Impact of Crime on Victims Presentation

Final Results

Data Source

- 50-item questionnaire administered to program participants and comparison subjects at ten correctional facilities in four states.

- Pretest – Posttest Model
  - Instrument administered twice.
  - Responses analyzed for change following completion of curriculum.

Data Yield

- Initial Yield: 842 total questionnaires returned.
  - 459 Pretest (233 Participant, 226 Comparison)
  - 383 Posttest (220 Participant, 163 Comparison)

- Final Yield: 360 useable cases following data compilation and cleaning.
  - 203 Participant Subjects
  - 157 Comparison Subjects

Subjects By State

State	Participant	Comparison	Total	Pct
CA	34	8	42	11.67%
OH	48	37	85	23.61%
TN	93	86	179	49.72%
VA	28	26	54	15.00%
Total	203	157	360	100.00%

Causes For Case Exclusion

- Subject attrition – no completed posttest.
- Subject missed 8+ responses in either pretest or posttest.

Other Data Issues

- Use of draft questionnaire – cases set aside as non-comparable.
- Even-numbered scale led to multiple response on single items.
  - Subject circled '3' and '4'
  - In such cases, mean value was substituted (i.e., 3.5).
- 'Ethnicity' variable thrown out.
  - Not enough variability in response to be useful.

Handling Missing Responses

- Each response item was searched for 'missing' responses.
- 'Missing' responses were replaced with the mean response for the group on the particular item.
  - E.g., a comparison subject fails to answer Item #4 on the posttest. The mