001). In order to do so, victims have five basic needs from the criminal justice system. First, they need a place where they can express their feelings and concerns while feeling safe and free from blame and judgment. Second, crime victims need restitution. Restitution is payment made to the victim by the offender, which holds the offender accountable for the harm they have caused (Achilles & Zehr, 2001). Third, victims need information and need their questions to be answered. Fourth, they need a voice. They need to be
able to tell their story and describe the impact the crime has had on them. Fifth, and finally, crime victims need to experience empowerment (Achilles & Zehr, 2001). In line with these needs of victims, Zehr (2002) identifies four important types of victims’ needs where the criminal justice system seems to fall short including information, truth-telling, empowerment, and restitution/vindication. The need for information goes beyond that of knowing what is happening with the case. Victims need to know what happened and why it happened. Many times, the only way to gain this knowledge is through the offender (Zehr, 2002). Truth-telling, a second need of victims, refers to the allowance of victims to tell their story or have a voice. Expressing their experiences related to the crime can be therapeutic. Victims often times feel a need to convey how the crime impacted them to the offender (Zehr, 2002). Another need – the need to be empowered – stems from the notion that victims feel their lives have been turned upside down by a crime. In basic terms, they have lost all control over their lives. There is a need for victims to regain this control (Zehr, 2002). Finally, restitution is an important need for victims because it not only compensates for the losses that were a result of the crime, but it also symbolizes the recognition of the wrongdoing the offender committed. Crime victims have a need to have their suffering be acknowledged and alleviated. Restitution is one way for this to be achieved (Zehr, 2002). It is important for the criminal justice system to not only acknowledge, but to also address the needs of victims. If the system is not meeting the needs of victims, it would likely result in further harm. Thus, the trauma to and suffering of victims continues, and may lead to additional negative outcomes such as revictimization by exacerbating risk factors (e.g. depression and anxiety) associated with being revictimized.

In the United States, there are various programs in place that promote the notion of restorative justice and meeting the needs of victims. These programs include victim-offender
mediation/reconciliation, restitution, family/community group conferencing, peacemaking, and sentencing circles (Centre for Justice and Reconciliation, 2008). By giving the victims a voice in what happens with the offender after they have been victimized, restorative justice aids in meeting victims’ needs and providing them with their own rights similar to those that are provided to offenders in the criminal justice system (Bazemore, 1998). Despite these needs being essential to victims’ recovery from the crime, many argue the criminal justice system does not adequately address these needs as discussed above (Achilles & Zehr, 2001; Bazemore, 1998; Zehr, 2002). Bazemore (1998) argues that if the criminal justice system can meet the needs of victims, perhaps through restorative justice for example, then victims will feel satisfied with the system. If crime victims have positive experiences with the criminal justice system (i.e. thereby meeting objectives of restorative justice and therapeutic jurisprudence), it should aid in the restoration of control, order, and trust in their lives.
In line with the ideals of the victims’ rights movement and the restorative justice movement, therapeutic jurisprudence, first introduced in the 1990s, has as its main objective a focus on the notion that laws and policies should promote the emotional, mental, and behavioral well-being of those who interact with the criminal justice system (King, 2008; Stolle, Wexler, & Winick, 2000; Wexler, 1995; Wexler & Winick, 1991; Winick, 1997, 2007, 2009; Winick & Wexler, 2003). In basic terms, when an individual comes into contact with the criminal justice system, there is a need for the system, its actors, and its services to promote a positive impact on the individual. Thus, therapeutic jurisprudence is a matter of whether the criminal justice system and its entities are working as a therapeutic agent or not (Slobogin, 1995). Therapeutic jurisprudence can be assessed in the criminal justice system as a whole as well as among its individual actors such as police and first responders, prosecutors, and judges. The system in general and each of these actors play a role in the experiences of individuals who come into contact with the criminal justice system and whether or not these experiences are positive or negative and therapeutic or not (Winick, 1997). Generally, interactions with the criminal justice system that promote empowerment of the individual and seek to address the needs of the individual exemplify the very elements of therapeutic jurisprudence. On the organizational level, problem-solving courts or specialty courts such as drug courts are examples of therapeutic jurisprudence ideals put into action (Hora, Schma, & Rosenthal, 1998; Rottman & Casey, 1999). Providing an example on the individual level, judges may consider the emotional undertones of their courtroom during a trial. Specifically, a judge may directly address a victim after a
sentence has been handed down in order to provide closure and help promote healing (Rottman & Casey, 1999).

Although this approach is appropriate for different types of people who come into contact with the criminal justice system (i.e. offenders, witnesses, family members of the victims, and accused), it has been applied to victims of crime in particular (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010; Feldthusen, Hankivsky, & Greaves, 2000; Winick, 2007). Winick (2007) discusses how the application of therapeutic jurisprudence is appropriate for crime victims. As previously discussed, research has shown that victims of crime may experience negative consequences as a result of their victimization experience. These negative outcomes include anxiety (Resick, 1993; Storch, 2003; Winick, 2007), fear (Resick, 1993; Winick, 2007), depression (Kilpatrick & Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Resick, 1993; Sweeting, Young, West, & Der, 2006; Winick, 2007), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Kilpatrick & Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick, Edmunds, & Seymour, 1992; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Resick, 1993; Simon, 1995), a sense of powerlessness (Winick, 2007), humiliation (Winick, 2007), substance abuse (Kilpatrick & Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Simon, 1995), self-blame (Simon, 1995), lack of self-worth (Grills & Ollendick, 2002), decreases in self-esteem (Resick, 1993; Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010; Winick, 2007), and helplessness (Simon, 1995) among many others.

Because of these negative outcomes often associated with victimization, the criminal justice system should provide a positive experience for victims and avoid the possibility of revictimizing them through disempowerment or further mental or emotional harm (Herman, 2003; Winick, 2007). The revictimization of victims by the criminal justice system can occur at various points throughout the case. For example, police actions have been found to be sources of revictimization for rape victims (Maier, 2008). In fact, Maier (2008) reported that in interviews
with 58 rape victim advocates, 46% of the participants reported police as being the perpetrators of revictimization. Police engaged in the revictimization of rape victims through victim-blaming (Maier, 2008; Ullman, 1996), insensitivity (Martin, 2005), invasive questioning (Maier, 2008), and hesitation or refusal to investigate the victim’s claims (Campbell, 2006; Edward & Macleod, 1999; Maier, 2008). In addition to these, police may also question or criticize the victim’s reaction to experiencing a rape, for example, saying that she does not demonstrate enough distraught emotion or injuries (Estrich, 1987; Maier, 2008; Madigan & Gamble, 1991).

Referencing victim-blaming specifically, the victims’ actions, behaviors, and lifestyle choices may also be questioned by police (Campbell, 2006; Maier, 2008). The behaviors discussed here are not limited to only the police. Similar behaviors can be found among prosecutors, judges, and other criminal justice professionals (Ford, 1991; Hart, 1992; Winick, 2007). For instance, Herman (1997) suggests that the court system aggravates PTSD and its symptoms among victims of violence. Moreover, crime victims, such as domestic violence victims, may have concerns for their safety and fear offender retaliation when participating in the case (Herman, 2003). All of these actions by the criminal justice system and its actors can be detrimental and may result in further harm to the victims. As Winick (2007) notes, individuals who experience violent crime have their emotional equilibrium imbalanced, and part of the job of the criminal justice system and the victims’ services that it provides is to restore this emotional balance, not damage it further. The services and programs embracing therapeutic jurisprudence seek to provide this restoration.

A major element of therapeutic jurisprudence that is specific to crime victims is meeting their needs (Winick, 2007). One such need held by victims is that they do not want to be disregarded or ignored (Feldthusen et al., 2000; Winick, 2007). It is important to make sure
victims feel as though they can express themselves and feel that they are being taken seriously. Another necessity of victims, and perhaps most important, is that victims need to be respected (Winick, 2007). Respect most often begins with the action of the police who are usually the first actors of the system with whom victims come into contact. Scholars have stressed the need for police, as well as other criminal justice actors, to be properly trained to be sensitive and educated to be able to provide referral and prevention information to victims of crime (Simon, 1995; Winick, 2007). By providing sensitivity and information to victims, criminal justice actors can increase victims’ feelings of being acknowledged, respected, and empowered.

In addition to meeting the needs of victims, providing a sense of empowerment can also be crucial to the emotional rebalancing of crime victims. Empowering victims aids in restoring balance to victims’ emotional well-being. For instance, when protection orders are in place for victims of domestic violence, police should enforce these appropriately when violated. Lack of enforcement decreases victims’ sense of safety and empowerment (Simon, 1995). Courts and prosecutors can aid in empowering victims by providing opportunities for victims to confront their perpetrator and tell their side of the story about how the crime has impacted their life. Giving this voice to the victim can be done with the use of victim impact statements, testifying in court, protection or restraining orders, and victim-offender mediation (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010; Simon, 1995; Winick, 2007).

Although the research regarding therapeutic jurisprudence as it pertains to victims within the criminal justice system may be discouraging, there is still a need to understand how different elements of the system can be beneficial in the healing process. Tying therapeutic jurisprudence ideals to victim-witness assistance programs (VWAP) and other programs specifically for victims, these providers in the criminal justice system should help victims fill out the necessary
forms and paperwork associated with victim impact statements, victims’ compensation, victim-offender mediation sessions, and protection orders, and should assist with providing any additional information that they may need when cooperating with the police or prosecutor. These tasks seem simple, but they are essential because sometimes victims have language, literacy, or cultural barriers that prevent them from adequately participating in their case (Winick, 2007).

To reiterate, the overall goal of therapeutic jurisprudence pertaining to crime victims is to aid them in restoring emotional and mental balance in their lives. Positive experiences with the criminal justice system and its actors/elements are crucial in improving victims’ well-being. In addition, the type of experience victims have with the system oftentimes influences whether or not they will choose to participate in the criminal justice system in the future (Belknap & Sullivan, 2003; Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010; Simon, 1995; Zweig & Burt, 2003). The option to interact with the criminal justice system in the future is more likely to be accepted when the objectives of therapeutic jurisprudence are met during the current victimization (Winick, 1997).

Beyond understanding what therapeutic jurisprudence is and how it is related to the criminal justice system, research has begun to try to understand the importance of therapeutic jurisprudence in the context of victims’ interactions with the criminal justice system. Some of this research has examined whether victim empowerment produces positive outcomes for victims, a goal of therapeutic jurisprudence. Cattaneo and Goodman (2010) examined the role of empowerment in the court system among female victims of intimate partner violence and its impact on levels of depression, quality of life, and whether or not the victims would utilize the court system again. Using a sample of 142 women, the study found that empowerment was significantly related to improvement in depression levels and the victims’ overall feelings of
well-being. Furthermore, women who felt they had positive experiences with the court system had greater intentions of participating in the system again (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010). Overall, the researchers concluded that empowerment and a positive experience with the court led to increased satisfaction with the system and improvement in the mental health of the victims (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010). In sum, when the ideals of therapeutic jurisprudence were upheld, positive outcomes for victims were present.

Similarly, in a study of 46 victims who took part in either direct or indirect mediation with their offenders, researchers found that mediation had a positive impact on victims’ well-being (Wemmers & Cyr, 2005). Over half of the victims (54.5%) reported that they felt their participation in the mediation helped them move on from their victimization, and over 64% of them indicated feeling better about their victimization experience following the mediation. In addition, the majority of victims expressed that they benefited from the mediation, with psychological benefits (62.1%) being the most commonly reported (Wemmers & Cyr, 2005). The results of this research suggest the victim-offender mediation program was therapeutic in nature for the victims. The service was found to be a healing process and a tool to regain balance in their lives. Furthermore, a majority of the victims felt that the mediation program was fair (66%), with correlational findings also indicating that the perception of the program and its procedures being fair were associated with feeling better about their victimization experience after the mediation. Thus, these findings suggest a therapeutic result stemming from the program (Wemmer & Cyr, 2005). Taken together, the findings clearly demonstrate the positive outcomes that programs can produce when in accordance with therapeutic jurisprudence.

Another study considered the therapeutic outcomes for victims of sexual abuse who either filed for government provided compensation or filed civil actions for damages. This study
is of particular interest because it is the first study to investigate compensation as a tool of therapeutic jurisprudence. Feldthusen and colleagues (2000) interviewed sexual abuse victims and found that, in terms of compensation through either outlet, victims were seeking a therapeutic outcome—a way to heal from their experience—rather than financial gain. More specifically, victims in the study wanted to be heard, express their experiences, and gain acknowledgment that what they went through was wrong (Feldthusen et al., 2000). Although over 40% of the sample identified money as one of the main reasons they applied for compensation, that reason was linked to the needs of paying for child care, education, and counseling (Feldthusen et al., 2000). Thus, money may have been a motivator, but the uses for that money would have provided a therapeutic outcome.

Importantly, a vast majority of the sample discussed several negative consequences, both emotional (84%) and physical (53%), associated with their compensation or civil action processes. Emotional consequences included issues such as depression, suicidal tendencies, anger, frustration, loss of control with regard to the process, and the system not being responsive towards them. Physical consequences included hypertension, vomiting, headaches, insomnia, and other illnesses (Feldthusen et al., 2000). Looking specifically at those who applied for compensation through the government, a large percentage of these victims (51%) reported dissatisfaction with their experience, specifically citing insensitivity, disrespect, and lack of empathy. They also expressed difficulty in filling out the required paperwork, and were insulted when the details of the application and file were not reviewed. Victims indicated feelings of being victimized and intimidated by the system and scared during the process as well (Feldthusen et al., 2000). In this sense, the findings demonstrate the characteristics of the
victims being revictimized by the system. Therapeutic jurisprudence was not upheld in the program and victims were subsequently negatively affected by their participation.

Research has also begun to consider the role of therapeutic jurisprudence in the criminal justice system, and how it may break the victimization-revictimization cycle for crime victims. For example, Finn (2013) examined the outcome of revictimization among 170 domestic violence victims when comparing evidence-based versus victim-centered prosecutorial policies. Victim-centered policies take on the ideals of therapeutic jurisprudence, specifically empowerment, in that this prosecutorial policy allows victims to participate in their case. The goal then is that victim participation will reduce their chances of experiencing revictimization incidents through empowerment. Supporting this idea, Finn (2013) found that those who were in the victim-centered policy group were less likely to report subsequent violence than those who were in the evidence-based policy group. This finding suggests that negative outcomes may be prevented or at least alleviated by the criminal justice system through empowering victims of crime.

**Crime Victims’ Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System**

An important consideration of victims’ rights is whether the privileges and programs put into place for victims are actually having a positive impact on them. One way to assess this impact is to consider victims’ satisfaction with the criminal justice system as a whole, as well as their satisfaction with different actors and aspects of the criminal justice system. To illustrate victims’ overall perceptions of the criminal justice system, of their sample of felony crime victims’ in Ohio, Erez and Tontodonato (1992) found that 55% felt the criminal justice system handled their case well. Just under one third of their sample, however, felt their cases were handled badly by the system.
Satisfaction with Police

Although research has explored victims’ satisfaction with the criminal justice system in general, other scholars have assessed victims’ satisfaction with specific actors in the criminal justice system. One of the first actors in the criminal justice system with whom a crime victim comes into contact is the police. This interaction—and the satisfaction associated with it—is important because the police are often the very first impression a victim has with the criminal justice system (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; Frazier & Haney, 1996; Reisig & Chandek, 2001; Skogan, 2005; Tewksbury & West, 2001). In general, victims tend to be satisfied with the police. Early studies reported that victims’ satisfaction with police ranged from 46% (Poister & McDavid, 1978) to over 70% (Shapland, 1984). A study assessing crime victims’ experiences with a central Wisconsin police department found that a majority of crime victims were satisfied with the police who handled their cases. The level of satisfaction, however, varied depending upon the type of crime. Sixty one percent of victims who experienced personal crimes, 67% of serious property crime victims, and 74% of victims who experienced minor property crimes were satisfied with the police (Brandl & Horvath, 1991). Further, Skogan’s (2005) study of Chicago residents found that over three-fourths of the sample reported satisfaction with police actions at the scene of the crime. With regard to police courtesy, other research has shown that just fewer than 60% of a sample of crime victims ranked police with high satisfaction. In addition, approximately half of the sample reported being completely satisfied with police contact (Tewksbury & West, 2001). Not all studies have found that victims are satisfied with police relative to other criminal justice actors. When asked what agents in the criminal justice system were most responsive, only 19% of crime victims chose police (Erez & Tontodonato, 1992).
This is not to say that victims were not satisfied with the police, rather they chose other actors besides the police as being the most responsive.

Some research has focused on particular types of victims, such as those who experienced domestic violence or sexual assault, and their satisfaction with the police. It may be that different types of victims are exposed to different social pressures, which may in turn influence how police officers respond to different victimization incidents. For instance, violence against women has been tolerated in some realms of society, and domestic violence victims, specifically, may feel social pressures to put the preservation of their families before their own rights and well-being (Brown, 1984). Because of the view society holds towards these victims and because police may repeatedly encounter the same situations of the victim wanting to spare her partner from being punished, police may rationalize that there is no sense in responding to these victims (Brown, 1984). With this view possibly being held by the police, perhaps satisfaction among intimate partner violence victims will be different from other victims.

In a particular study of female victims of domestic violence who sought refuge in a battered women’s shelter, three-fourths of the women reported the police were helpful (Yegidis & Renzy, 1994). Other studies of victims of domestic violence have reported similar findings with about 66% of these victims being satisfied with the police (Brown, 1984; Kennedy & Homant, 1983). Similarly, in her study of domestic violence victims, Martin (1997) also found that there was a consensus of general satisfaction among victims with the way in which the police treated them.

Importantly, repeat victims—those who experience more than one victimization incident—are also considered a specific category of victims. A study of repeat victims of burglary and violence against women found that those who had been victimized more than once
reported lower levels of satisfaction with police responses when compared to those who had only been victimized once (van Dijk, 2001). In addition, repeat victims of violence against women were found to have higher levels of satisfaction with the police response than repeat burglary victims (van Dijk, 2001).

In addition to assessing levels of satisfaction with police, research has also tried to discover why victims are satisfied or not. Brandl and Horvath (1991) found that satisfaction with the police was positively related to the victims’ perception of police professionalism. This relationship was present no matter what type of crime the victims experienced. Similarly, Shapland (1983) found that higher levels of satisfaction with police were reported when the police provided feedback to victims and appeared to be invested in the victim’s case. Moreover, other research has reported that specific police actions—including making an arrest, comforting the victim, and supplying information related to crime prevention—were all significantly related to higher levels of victims’ satisfaction (Percy, 1980). Kelly (1983) found that victims’ satisfaction was dependent on the amount of case information the police provided to the victim, how often the police contacted the victim, and how sensitive police were towards the victim. Thus, increases in information provided by the police and police contact with victims led to a greater level of police satisfaction among victims. Furthermore, other research indicated that the level of satisfaction with the police among breaking and entering victims was related to the level of service provided by the police. These services included whether or not they arrived promptly, tried to locate witnesses, attempted to collect evidence, provided advice on preventing future incidents, and contacted the victims about the status of the case (Reisig & Chandek, 2001). In sum, this body of research suggests that victims are most satisfied with police when the police
are actively interacting and staying in contact with victims (i.e. providing information to victims) throughout their investigation.

**Satisfaction with Prosecutors**

After reporting a crime to the police, the prosecutors, VWAPs, and courts are usually the next actors/aspects of the criminal justice system with whom crime victims interact. Prosecutors typically interact with victims during the investigation and trial processes. For example, depending upon the rights provided, victims may consult with the prosecutor, participate as witnesses, give victim impact statements, or simply be present in court during the trial. In many cases, victims prefer to be included in the trial process rather than be excluded (Kelly, 1983). In addition, Kelly (1983) found that victims believed that the prosecutor’s job was, in part, to represent them. Although this representation is not the role of the prosecutor, if the victim perceived this representation to be present, then the more likely the victim was to give a positive evaluation of the prosecutor (Kelly, 1983). Furthermore, the more contact the prosecutor had with the victim, the higher the satisfaction level the victim held for the prosecutor (Kelly, 1983).

Other research has assessed victims’ satisfaction with prosecutors more generally. In a study of 100 female rape victims, Kelly (1984) found that 69% of these victims were satisfied with the prosecutor assigned to their case and the services he or she provided. Other research has also indicated high levels of satisfaction with the prosecutor among crime victims, with a majority of victims reporting they were somewhat or very satisfied with the prosecutor (Kilpatrick, Beatty, & Howley, 1998). Although much of research suggests that victims are generally satisfied with prosecutors, out of all of the actors in the criminal justice system, prosecutors were the least selected actor by crime victims with regard to their responsiveness (Erez & Tontodonato, 1992). As with police, this lack of selection does not necessarily mean that victims are dissatisfied with prosecutors, they are just not selected as the most responsive actors in the system.
Prosecutors are not the only connection crime victims have to their case and its accompanying decision-making process. Victim impact statements provide an opportunity for victims to have their voices heard during the trial. These statements—which often involve a testament as to how the victimization experience affected the victim’s everyday life, the victim’s feelings toward the offender, and the sentence that the victim would like the offender to receive—are when the victim has the chance to address the court prior to sentencing. Besides being used at sentencing, victim impact statements can also be used at other points throughout the case including during parole hearings, bail hearings, pre-trial release hearings, and during plea bargaining (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2012). A study comparing victims who gave victim impact statements and those who did not, found that both groups had approximately the same level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system. A majority of victims reported being satisfied (30%) when a five-point Likert scale (1=very dissatisfied to 5=very satisfied) was used to assess their level of satisfaction (Erez, Roeger, & Morgan, 1994). Although it would seem that victim impact statements would lead to increased victim involvement in the court system, one study found no evidence of this influence (Davis & Smith, 1994a). In fact, research has shown that victim impact statements can actually be harmful to victims with regard to sentencing, specifically; because victims may be left with unfulfilled expectations of the sentence they expected the offender to receive (Erez, Roeger, & Morgan, 1997).

The role of victim impact statements has also been examined with consideration for how they may influence the actors and decisions made in the courtroom. For example, research has explored the impact of victim impact statements on sentencing outcomes. In general, these statements do not lead to harsher sentencing of offenders (Davis & Smith, 1994b; Erez & Roeger, 1995). Moreover, Davis and Smith (1994b) found that victim impact statements do not
increase criminal justice officials’ attention to the harm a victim may have suffered. In relation to the harm done to victims, when considering the influence victim impact statements have on victims’ lives such as receiving restitution and compensation, there is no evidence to suggest that the court orders these repayments more readily as a result of victim impact statements being given (Erez & Roeger, 1995).

**Satisfaction with Victims’ Services**

In addition to examining the research surrounding victims’ satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its actors, there are also various services provided to crime victims that may influence victims’ satisfaction. These services include programs such as domestic violence shelters, victim-offender mediation, restitution, and other victim-witness assistance programs. One such program is crime victims’ compensation. Victims’ compensation programs vary from state to state, but generally, these programs are in place to reimburse or pay for tangible losses related to an individual’s victimization. These losses could include things such as medical expenses, counseling services, funeral costs, loss of wages or economic support, and crime scene clean-up. Some states’ programs also include compensation for pain and suffering, relocation costs, and loss of personal property, among other losses. Because victims’ compensation programs have the potential to have a positive impact on victims, assessing crime victims’ satisfaction with these programs is important.

The existing research surrounding victims’ compensation can largely be categorized into three overarching areas of interest. Much of the early research explored the need for victims’ compensation (Wolfgang, 1965) as well as demonstrated an overview of the victims’ compensation programs in place and the characteristics and issues associated with these programs (Hoelzel, 1980; McAdams, 1976; Miers, 1983; Ramker & Meagher, 1982). Another area of the literature on victims’ compensation focused on comparative assessments. For
example, McCormack (1991) compared victims’ compensation programs from state to state in an attempt to understand why victims’ compensation application rates are so low and vary from state to state. Other comparative research has concentrated on a larger comparison of victims’ compensation programs from one country to another. Specifically, one study compared structures of the United States’ victims’ compensation programs to those in Australia (Kersh, 1994).

Finally, the victims’ compensation literature has begun to move beyond these descriptive forms of research to examine the relationships between victims’ compensation and other variables. For instance, Fritsch and colleagues (2004) surveyed law enforcement officers in Texas to assess the knowledge officers held about victims’ compensation and what predicted whether or not they advised crime victims of compensation. They found that predictors of informing victims of compensation included the time restrictions felt by the officer, the size of the department, whether the officer had a college degree, the officer’s perception of the capability of their departments liaison for victims, the officer’s perception of support to advise victims, the officer’s perception of the victim, the officer’s knowledge of victims’ compensation, and the source of this knowledge (Fritsch, Caeti, Tobolowsky, & Taylor, 2004).

Other research has examined how victims’ compensation may serve as a therapeutic tool for persons who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder. Specifically, Kunst (2011) was interested in the role of victims’ compensation as a mediating factor between post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and employment. Utilizing a sample of 226 Dutch victims of violence who had applied for victims’ compensation and were employed full-time when they were victimized, the study found that suffering from PTSD was related to unemployment. When the
indirect effect of the level of victims’ compensation was examined, no effect was found (Kunst, 2011).

Scholars have also focused on the variable of victims’ satisfaction and how it relates to victims’ compensation. A study using data from the Florida Crimes Compensation Commission files considered victims who received compensation and their attitudes toward other elements of the criminal justice system. Results indicated that compensated victims had more favorable attitudes towards the Compensation Commission (Doerner & Lab, 1980). Furthermore, non-White, compensated victims were found to have more positive attitudes towards police than those non-White victims whose compensation was denied. In addition, those who received compensation reported they would interact with the Compensation Commission again in the future (Doerner & Lab, 1980). In sum, it appears that victims in this study who received compensation were more satisfied with the program than those who did not receive compensation. This finding suggests that the money itself was influential in determining satisfaction.

In another study, Ristovski and Wertheim (2005) explored the relationship between the receipt of compensation and victims’ satisfaction level with compensation as a type of victim-offender reconciliation. With the use of scenarios, the findings suggest when compensation—including government compensation, ordered compensation from the offender, or voluntary compensation from the offender—was received, the participants reported being more satisfied than those who did not receive compensation. Additionally, those who received compensation from the offender voluntarily were more likely to forgive the offender than those who received other forms of compensation (Ristovski & Wertheim, 2005).
Research has also examined whether victims’ satisfaction with compensation influences victims’ perspectives on other areas of the criminal justice system. Examining the effects of compensation on victims’ satisfaction levels, a study in Britain showed that when compensation was ordered by the court, victims held higher levels of satisfaction with the court system (Shapland, 1984). It is important to note that in this study compensation could come from the offender or a state agency. In this case, satisfaction with the courts was influenced by the court ordering the offender to pay compensation. In addition, victims did feel that compensation provided from the state was important and should continue to be a right for those who qualify for this assistance. They felt the existence of this program reflected a supportive stance towards victims by the criminal justice system (Shapland, 1984).

Although research has begun to examine victims’ compensation and the victims’ satisfaction related to it and with the exception of Kunst (2011) study of its impact on the relationship between employment and PTSD, there has not been an examination of how victims’ compensation may impact various outcomes associated with victimization. It is possible that when victims have a positive interaction with the criminal justice system, it may reduce the negative outcomes of experiencing the initial victimization incident. Specifically, the existing literature has not examined the relationship between satisfaction with victims’ compensation and the possible negative outcome of experiencing a subsequent victimization (i.e., revictimization) Using a therapeutic jurisprudence perspective, it may be that crime victims who have a positive experience with victims’ compensation—represented by satisfaction—may be at a reduced risk of being revictimized.
Recalling the earlier discussion of the prevalence of revictimization, estimates range from 3% to 38% of victims reporting more than one victimization incident (Crime in England and Wales, 2010/2011; Perrault et al., 2010; Truman, 2011b). In addition, research shows that revictimization is evident among victims of both personal and property crimes. For instance, research indicates that revictimization is increasingly common among incidents of assault, intimate partner violence, rape, and burglary.

**Explanations of Revictimization**

Identifying the extent of revictimization is a first step in establishing whether revictimization is occurring at a meaningful level; however, prevalence does not aid in understanding why some victims experience a heightened risk of revictimization. Thus, it is important to explore what might predict the occurrence of revictimization. There are two major theoretical perspectives that are used to explain the existence of revictimization. These explanations are state dependence and risk heterogeneity. Research has utilized these perspectives in order to better comprehend the possible risk factors for revictimization. In knowing what causes revictimization, prevention and intervention can then be developed.

**State Dependence**

State dependence, sometimes referred to as event dependence, suggests that the occurrence of an initial victimization increases the risk of a subsequent victimization occurring (Farrell, Ellingworth, & Pease, 1996; Farrell & Pease, 1997; Farrell, Phillips, & Pease, 1995; Sagovsky & Johnson, 2007; Tseloni & Pease, 2003). Characteristics surrounding the incident, if associated with an increased risk of subsequent victimization, are also known as *boosts* (Pease,
1998; Tseloni & Pease, 2003). Specifically, it may be that the subsequent victimization was pursued based on the information the offender gathered from the victim during the initial victimization (Farrell & Pease, 1997) or from successfully completing the first incident (Tseloni & Pease, 2003). For example, whether or not the offender may return to take something he saw the first time, or if the offender’s familiarity with the property through the completion of the first crime entices him and he takes advantage of this knowledge to commit a subsequent crime may predict whether or not revictimization occurs (Pease, 1998; Sagovsky & Johnson, 2007).

Moreover, the characteristics and actions of the victim and the offender prior to, during, and directly after the first incident may lead to subsequent victimizations (Farrell et al., 1995; Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010a). When considering personal crimes, these characteristics may include the relationship between the victim and the offender, any self-protective action that was taken by the victim during the experience, and whether or not the victim reported the incident. With a focus on property crime, whether the victim replaced stolen items after the initial victimization could determine the likelihood of a subsequent victimization occurring (Pease, 1998; Sagovsky & Johnson, 2007). In sum, being victimized the first time increases the risk of being victimized again.

Research has found support of this notion of state dependence. For example, if a victim fights back by using some type of protective action, the offender will likely perceive the victimization as a difficult task to complete. This protective measure could also deter the offender from targeting this victim again. The idea of using protective actions has been studied among sexual victimization incidents of college women. Daigle et al. (2008) found that using effective self-protective action during a sexual victimization incident may reduce target attractiveness. On the other hand, if a victim does not use a self-protective action, he or she may
be seen as an easy target, and thus be targeted again. Studying repeat incidents of burglary, Sagovsky and Johnson (2007) found support for state dependence in that the initial victimization increased the risk of a subsequent victimization occurring. Specifically, within a two-year time period, households who experienced an initial burglary were 6 times more likely to be burglarized again than those households who had not been burglarized initially (Sagovsky & Johnson, 2007). These findings fall in line with earlier research by Polvi, Looman, Humphries, and Pease (1991) who found that victimized households had 4 times greater the risk of experiencing multiple incidents of burglary within the same year when compared to households who were not victimized for the first time. Moreover, other research has also found support for state dependence for other household crimes such as household property theft and motor vehicle theft when studying longitudinal data over a three-year time period from the NCVS (Averdijk, 2011).

**Risk Heterogeneity**

Contrary to a state dependence explanation, according to risk heterogeneity, the elements that put an individual at risk for an initial victimization, if unchanged, will keep that individual at risk for subsequent victimizations (Farrell et al., 1996; Farrell & Pease, 1997; Farrell et al., 1995; Fisher et al., 2010; Sagovsky & Johnson, 2007; Tseloni & Pease, 2003). Pease (1998) and Tseloni and Pease (2003) refer to these continued risk factors as flags. An individual will be a suitable target and remain a suitable target if nothing is done to change risk factors that put him or her at risk for victimization initially.

Risk factors can include demographics, behavioral characteristics, genetics, values and beliefs, and other individual-level factors. In general, research often links risk heterogeneity to individuals’ lifestyles and daily routine activities. For example, drinking alcohol (Abbey,
Zawacki, Buck, Clinton, & McAuslan, 2001; Combs-Lane & Smith, 2002; Schwartz & Pitts, 1995; Siegel & Williams, 2003; Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999) and using drugs (Cass, 2007; Fisher & Wilkes, 2003; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2002) have been found to be related to an increased risk of being sexually victimized for college women. These same behaviors have also been shown to be risk factors for experiencing more than one sexual victimization incident (Daigle et al., 2008; Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010b; Raghavan et al., 2004). Thus, women who engage in these behaviors may be at an increased risk of experiencing an initial sexual victimization. Furthermore, if the behaviors continue after the initial incident, they may be at a heightened risk of experiencing a subsequent sexual victimization. The idea of risk heterogeneity can also be applied to property crimes. Properties that appear to have wealth or value and have decreased levels of surveillance and security as well as those that are in areas that provide an easy getaway demonstrate attractive targets for offenders. Thus, these properties will have an increased risk of revictimization if these traits continue to be apparent after the initial victimization has taken place (Pease, 1998; Sagovsky & Johnson, 2007).

**Risk Factors for Revictimization**

Beyond the explicit tests of state dependence and risk heterogeneity (along with the example of alcohol), research has found support for various characteristics and behaviors that may increase the risk of experiencing revictimization. Individual-level, neighborhood-level, and household-level risk factors have been explored in the existing literature.

**Individual-Level Risk Factors**

**Demographics**

Demographic characteristics including sex, race, age, marital status, and socioeconomic status have all been found to be associated with experiencing revictimization. Differences
between males and females and their risk of experiencing revictimization have been explored. With the exception of sexual revictimization, males are more likely than females to experience more than one victimization incident (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995; Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998; Tseloni & Pease, 2003). Race has also been considered with regard to risk in the revictimization literature. A study conducted by Tseloni and Pease (2003) considered risk factors for repeat incidents of personal crime. The scholars found that Caucasians are at an increased risk of experiencing multiple victimizations when compared to Asian/Pacific Islanders, African-Americans, and other races (Tseloni & Pease, 2003). Specifically in the sexual victimization literature, when African-American women were compared to other races, they have been found to have the highest risk for sexual revictimization incidents (Classen et al., 2005; Urquiza & Goodlin-Jones, 1994). With regard to age, individuals who are younger are at a heightened risk of experiencing subsequent victimization than older persons (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995; Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998; Outlaw et al., 2002; Perrault et al., 2010; Tseloni, 2000). In addition, research examining whether marital status is a risk factor for revictimization has found that being single, separated, or divorced all increase an individual’s risk of experiencing more than one victimization (Perrault et al., 2010; Tseloni, 2000; Tseloni & Pease, 2003). Lauritsen and Quinet (1995) and Outlaw and colleagues (2002) found support for socioeconomic status being a risk factor for revictimization.

*Risky Lifestyles/Routine Activities*

In addition to demographic characteristics, other factors regarding behaviors and daily routines have also been considered when studying the risk factors for revictimization. Research has shown that unemployment (Mukherjee & Carach, 1998), the frequency of being away from home at night (Tseloni, 2000; Tseloni & Pease, 2003) and utilizing public transportation in the
evening and night hours (Mukherjee & Carach, 1998; Tseloni & Pease, 2003) are both associated with increased risk of experiencing subsequent victimizations. Other behaviors such as offending and delinquency (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995; Wittebrood & Nieuwbeerta, 2000), hanging out with delinquent peers (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995), and consuming alcohol (Raghavan et al., 2004) are all predictive factors of revictimization. When considering sexual revictimization in particular, various studies have found a link between experiencing childhood sexual assault and being a victim of subsequent sexual assault as an adult (Arata, 2000; Brousseau, Hebert, & Bergeron, 2012; de Haas, van Berlo, Bakker, & Vanwesenbeeck, 2012; Desai, Arias, Thompson, & Basile, 2002; Filipas & Ullman, 2006; Messman & Long, 1996; Messman-Moore & Long, 2002; Messman-Moore, Long, & Siegfried, 2000; Roodman & Clum, 2001; Siegel & Williams, 2003). In this sense, being previously victimized may increase an individual’s risk of being revictimized in the future.

**Neighborhood-Level Risk Factors**

Although a large portion of the research on the risk of revictimization focuses on individual-level traits, research has also considered neighborhood characteristics and their relationship to revictimization risk. Neighborhoods that contain larger numbers of single-parent households (Osborn, Ellingworth, Hope, & Trickett, 1996), are located in urban settings (Tseloni, 2000; Tseloni & Pease, 2003; Wittebrood & Nieuwbeerta, 2000), and experience increased levels of disorder (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995; Outlaw et al., 2002) create an increased risk for revictimization for the people who live there.

**Household-Level Risk Factors**

In addition to these neighborhood-level characteristics, there are also risk factors within the household that may influence the risk of being victimized more than once. Tseloni (2000)
and Perrault et al. (2010) found that household income was associated with revictimization. Specifically, households with low income were at greater risk of experiencing crimes against persons (Tseloni, 2000; Tseloni & Pease, 2003). On the other hand, an increased risk of being the victim of property crimes was found among households with high income levels (Perrault et al., 2010). Additionally, having children in the household also increase revictimization risk (Tseloni, 2000). Renting and the length of time spent living in the household—specifically a short amount of time—also increase the risk of revictimization (Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998; Osborn et al., 1996; Perrault et al., 2010).

**Consequences of Revictimization**

Although it is essential to understand the possible explanations and risk factors associated with why revictimization occurs, it is equally important to understand what types of negative consequences could be associated with these experiences. Research has shown that individuals who experience a victimization incident commonly experience negative outcomes related to their victimization. Similarly, those who experience revictimization also report comparable negative consequences. For instance, multiple sexual victimization experiences are associated with depression (Casey & Nurius, 2005; Messman-Moore et al., 2000), self-blame (Filipas & Ullman, 2006), anxiety (Messman-Moore et al., 2000), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Casey & Nurius, 2005; Filipas & Ullman, 2006; Gidycz, Coble, Latham, & Layman, 1993; Messman-Moore et al., 2000; Walsh et al., 2012), and binge drinking (Casey & Nurius, 2005).

As discussed previously, victims’ compensation provides financial support for monetary burdens such as medical costs, counseling, funeral expenses, lost wages and economic support, and crime scene clean-up. Perhaps by providing compensation to crime victims, victims’ compensation may reduce the likelihood of revictimization and the consequences associated with
it from occurring altogether through promoting the well-being of victims. A study by Feldthusen and colleagues (2000) found that interviews with sexual abuse victims who applied for compensation or restitution yielded support for positive outcomes associated with therapeutic jurisprudence ideals. Victims who applied for government compensation felt the amount of the reward they received symbolized recognition and understanding of their suffering, thus representing a therapeutic outcome. Although only 34% reported satisfaction with compensation, almost half of the victims reported overall satisfaction with their general experience citing relief, validation, empowerment, and closure (Feldthusen et al., 2000). With the positive outcomes associated with compensation shown here, this study demonstrates the importance of crime victims having a therapeutic experience with the criminal justice system in order to aid in alleviating the risk of experiencing negative outcomes such as additional victimizations and the consequences that accompany them.

**Victims’ Compensation & Revictimization Risk Reduction**

As Shapland (1984) suggests, victims felt that compensation provided by the state was important because it promoted the support of victims by the system. Therefore, if victims feel support from the criminal justice system, they may be more likely to be satisfied with the services they receive, which would constitute a therapeutic experience. With the possible benefits of victims’ compensation and a positive experience with the program, it is possible that applicants’ satisfaction and use of victims’ compensation may lead to a reduction in the risk of being revictimized. Perhaps by providing the means to get counseling and medical attention, for example, victims’ compensation could emotionally and physically rebalance individuals. For instance, research has shown that mental health factors such as depression and having an antisocial personality can be predictors of subsequent victimization (Burnam et al., 1988). Thus,
if mental health is improved following an initial victimization incident by providing the financial means for counseling services, it could reduce the likelihood of a subsequent victimization event. Ideally, the hope is that if individuals are satisfied with victims’ compensation and its process—meaning victims are having positive experiences with the program and being provided with the financial compensation to aid in meeting their needs following a victimization, then revictimization risk can be reduced. This reduction of risk reflects the idea of risk heterogeneity. That is, those factors that put a person at risk for an initial victimization, if altered, may decrease the chances of experiencing a subsequent victimization (Farrell et al., 1996; Farrell & Pease, 1997; Farrell et al., 1995; Fisher et al., 2010; Sagovsky & Johnson, 2007; Tseloni & Pease, 2003). If the continuation of risk can be disrupted through a therapeutic experience with victims’ compensation, it may produce change in risk factors, thus a possible change in revictimization risk.

On the other hand, if the individual is not satisfied with the victims’ compensation process or the amount of money they received, then they are possibly being revictimized by the system and may suffer further emotional and mental instability or trauma. This perpetuated harm may create an increased risk for future victimization. The lack of compensation, thus the lack of support and dissatisfaction with the individual’s experience, could lead to victims having experiences with the system that were not therapeutic. These types of interactions could result in other negative outcomes, such as revictimization, by further harming these individuals. For instance, Herman’s work (1997, 2003) suggests that the mental health of victims may be affected by the criminal justice system. Specifically, participation in the court process produced increased symptoms of PTSD among victims. Furthermore, victims may experience fear related to their safety and possible offender retaliation due to their involvement in the case (Herman,
Research has shown that victimization is associated with PTSD (Kilpatrick & Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick, Edmunds, & Seymour, 1992; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Resick, 1993; Simon, 1995), fear (Resick, 1993; Winick, 2007), and anxiety (Resick, 1993; Storch, 2003; Winick, 2007). Thus, when victims are further harmed by their participation in the system (e.g. victims’ compensation) and experience these risk factors as Herman (1997, 2003) suggests, then the likelihood of being revictimized may be increased. Moreover, victims who participate in the criminal justice system, through victims’ compensation for example, who have a negative experience with the system may turn to substance use as a coping mechanism. Because alcohol consumption (Abbey, Zawacki, Buck, Clinton, & McAuslan, 2001; Combs-Lane & Smith, 2002; Schwartz & Pitts, 1995; Siegel & Williams, 2003; Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999) and drug use (Cass, 2007; Fisher & Wilkes, 2003; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2002) are risk factors for victimization, perhaps the harm by the system will lead to these behaviors and increase the risk for future victimization. Furthermore, applicants’ satisfaction with victims’ compensation with regard to lost wages or economic support may also have an effect on revictimization. As discussed previously, there are substantial tangible costs associated with victimization (McCollister et al., 2010). It could be that when applicants have a loss of income or loss of economic support and do not receive aid in this area from victims’ compensation, they are unable to have the financial means to adequately protect themselves. For example, home and/or personal security measures (e.g. locks, security systems) may be unobtainable with the lack of monetary funds. Without the ability to provide protection for themselves and their property, applicants of victims’ compensation may be at an increased risk for revictimization. Existing research has not considered this revictimization outcome and how victims’ compensation may be potentially beneficial or harmful to reducing future victimization experiences.
Current Study

To examine the possible therapeutic impacts the criminal justice system may have on victims and their loved ones, the current study seeks to make the connection between victims’ compensation applicants’ experiences with the criminal justice system and those experiences’ influence on revictimization—any subsequent victimization since applying for victims’ compensation. Interactions with the police, the prosecutor, victims’ specialist, VWAPs, and victims’ compensation program will be assessed through a therapeutic jurisprudence lens in hopes to better understand how victims’ experiences with the criminal justice system may influence the risk of experiencing revictimization, one potential negative outcome of victimization. In doing so, the following research questions will be addressed.

1. Does satisfaction with victims’ compensation vary according to revictimization status?
2. Does satisfaction with the CJ system and its actors vary according to revictimization status?
3. Is whether compensated and the amount of victims’ compensation received associated with revictimization?
4. Does satisfaction and amount of victims’ compensation received predict revictimization among applicants for victims’ compensation?
CHAPTER V
Methods

Data

Data used in the current study were collected through the *Voice of the Victim: Statewide Analysis of Victim Compensation* research project, which consisted of both a telephone survey and a file review.\(^2\) The telephone survey was comprised of 48 questions which sought to measure the use of and satisfaction with the victims’ compensation program in Georgia by those who had applied. Respondents were asked questions pertaining to their experiences with the program—including the application process and interactions with those involved in the program—and their views of and satisfaction with the victims’ compensation program. Applicants were also asked questions about other actors/elements in the criminal justice system with whom they may have come into contact (i.e. victims’ specialist, VWAP, police, prosecutor). In addition, items were also included to reflect the participants’ feelings towards the appeals process in the compensation program and other needs that may not have been provided by the program as well as health issues, revictimization experiences, and demographic information (Daigle et al., 2013).

The file data were coded from the telephone survey participants’ victims’ compensation files at the Criminal Justice Coordinating Counsel of Georgia (CJCC). Information was collected regarding the total amount of compensation requested and received as well as the type of specific benefit areas for which the applicant was applying. The type of crime experienced, information about the victim and the offender, the status or outcome of the compensation claim, and any documentation dates were also recorded (Daigle et al., 2013).

\(^2\) The project also included focus groups held in multiple locations throughout the state of Georgia. The focus group data, however, is not utilized in the current study.
Sample

The sample for the current study included a telephone survey of 500 people who applied for compensation in Georgia. Using information supplied by the CJCC, individuals who had applied for victims’ compensation in Georgia between January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2010, including victims and claimants, were randomly selected to participate in the telephone survey. Only adults were included in the sample. Originally, information on 7,991 individuals who had applied for compensation was provided by the CJCC (Daigle et al., 2013). Using a random-number generator, the initial sample of 500 persons was selected from the application database. With only 38 completed interviews from this first selection—due to disconnected or wrong numbers in the database—the random selection process was used until the preferred total sample of 500 was met. Individuals were sent letters that detailed the purpose of the study and included the consent form in advance of being contacted by telephone.³ Consent forms and letters were sent to a total of 4,841 individuals before the 500 person sample was fulfilled.⁴ Approximately 53% of these persons had working phone numbers. For individuals who were reachable and agreed to participate, telephone surveys were then conducted by trained personnel at the Social Science Research Center (SSRC) at Old Dominion University. Phone calls began the week of August 12, 2011 and were completed March 28, 2012. Before being categorized as a non-response, each phone number was called a total of 10 times. The surveys produced a response rate of 20.2% when non-English speakers were excluded, and 19.4% when these individuals were included (Daigle et al., 2013). Those who were non-English speakers were not included in

³ In addition to the letter and consent form for the telephone survey being sent by mail in advance, individuals who were contacted by the Social Science Research Center (SSRC) at Old Dominion University were also given the opportunity to request another hard copy of these items be mailed to them. Furthermore, they were given the option to visit a website where these items and additional information were posted as well.

⁴ Although the mailing addresses were taken directly from the CJCC’s application database, a total of 954 letters were returned and deemed undeliverable due to incorrect addresses, a change in address with no forwarding address, etc.
the sample. Other victims’ satisfaction research has found similar response rates with Tewksbury and West (2001) and Kunst (2011) reporting response rates of 15% and 19.8%, respectively. These rates are most often a result of agencies not having current contact information in their records. When compared to all eligible participants, the respondents in the sample were more likely to be White, female, and victims rather than claimants. In addition, with regard to the type of victimization for which the application was being filed, individuals in the sample were more likely to have indicated murder and robbery incidents and less likely to have indicated domestic violence and assault incidents when compared to the 7,991 individuals who served as the eligible participants (Daigle et al., 2013).

The sample was predominantly female (63.2%), and approximately half of the respondents were non-White (49.7%). The average age of the respondents was 42 years. Approximately 41% of the sample were cohabitating or married. Less than half (48.1%) were employed, and about 44% had private health insurance. Slightly less than half (46.2%) of the sample were claimants (those individuals who filed a victims’ compensation claim, but were not the direct victim of the incident). About 35% of respondents reported drinking alcohol during the past 30 days. With regard to the initial victimization experience, 16.5% of the incidents took place in a rural setting. Approximately 58% of the sample indicated a household income above the poverty line (>$22,000).
Table 1: Sample Descriptives—Demographics & Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>% or Mean (n or S.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=female)</td>
<td>63.2% (314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (1= non-White)</td>
<td>49.7% (245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.68 (14.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitating (1=married or living with a partner)</td>
<td>41.4% (206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Health Insurance</td>
<td>43.9% (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Applied (1=claimant)</td>
<td>46.2% (231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyles/Routine Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>48.1% (240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink alcohol</td>
<td>35.4% (175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban vs. Rural (1=rural)</td>
<td>16.5% (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (1=above $22,000)</td>
<td>58.2% (259)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 27% of the sample reported being victimized since they applied for compensation. In general, the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the criminal justice system (range=5.00 to 20.00 with higher scores indicating greater dissatisfaction; mean=9.00). With regards to their case, a majority of the sample (72%) reported being satisfied with the police. These percentages are in line with other research on victims’ satisfaction with the police by Shapland (1984) and Brandl and Horvath (1991) with satisfaction found at 70% and 74%, respectively. Seventy-four percent of the sample said they were satisfied with the prosecutor in regards to their case. This satisfaction level is similar to Kelly’s (1984) work that found 69% of victims were satisfied with the prosecutor. Slightly more than three-fourths (78.9%) of the sample reported being satisfied with the victims’ specialist. Over 81% of the
sample indicated they were satisfied with the VWAP, and 67.3% of the sample was satisfied with victims’ compensation. Another way of examining satisfaction with victims’ compensation is considering whether or not a respondent would apply for victims’ compensation again. A large majority of the sample (86.8%) said that they would apply for victims’ compensation again. The total mean dollar amount compensated was $3,974.89; however, approximately 28% of the sample had their claim denied—meaning they did not receive any funds from the victims’ compensation program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Sample Descriptives—Revictimization &amp; Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revictimized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the CJ System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with CJ Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Prosecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with Prosecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Victims’ Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Victims’ Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with Victims’ Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with VWAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with VWAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Victims’ Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Victims’ Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with Victims’ Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for Victims’ Compensation Again (1=yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Victims’ Compensation Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dollars Compensated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim Denied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

**Dependent Variable**

*Revictimization.* To determine whether or not individuals who had applied for compensation were subsequently revictimized after they applied for compensation, persons were asked if they experienced four different types of subsequent victimizations since applying for compensation. They were asked, (1) “Since the date you applied for compensation, has anyone attempted to or broken into your home or where you are staying?”, (2) “Since the date you applied for compensation, have you had something belonging to you stolen (such as clothing, electronics, wallet, laptop, cars, motor vehicles, etc)?”, (3) “Since the date you applied for compensation, have you been attacked or threatened, such as being punched, grabbed, or choked or with a knife, gun, baseball bat, or with scissors?”, and (4) “Since the date you applied for compensation, have you been forced to engage in any unwanted sexual activity?” Participants indicated either a yes or no response to each. The responses to these items were added together and recoded to create a general revictimization measure that measures whether or not a person experienced a victimization after applying for compensation with 0=no and 1=yes.

**Independent Variables**

*Overall Satisfaction.* A continuous variable assessing respondents’ overall satisfaction with the criminal justice system was created by summing the satisfaction with compensation, satisfaction with victim specialist, satisfaction with VWAP, satisfaction with police, and satisfaction with prosecutor variables. Higher scores indicated increased levels of overall dissatisfaction with the criminal justice system.

*Satisfaction with Police.* Respondents were asked, “Overall, how satisfied were you with the police in regards to your case?” to measure their satisfaction level with the police. Responses
were originally coded on a four point Likert scale of 1=very satisfied and 4=very unsatisfied. This item response set was collapsed and recoded to a dichotomous dummy variable representing 0=satisfied and 1=dissatisfied.5

*Sat\textit{isfaction with Prosecutor}.* Participants were asked to indicate their level of overall satisfaction with the prosecutor on their case. They were asked “*Overall, how satisfied were you with the prosecutor in regards to your case?*” Responses were originally coded on a four point Likert scale with 1=very satisfied and 4=very unsatisfied. This satisfaction measure was dichotomized into a dummy variable and recoded to reflect 0=satisfied and 1=dissatisfied.

*Sat\textit{isfaction with Victims’ Specialist}.* Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the victim specialist. The item “*Overall, how satisfied were you with the victim specialist?*” was used with original responses ranging on a four point Likert scale of 1=very satisfied and 4=very unsatisfied. Participants who did not speak with a victim specialist were excluded from this measure. The responses were collapsed to create a dichotomous dummy variable and recoded to the categories of 0=satisfied and 1=dissatisfied.

*Sat\textit{isfaction with VWAP}.* A measure of the participant’s overall satisfaction with the VWAP was assessed through the item, “*Overall, how satisfied were you with the VWAP (victim’s advocate) who assisted you in your case?*” Responses were originally coded on a four point Likert-type scale in which 1=very satisfied and 4=very unsatisfied. Respondents who did not interact with a VWAP were excluded from this measure. The measure was then dichotomized into a dummy variable and recoded to reflect 0=satisfied and 1=dissatisfied.

---

5 The four point Likert scale was collapsed into a dichotomous variable for the items of satisfaction with police, satisfaction with prosecutor, satisfaction with victims’ specialist, satisfaction with VWAP, and satisfaction with compensation. This was done because very few respondents indicated they were very dissatisfied with any of these actors or services. The variation appeared to be between satisfaction and dissatisfaction; hence, dichotomous indicators were created to reflect this variation.
Satisfaction with Victims’ Compensation. Participants were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the victims’ compensation process through the use of the item, “Overall, how satisfied are you with your experience with the compensation process?” Responses were originally coded on a four point Likert-type scale with 1=very satisfied and 4=very unsatisfied. This measure’s responses were collapsed and dichotomized into a dummy variable. Responses were recoded to 0=satisfied and 1=dissatisfied.

Apply for Victims’ Compensation Again. As an alternative measure for satisfaction with victims’ compensation, participants were asked “Would you apply for victim compensation again?” Responses were coded as 0=no and 1=yes.

Total Dollars Compensated. Through the use of the file review, the total dollar amount that the participant was compensated was recorded.

Claim Denied. Whether or not respondents’ claim for victims’ compensation was denied was coded from their file. This item was coded 0=no and 1=yes.

Control Variables

Gender. Research generally shows that males are more often the victims of revictimization when compared to women with the exception of sexual victimization experiences (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995; Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998). To account for gender’s relationship to revictimization, the respondent’s gender was recorded according to his or her file so that 0=male and 1=female.

Race. Minorities are found to be at higher risk of experiencing revictimization than others. For example, in the sexual revictimization research, African-American females reported the highest rates of sexual revictimization incidents when compared to other racial groups (Classen et al., 2005; Urquiza & Goodlin-Jones, 1994). In order to assess this relationship, respondents were
asked to identify their race during the survey by being asked, “What race best describes you?” Responses were recoded to reflect 0=White and 1=non-White.

Age. When compared to older people, younger people are found to be at an increased risk of experiencing revictimization (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995; Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998; Outlaw et al., 2002; Perrault et al., 2010; Tseloni, 2000). In order to assess this relationship, the age of the respondent was recorded from their file.

Cohabitating. Existing literature suggests that those who are single or living alone are at greater risk of experiencing subsequent victimizations than others (Lasley & Rosenbaum, 1988; Perrault et al., 2010). Because of this, respondents were asked, “What is your current marital status?” This item was recoded to indicate whether or not an individual was cohabitating or not with 0=not married or living with a partner and 1=married or living with a partner.

Private Health Insurance. This item serves as a measure of wealth. Because socioeconomic status has been associated with revictimization (Lauritsen and Quinet, 1995; Outlaw et al., 2002), a measure was included to account for this relationship. Respondents were asked “At the time you applied for compensation, were you covered by? (check all that apply)” Response options included private health insurance, Medicaid, Medicare, worker’s compensation, dental insurance, and burial insurance. These responses were recoded to reflect 0=no and 1=yes.

Who Applied. When applying for compensation, either the victim or someone on behalf of the victim—the claimant—can apply. For instance, a claimant may apply for compensation if they had a loved one who was murdered. Based on the information in the individual’s file during the file review, a measure of whether the participant was the victim or the claimant was recorded. Victims were coded as 0 and claimants were coded as 1.
Employed. Unemployment has been linked to an increased risk of experiencing revictimization (Mukherjee & Carach, 1998). In order to assess employment status and its relationship with revictimization, participants were asked “Are you currently employed full-time outside of the home?” Responses were coded 0=no and 1=yes.

Drink Alcohol. Specifically in the sexual victimization literature, research suggests that alcohol consumption is related to subsequent sexual victimizations. When alcohol is being used, there is an increased risk of women experiencing sexual revictimization (Messman-Moore & Long, 2002; Raghavan et. al., 2004; Siegel & Williams, 2003). To assess alcohol use, respondents were asked, “During the past 30 days, on how many days did you drink alcohol?” Responses to this item included none, one day, two or three days, one day a week, two days a week, three to five days a week, and every day or almost every day. These responses were recoded to reflect whether or not an individual drank alcohol or not with 0=no and 1=yes.

Urban vs. Rural. Research shows that urban neighborhoods have been associated with revictimization (Tseloni, 2000; Tseloni & Pease, 2003; Wittebrood & Nieuwbeerta, 2000). To account for this relationship, the county in which the victimization incident occurred was recorded from the participants’ file. This item was recoded to reflect 0=urban and 1=rural.

Income. Studies have shown that household income may serve as a risk factor for revictimization. Risk for subsequent victimization differs for those of high household income and low household income depending on the type of revictimization—property versus personal (Perrault et al., 2010; Tseloni, 2000). To account for this relationship between income and revictimization, participants were asked to indicate their household income through the item, “What is your current total household income?” Responses were recoded to reflect above and below the poverty level with 0=$22,000 and below and 1=above $22,000.
Analyses

Analyses were conducted in two stages. In the first stage, bivariate analyses, including cross tabulations with chi-square test and independent samples t-tests, were conducted in order to establish if significant relationships exist between each of the independent variables and revictimization. Based off of the bivariate analysis, multivariate logistic regression models were run to examine the potential relationships between satisfaction, use of victims’ compensation, and revictimization, while controlling for other relevant variables (Weinberg & Abramowitz, 2008).

Multivariate logistic regression analyses were run in order to determine the relationship between variables when the outcome variable is a dichotomous variable or does not have a normal distribution (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). Multiple independent variables can be included in this analysis. Furthermore, the main effect between the main predictor and the outcome variable can be determined while controlling for other possible variables that may predict the outcome variable (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). Multivariate regression models were conducted for the satisfaction measures that were significant on the bivariate level. These models assess whether or not the victims’ experiences with each of the actors/elements of the criminal justice system are associated with revictimization, and the direction of the relationship.
CHAPTER VI
Results

Bivariate Results

In the first step of the analyses to address research questions one, two, and three, bivariate analyses with each of the independent and control variables and the outcome variable of revictimization were conducted. An independent samples t-test was run in order to assess the relationship between overall satisfaction with the criminal justice system and revictimization (see Table 3). There was no significant difference in the means between groups on the dependent variable of revictimization for overall satisfaction with the criminal justice system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revictimization</th>
<th>Mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.75 (4.12)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.91 (3.56)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-1.419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table 4 depicts the bivariate relationships between satisfaction with criminal justice actors (i.e. the police and the prosecutor) and revictimization. Results of the chi-square analysis indicate a significant association between satisfaction with the police and revictimization. Although 23.2% of respondents who were satisfied with the police reported being revictimized, 34.6% who were dissatisfied with the police were revictimized. These findings show that the odds of being dissatisfied with the police and experiencing revictimization are 1.94 times the odds of being satisfied with the police and experiencing revictimization. Thus, those who were
dissatisfied with the police were at a heightened risk of being revictimized compared with respondents who were satisfied with the police. There was not a significant relationship found between satisfaction with the prosecutor and revictimization.

| Table 4: Bivariate Analyses—Satisfaction with CJ Actors & Revictimization |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| **Satisfaction with Police**    | **Satisfaction with Prosecutor** |
| **Satisfied**                   | **Dissatisfied** |
| %                               | %                | %                               | %                |
| n                               | n                | n                               | n                |
| **Revictimization**             |                 | **Revictimization**             |
| Yes                             |                 | **Yes**                         |                 |
| 23.2%                           | 34.6%           | 21.3%                           | 30.7%           |
| 78                               | 45               | 53                              | 27               |
| No                              |                 | **No**                          |
| 76.8%                           | 65.4%           | 78.7%                           | 69.3%           |
| 258                              | 85               | 196                             | 61               |
| Pearson Chi-Square              | 6.271*          | 3.171                           |

Bivariate analyses were also conducted for the independent variables representing satisfaction with victims’ services (i.e. the victims’ specialists and the VWAP) and revictimization. The results of the chi-square analysis are shown in Table 5. Findings indicate a significant relationship between satisfaction with victims’ specialists and revictimization. Of those who were satisfied with the victims’ specialist, 22.4% were revictimized; however, 35.9% of those who were dissatisfied with the victims’ specialist were revictimized. When the odds ratio is calculated, the odds of being dissatisfied with the victims’ specialist and being revictimized is 1.75 times the odds of being satisfied with the victims’ specialist and being revictimized. These results show that respondents who were dissatisfied with the victims’ specialist were at greater risk of experiencing revictimization than those who were satisfied with the victims’ specialist. The bivariate analysis of satisfaction with the VWAP and experiencing revictimization revealed no evidence of a significant relationship between these two variables.
Findings from the chi-square analyses between variables expressing satisfaction with victims’ compensation (i.e. victims’ compensation and apply for victims’ compensation again) and revictimization are reported in Table 6. Neither satisfaction with victims’ compensation or whether or not the victims’ compensation applicant would apply for compensation again were found to have a significant relationship with revictimization.

A chi-square test and an independent samples t-test were conducted to assess the relationship between satisfaction with the victims’ compensation process and revictimization (see Table 7). As shown, there was not a significant difference in means between the groups on
the revictimization outcome measure for the items of whether or not the victims’ compensation claim was denied and the total dollars the applicant was compensated.⁶

| Table 7: Bivariate Analyses—Satisfaction with Compensation Process & Revictimization |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                                   | Claim Denied | Total Dollars Compensated |
|                                   | Yes (%) | No (%) | Mean (s.d.) |
| Revictimization                   |         |         |           |
| Yes                               | 27.6 | 25.6 | $3,475.29 ($3,323.72) |
|                                  | 34  | 80   | 130         |
| No                                | 72.4 | 74.4 | $4,135.27 ($5,538.76) |
|                                  | 89  | 232  | 361         |
| Pearson Chi-Square                | 0.183  |     |             |

Bivariate analyses were also conducted for each of the control variables and revictimization. These findings are displayed in Table 8. Results of these analyses suggest two demographic variables are associated with revictimization. Although 21.8% of those who were married or living with a partner experienced revictimization, 30% of those who were not married or living with a partner were revictimized. The odds of being married or living with a partner and being revictimized were .65 times the odds of not being married or living with the partner and being revictimized. Thus, those who were cohabitating were at a decreased risk of being revictimized compared to those who were not cohabitating. In addition, of those in the sample

---

⁶ To consider a sample that consisted only of victims, bivariate analyses were conducted between the satisfaction variables and revictimization when the sample was split into two groups, victims and claimants. The results of the victim-only analyses were similar to the full sample results with the only significant relationships found between satisfaction with the police and revictimization and satisfaction with the victims’ specialist and revictimization. Because the sample was approximately half victims/half claimants, split sample multivariate-level models could not be conducted due to a reduction in sample size.
who were claimants, 21.2% were revictimized; however, 31.5% of those who were victims were revictimized. Moreover, the odds of being a claimant and experiencing revictimization were .59 times the odds of the being a victim and experiencing revictimization. These findings suggest respondents who were claimants were at a decreased risk of being revictimized compared with those who were victims. The demographic variables of gender, race, age, and having private health insurance were not significantly associated with revictimization.

Shown in Table 9, two lifestyle/routine activities were assessed along with neighborhood- and household-level measures. Regarding employment, 22.2% of respondents who were employed and 31% who were unemployed experienced revictimization. The odds of being employed and experiencing revictimization were .63 times the odds of being unemployed and experiencing revictimization. Therefore, applicants who were employed were at a lower risk of being revictimized than those who were unemployed. Another lifestyles/routine activities variable of whether or not a respondent drank alcohol in the past 30 days was significantly related to revictimization. Although 22.9% of respondents who did not report drinking alcohol experienced revictimization, 34.3% of those who did drink were revictimized. The odds of drinking alcohol and experiencing revictimization were 1.75 times the odds of not drinking alcohol and experiencing revictimization. Thus, applicants who drank alcohol were more likely to be revictimized than those who did not drink. The neighborhood-level measure of whether the initial victimization incident took place in an urban versus rural setting and the household-level measure of income were not significantly related to experiencing revictimization.
### Table 8: Bivariate Analyses—Demographics & Revictimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cohabiting</th>
<th>Private Health Insurance</th>
<th>Who Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mean (s.d.)</td>
<td>Married or living with a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revictimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>41.02 (13.92)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>41.86 (14.14)</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square or t</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>4.102*</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>6.646**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Bivariate Analyses—Additional Control Variables & Revictimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L/RAT</th>
<th>Neighborhood-level</th>
<th>Household-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Drink Alcohol</td>
<td>Urban versus Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revictimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.938*</td>
<td>7.467**</td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01
**Multivariate Results**

Based on the results of the bivariate analyses, multivariate logistic regression analyses were conducted for the multivariate portion of the analyses. One model was run for each of the two satisfaction variables (i.e. satisfaction with police, satisfaction with victims’ specialist) that were significantly related to the dependent variable, revictimization. In addition, because the sample consisted of all victims’ compensation applicants and because the victims’ compensation program may influence the applicants’ view of other aspects of the criminal justice systems, whether or not the applicant would apply for compensation again was included in the regression models. Control variables, which were significantly associated with revictimization on the bivariate level, were also included in the models. These measures include cohabiting, employed, who applied, and drinking alcohol.

The first multivariate model was run to assess the relationship between satisfaction with the police and revictimization. This regression analysis yielded multiple significant relationships, shown in Table 10. The findings indicate that satisfaction with the police is associated with revictimization, holding all other variables constant. The odds of being dissatisfied with the police and experiencing revictimization are 1.645 times the odds of being satisfied with the police and experiencing revictimization. In addition, the control variables of employed and alcohol consumption are also related to revictimization on the multivariate level. Being employed reduced the odds of revictimization by 40%. The odds of drinking alcohol and experiencing revictimization are 1.687 times the odds of not drinking alcohol and experiencing revictimization. The variables of apply for compensation again, cohabiting, and who applied were not significant on the multivariate level.
The second multivariate logistic regression model examined the association between satisfaction with the victims’ specialist and revictimization. Results are shown in Table 11. Only one variable was significant in this model. Holding all else constant, satisfaction with the victims’ specialist was significantly related to being revictimized. Being dissatisfied with the victims’ specialist increased the odds of revictimization by 1.912 times.
Table 11: Logistic Regression Analysis for Satisfaction with Victims’ Specialist & Revictimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>O.R. (95% C.I.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Victims' Specialist (1=dissatisfied)</td>
<td>.648* (.309)</td>
<td>1.912 (1.044 - 3.503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for Compensation Again (1=yes)</td>
<td>-.029 (.309)</td>
<td>.971 (.449 – 2.103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (1=married or living with a partner)</td>
<td>-.139 (.260)</td>
<td>.870 (.523 – 1.449)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Applied (1=claimant)</td>
<td>-.209 (.262)</td>
<td>.812 (.486 – 1.356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-.438 (.257)</td>
<td>.645 (.390 – 1.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink alcohol</td>
<td>.248 (.269)</td>
<td>1.282 (.757 – 2.170)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 Loglikelihood               379.606
Nagelkerke R Square            .045
Chi-Square                     10.625

*p<.05
CHAPTER VII
Discussion & Conclusions

Based on the results of the current study, victims’ compensation applicants’ satisfaction with the different actors, programs and services provided through the participation with the criminal justice system can have a positive and therapeutic impact on victims of crime and their loved ones. In turn, these positive experiences and interaction can alleviate, or at the very least not facilitate, future victimization. The current study yielded five major findings supporting this conclusion.

First, overall, applicants of victims’ compensation were satisfied with various actors of the criminal justice system and victims’ compensation. A majority of the sample reported being satisfied with the police (72%) and the prosecutor (74%). These levels of satisfaction are consistent with other studies that have found that most victims are satisfied with the police (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; Shapland, 1984; Skogan, 2005; Tewksbury & West, 2001) and the prosecutor (Kelly, 1984; Kilpatrick et al., 1998). Additionally, descriptive statistics revealed that applicants were satisfied with the victims’ specialist (78.7%), VWAPs (81.3%), and victims’ compensation (67.3%). The fact that satisfaction levels among applicants of victims’ compensation are high shows that, in general, the criminal justice system and its entities are at the very least sufficient in creating positive perceptions by victims and their loved ones with whom they come into contact, which falls in line with the ideals of therapeutic jurisprudence.

Second, satisfaction with the police serves as a protective factor for experiencing revictimization. The bivariate analysis of satisfaction with the police and revictimization revealed a negative relationship between satisfaction with the police and revictimization—meaning dissatisfaction was associated with experiencing revictimization. This relationship was also found when multivariate analyses were conducted. Applicants who were satisfied with the
police had reduced odds of being revictimized compared with those who were dissatisfied with the police, holding all other significant predictors found on the bivariate-level constant. This finding suggests that police can act as therapeutic agents for victims and their loved ones, thus upholding the principles on which therapeutic jurisprudence and restorative justice are grounded. As research suggests, if individuals have a positive experience with the criminal justice system, in this case the police, it reflects the ideals of therapeutic jurisprudence and negative outcomes may be alleviated or avoided (Finn, 2013). In addition, if the needs of victims—information and empowerment for example—are being met by the police, then it is likely that a therapeutic or positive experience is taking place—in short, victims are likely being restored to their previous selves (Achielles & Zehr, 2001; Zehr, 2002).

This finding regarding the relationship between police satisfaction and reductions in the odds of revictimization is critical given that police are often the first system actors with whom victims and their loved ones come into contact (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; Frazier & Haney, 1996; Reisig & Chandek, 2001; Skogan, 2005; Tewksbury & West, 2001). Having a negative experience with the criminal justice system from the start could lead to negative encounters with other actors and services throughout the rest of the victims’ experience with the system. As part of the process for applying for victims’ compensation, applicants must produce a copy of the police report. Because of this requirement, applicants have to have direct contact with the police. Therefore, applicants’ satisfaction with the police, demonstrates the importance of having positive interactions with first responders due to the potential for these interactions to have long lasting benefits, one of which is reducing the odds for revictimization.

Third, an applicant’s satisfaction with the victims’ specialist is related to revictimization. Similar to satisfaction with the police, satisfaction with the victims’ specialist is a protective
factor against being revictimized. On the bivariate-level, applicants’ satisfaction with the
victims’ specialist is significantly related to experiencing revictimization such that dissatisfaction
is associated with being revictimized. This relationship was also apparent in the multivariate
model in which other significant bivariate-level predictors of revictimization were held constant.
Applicants who reported being satisfied with the victims’ specialist had reduced odds of being
revictimized following their application for victims’ compensation compared with those who
were dissatisfied with the victims’ specialist. As with satisfaction with the police, these findings
suggest a therapeutic experience with the victims’ specialist is occurring. The impact of
therapeutic jurisprudence ideals on victims can be measured through satisfaction (Cattaneo &
Goodman, 2010). Applicants’ satisfaction with this victims’ service reflects a positive
interaction. In turn, this positive experience led to a reduction in the odds of experiencing a
subsequent victimization. In addition, part of a therapeutic experience in a restorative justice
context would involve victims having their needs met by the criminal justice system (Achielles
& Zehr, 2001; Zehr, 2002). It appears, then, that the victims’ specialist is meeting some of the
needs of the individual such as providing information and empowerment (i.e. restorative justice).
With a therapeutic jurisprudence perspective, restoration or rebalance of a crime victim can
reduce the likelihood of negative outcomes (Finn, 2013), including reducing the likelihood of
revictimization.

Fourth, the current study produced multiple null findings with regards to the main
independent variables of satisfaction. Researchers have argued that null findings are at times
important findings and should not be discarded (Elliott & Granger, 2004; Wooldridge, 2004).
With regard to the bivariate analyses, overall satisfaction with the criminal justice system was
not significantly related to revictimization. Likewise, satisfaction with the prosecutor,
satisfaction with the VWAP, and satisfaction measures related to victims’ compensation and its process—satisfaction with victims’ compensation, apply for victims’ compensation again, total dollars compensated, and claim denied—were also found to have a non-significant relationship with experiencing revictimization. Although these results constitute null findings, in the context of the current study these findings are noteworthy. The ideals of therapeutic jurisprudence seek to help victims of crime, not hurt them (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010; FeldthUSEN et al., 2000; King, 2008; Slobogin, 1995; Stolle et al., 2000; Wexler, 1995; Wexler & Winick, 1991; Winick, 1997, 2007, 2009; Winick & Wexler, 2003). Unfortunately, there is no evidence in the current study that suggests that these satisfaction variables are protective factors for revictimization; however, there is also no evidence to suggest that the interactions with these actors, programs, and services in the criminal justice system are facilitators of revictimization. Basically, although these various components of the system are not helping applicants by reducing revictimization risk, they are also not harming applicants by increasing their risk of being revictimized. This finding is important because, above all else, the system does not want to inflict more harm on victims by increasing the risk of experiencing negative outcomes or by harming victims who choose to come into contact with and participate in the criminal justice system. Given that most victims’ compensation applicants were satisfied with all actors and program personnel, it appears, then, that victims’ compensation in Georgia is likely meeting at least some of the goals of therapeutic jurisprudence and restorative justice. Future research should consider if the program reduces the risk for other deleterious outcomes. For instance, it may be beneficial to assess the victims’ compensation program and how it may affect mental health outcomes since mental health is not only a consequence of victimization and revictimization, but also a risk.

Due to the non-significant associations on the bivariate-level, these variables were not included in the multivariate logistic regression analyses (Weinberg & Abramowitz, 2008).
factor being victim (Burnam et al., 1988; Kilpatrick & Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick et al., 1992; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Resick, 1993; Simon, 1995; Storch, 2003; Winick, 2007).

Fifth, two control variables were significantly related to revictimization in the satisfaction with the police multivariate logistic regression model. The lifestyle/routine activities variable of whether or not the applicant was employed was associated with being revictimized. Specifically, applicants who were employed were less likely to be revictimized since their application for victims’ compensation than those who were unemployed. This finding is in line with other research that has shown unemployment being a predictive factor of revictimization (Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998). In addition, drinking alcohol (also a lifestyle/routine activities measure) and revictimization were also significantly related in the multivariate model examining satisfaction with the police. Victims’ compensation applicants who reported drinking alcohol in the past 30 days were at an increased risk of being revictimized since applying for victims’ compensation. Past research has found a similar relationship between alcohol consumption and revictimization (Raghavan et al., 2004). Together, these significant findings of unemployment and drinking alcohol provide support for lifestyle/routine activities theory, such that these two lifestyles or behaviors have been shown to be risk factors for revictimization among the current study’s sample of victims’ compensation applicants.

Overall, the current study is an important addition to the extant research on victims’ compensation as well as other programs, services, and actors that may interact with victims and their loved ones. Limited research has been conducted on examining victims’ experiences with the criminal justice system and their subsequent risk for revictimization (for exception see Finn 2013). Moreover, there has been virtually no research conducted to examine the role of victims’ compensation in alleviating revictimization. Perhaps the different areas of victims’
compensation (i.e. medical costs, counseling, funeral costs, loss of wages or economic support, crime scene clean up, etc.) may be more useful than other in terms of reducing revictimization. For example, counseling that targets mental health would appear to be a potential benefit that could be very important in reducing revictimization. Research has demonstrated that mental health (i.e. depression, PTSD, anxiety) is related to being victimized (Briere, Elliott, Harris, Cotman, 1995; Kilpatrick & Acierno, 2003; Kilpatrick et al., 1992; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Resick, 1993; Sweeting et al., 2006; Storch, 2003; Winick, 2007). Therefore, it seems plausible that applicants who can obtain counseling with the aid of the program, may be at a reduced risk of being victimized again. Unfortunately this is unknown because not only is the research on revictimization and victims’ compensation lacking in general, it is also lacking in considering specific aspects of the program itself and their impact on revictimization. With these gaps in the literature, the current study has begun to fill these gaps with evidence of the positive influence that police and victims’ specialists can have on reducing revictimization risk for victims’ compensation applicants. Furthermore, this study has also found that although satisfaction with other actors, programs, and services were assessed and were not significant, they were also not harmful to applicants.

Limitations

Although the findings from the current study are valuable in adding to the existing literature on victims’ compensation, satisfaction with criminal justice actors and victim service personnel, and revictimization, there are some limitations to the study that should be addressed. One such limitation is the use of cross-sectional data. Time order cannot be accounted for when using cross-sectional data (Leiberson, 1985). Not having the ability to establish time order becomes problematic when interpreting findings such as alcohol consumption, for example, as a
predictor of revictimization. It cannot be certain that drinking alcohol took place before the revictimization incident.

Another limitation is that the sample consists of both victims and those who applied for victims’ compensation on behalf of a victim. In Georgia, others can apply for victims’ compensation such as dependents or parents/guardians of the victim (CJCC, 2012); approximately 46% of the sample was claimants. Claimants are not direct victims of the crime, but are affected by the crime in some way due to their relationship to the victim. On the bivariate-level, analyses were conducted in order to see if there were apparent differences in results when the sample was split into two groups (victims and claimants). The victims-only results were similar to the full sample results. These findings suggest that satisfaction with the police and satisfaction with the victims’ specialist may be more influential on revictimization risk for applicants who were victims rather than claimants. Although, there was no significant relationship between who applied and revictimization in the multivariate-level models, any differences between victims and claimants related to satisfaction could not be tested on the multivariate-level. These two groups of people in the sample (i.e. victims and claimants) could not be separated because the sample size would be significantly reduced, not allowing for enough variation and statistical power for multivariate analyses to be possible (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). Due to the mixture of victims and claimants in the sample, the outcome measure of revictimization may not be a true revictimization incident for those who were claimants. Although it could be argued that claimants can be seen as secondary victims of the crime for which they are applying for victims’ compensation, they were not the direct victim. Therefore, the revictimization experience could be their first direct victimization incident. Regardless, the system’s interaction with these individuals is still important from a therapeutic
jurisprudence standpoint since they could still be impacted by the system, and possibly exposed to subsequent victimization.

The fact that the sample was derived from one victims’ compensation program in one state is a third limitation to this study. The sample and data were selected from the victims’ compensation program in Georgia. Due to this sample and population, the results of this study cannot be generalized to applicants of victims’ compensation in other states, as each state has their own separate program and guidelines. For instance, it may be that research on victims’ compensation programs in states that include immediate emergency funds or benefits that aid applicants in getting to their much needed appointments (i.e. child care, transportation) would produce a significant relationship between satisfaction with victims’ compensation and revictimization. Despite this limitation, the current study is an initial examination of the relationship between victims’ compensation and revictimization.

A fourth limitation in the current study is a lack of lifestyle/routine activities measures. Previous research has indicated that there are multiple daily life activities that have been shown to be risk factors for revictimization including unemployment (Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998), being away from home at night (Tseloni, 2000; Tseloni & Pease, 2003), using public transportation especially during nighttime hours (Mukherjee & Carach, 1998; Tseloni & Pease, 2003), engaging in criminal activity and delinquency (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995; Wittebrood & Nieuwbeerta, 2000), spending time with delinquent peers (Lauritsen & Quinet, 1995), and drinking alcohol (Raghavan et al., 2004). The only lifestyle/routine activities measures available for use in the current study were unemployment and alcohol consumption. As such, it is possible that other factors not included in the model could help to explain revictimization. Any of these
factors that are also related to compensation satisfaction that were not included, could mean that the relationship is spurious.

Not having these competing factors in the models, may account for why the explained variance in the model was low. The R-squared, or variance explained, in both of the multivariate logistic regression models is low with .053 for the satisfaction with the police model and .031 for the satisfaction with the victims’ specialist model. These numbers indicate that the models do not explain a large portion of the variance in revictimization. One reason for this lack of explained variance could be the lack of inclusion of measures that have been shown in the existing research to be risk factors for revictimization, such as the lifestyle/routine activities variables discussed above. Beyond lifestyle/routine activities, research has begun to study other individual characteristic explanations for revictimization (e.g. self-control). Furthermore, additional variables on the neighborhood- and household-level of measurement, with the exception of urban versus rural and income, could account for the lack of variance explained. Unfortunately, additional lifestyle/routine activities, individual characteristics, neighborhood-level, and household-level measures were not available in the current data and could not be included. In addition to these variables, it is also noteworthy to discuss the measurement of the satisfaction variables. With only general measures of the satisfaction variables (dichotomized to satisfied or dissatisfied), these measures could be limited in being able to tap into the satisfaction of victims’ compensation applicants. Better measurements for satisfaction with different criminal justice actors and the victims’ compensation program could consider specific actions or aspects of these actors and programs. For example, when considering the police, a more specific satisfaction measure would be asking whether applicants felt the police respected them or provided them with the information the applicant felt was necessary for his or her case. By
having more detailed, targeted measure of satisfaction, the current study could have provided more insight as to what is important in reducing revictimization with regard to applicants’ satisfaction.

**Policy Implications**

The results of the current study have various policy implications with respect to revictimization. First, the significant relationship between victims’ compensation applicants’ satisfaction with the police and revictimization suggest that policies should be in place to facilitate satisfaction with the police. Police training on how to approach and handle victims should be continued and strengthened. For instance, existing research on police training specifically geared towards interacting with victims and witnesses has primarily focused on effective interviewing techniques (Clifford & George, 1996; Daviesl, Westcott, & Horan, 2000; Milne & Bull, 2006). Most often, victims and witnesses are the main source of information pertaining to a crime (Milne & Bull, 2006). Much of Milne and Bull’s work considers interviewing techniques with vulnerable populations of victims and witnesses such as children or those with mental disorders. When interviewing victims and witnesses, especially those who are considered vulnerable, police should be trained using general guidelines. These guidelines include providing the individual with adequate time to answer questions. Victims and witnesses should not feel rushed. Time is needed to comprehend questions and for victims and witnesses to retrieve and express their memories (Milne & Bull, 1999). Interviews should also be well-planned, especially when interacting with vulnerable victims and witnesses (Milne & Bull, 2006). The interviewer should be cognizant of his and her own behavior as to not come across as being impatient or uneasy, and should focus on building a rapport with the victim or witness (Milne & Bull, 2006). Other research has considered specific interviewing techniques by police
when conducting interviews with victims and witnesses. When examining cognitive interview
techniques, conversational interview techniques, and a combination of these two techniques used
by specially trained police officers as well as police officers who had not been trained in any of
these techniques, Clifford and George (1996) found that cognitive interviewing—a method of
building a rapport with victims and witnesses, while giving them control of the interview—was
the most beneficial in obtaining information from victims and witnesses.

Furthermore, in order to aid in positive interactions with victims and maintain effective
service for and interviewing of victims, police departments often have specialized units that
handle certain types of victims. For example, Martin and Hamilton (1990) found that child
abuse specialists or child abuse units were commonly implemented among the police department
in their study. Moreover, other scholars have reported that police departments often respond to
child abuse situation with a “closed unit” type of approach, meaning only those officers who are
in the child abuse unit and who are specially trained in responding to child abuse conduct the
interviews and investigation (Humphreys, 1996). Similar units are found in police departments
with regard to violence against women as well. Research suggests that some departments have
specialists and investigators who are trained to work specifically with domestic violence victims
(Henderson & Reder, 1996; Marshall, 1994). Regarding domestic violence, police are trained as
generalist, specialists, or generalists-specialists (Bard, 1973 as cited in Breci, 1996). Generalists
are trained, as all officers are trained, in responding to domestic crisis incidents. A more targeted
training in how to respond to domestic violence situations specifically is provided to specialists.
Finally, generalist-specialists receive the specialists’ training, but may also handle other crimes
beyond domestic violence (Bard 1973 as cited in Breci, 1996). Specialized units in police
departments can be beneficial and important for victims because officers in these units are
specifically trained on how to appropriately interact (e.g. sensitivity training) and empower victims, while also meeting their needs.

As research suggests, high levels of satisfaction with police were found when police were actively involved with the victims by having contract with the victim (Kelly, 1983) and providing feedback or information to the victim (Percy, 1980; Reisig & Chandek, 2001; Shapland, 1983). Thus, it seems logical that training for police should include how to effectively respond, interview, and provide information to victims and their loved ones. If satisfaction levels can be increased with police, perhaps the odds of experiencing revictimization can be further reduced. Given the relationship between satisfaction with the police and revictimization, it appears that police play an important role in reducing the likelihood of future victimization experiences. Therefore, police should be properly trained in how to interact with victims and their families and meet their needs.

Additionally, the use of victims’ specialist—at least in accordance with victims’ compensation—should be continued and utilized more often. Based on the findings of this study, victims’ specialists have a significant impact on reducing revictimization. When victims’ compensation applicants were satisfied with the victims’ specialist, they faced lower odds of being revictimized. Victims’ specialists are individuals at the CJCC who aid applicants with their victims’ compensation claims. Victims’ specialists answer questions about the application and the victims’ compensation program and process as well as aid in completing the necessary paperwork and filing (CJCC, 2012). An examination of this victims’ compensation actor’s role has not been explored in the existing research, making this finding a valuable addition to the victims’ compensation literature. Victims’ specialists serve as gate-keepers for the victims’ compensation program, if applicants have a negative experience with these actors, it could lead
to dissatisfaction not only with the victims’ specialist, but also with victims’ compensation as a whole. Furthermore, if applicants have a negative view of the victims’ specialist, they may be less likely to proceed with the victims’ compensation process, thus not receiving the financial aid they need to acquire counseling or other services. By not being able to obtain these services and meet their needs, applicants may not be addressing possible factors (e.g. depression, anxiety, PTSD, substance abuse), which increase their risk of experiencing revictimization. The role of victims’ specialists, thus, is important in empowering victims by allowing them to discuss their claims with someone who is knowledgeable with the victims’ compensation program and process. Empowerment, a need of victims (Achilles & Zehr, 2001; Zehr, 2002), can be a useful tool in reducing revictimization (Finn, 2013). If victims’ specialists continue to aid and empower victims and their loved ones, than a further reduction of revictimization incidents may be achieved.

Finally, the two control measures of employment and alcohol consumption were also significantly related to revictimization on the multivariate-level. Unemployment and drinking alcohol increase the applicants’ odds of experiencing revictimization, which is in accordance with previous research (Mukherjee & Carcach, 1998; Raghavan et al., 2004). These two characteristics of applicants are important to policy because these are behaviors that can be altered or changed. In the context of victims’ compensation, the program allows for the financial means to attend counseling. By participating in counseling, applicants may be able to reduce their drinking behaviors—sometimes utilized as a coping mechanism for dealing with their initial victimization—and risk factors related to revictimization (i.e. anxiety, depression, and PTSD) by confronting their problems and getting the mental health services they need. Policies should encourage prevention and intervention efforts that target unemployment through education and
job training as well as drinking through knowledge of the effects of alcohol and treatment methods to reduce alcohol abuse. Victims’ compensation could help in providing support to applicants by referring them to these services. If these characteristics can be changed, meaning reduce unemployment and alcohol consumption, it would likely lead to a decrease in revictimization risk. In addition, the victims’ compensation program could serve as a resource and referral center for applicants, even if they do not qualify for victims’ compensation or if the services applicants need are not provided by the program. For example, the program could provide applicants with information regarding counseling or employment services. Regardless of whether the applicants qualify for compensation, these individuals may have needs. The victims’ compensation program could provide them with information and referrals that may fulfill these needs, thus possibly intervening in the victimization-revictimization process.

**Directions for Future Research**

The current study should be used as a building block to further assess the experiences of victims and their loved ones when they come into contact with the criminal justice system, especially victims’ compensation programs, and the possible outcomes that may be affected. Due to the limitations of cross-sectional data discussed above, future research should seek to better understand therapeutic jurisprudence ideals through victims’ satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its entities and its relationship to revictimization through the use of longitudinal data. Longitudinal data will allow for the assumption of time order and causality (Lieberson, 1985), and could provide a more complete picture of victims and their loved ones who interact with the criminal justice system and the possible influence those experiences have over time.
Future research should also consider examining a purely victims sample since the current study did not allow for such an analysis. Furthermore, different types of victims may have different interactions with the criminal justice system and its elements. For example, police may interact differently with female victims of violence than they do with other victims due to their previous experiences or beliefs (Brown, 1984). Therefore, it would be interesting to explore whether or not the criminal justice system and its elements influence revictimization differently for different types of victims (e.g. personal crimes versus property crimes or victims of different crimes more specifically such as theft, burglary, assault, domestic violence, sexual assault, etc.). In addition, different types of revictimization could also be examined. In the current study, incidents of burglary, theft, assault, and sexual victimization that occurred after applying for compensation were included in the revictimization measure. Future research with large samples may be able to study these types of revictimization incidents separately to see if satisfaction affects revictimization risk differently by incident type. Some types of revictimization are more common than others such as assault, intimate partner violence, rape, and burglary. Thus, it could be that victims who experience a particular type of initial victimization may be more prone to experiencing subsequent victimizations, and their interactions with the criminal justice system and its entities may be more instrumental in reducing revictimization risk of a particular type. Furthermore, satisfaction measures that produced null findings may produce significant findings for different types of victimization and revictimization. For instance, satisfaction with prosecutors and VWAPS may be more influential in reducing revictimization risk for intimate partner violence due to the fear that often accompanies these experiences. Intimate partner violence victims who are more fearful due to their relationship with the perpetrator may be better benefited by VWAPs and prosecutors who
help them with protection orders. Thus, victims’ satisfaction may be higher and their risk of being the target of future victimizations at the hands of the perpetrator may be reduced.

Additionally, future research should also consider expanding the population and sample of the current study beyond Georgia to other states and their victims’ compensation programs in order to see if these results generalize beyond this one state.

In future studies, a more complete understanding of the role of lifestyles/routine activities should be assessed through the use of additional variables targeting these behaviors associated with revictimization risk. This suggestion is due to the limited availability of daily activities measures in the current data. Beyond unemployment and drinking alcohol, other lifestyle/routine activities that have been found to be associated with revictimization could not be evaluated in the models of this study. Perhaps by including additional lifestyle/routine activities measures (e.g. frequency of being away from home at night, offending or delinquency, association with delinquent peers) along with other individual characteristics (e.g. self-control, attitudes and beliefs) and neighborhood- and household-level variables, more of the variance could be accounted for in the models—providing a better depiction of the risk factors for revictimization.

Maybe more importantly, these additional variables could provide a better understanding of how important satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its entities is in relation to the impact on revictimization. In other words, is satisfaction important in reducing experiences of revictimization when other relevant variables that could not be controlled for in the current study are included?

Taking all of the findings and limitations into consideration, the current study expands the knowledge regarding victims’ compensation and how satisfaction with the criminal justice system and its entities impact applicants—specifically the possible negative outcome of
revictimization. Satisfaction with the police and victims’ specialist are important in reducing the risk of revictimization, and that training and access to these actors should be continued and strengthened. Although satisfaction with the other elements of the criminal justice system (i.e. prosecutor, VWAP, victims’ compensation and its process) were not found to be protective factors for experiencing revictimization, the satisfaction levels with these other criminal justice entities were also not increasing applicants’ odds of being revictimized. As such, strategies to improve services through victims’ compensation, for example, should be explored. These improvements to victims’ compensation could be increasing the financial caps for victims’ compensation or providing additional services such as emergency funds. As shown in the current study, aspects of the criminal justice system can indeed be therapeutic agents in meeting the needs of victims and their loved ones and intervening in the victimization-revictimization nexus.
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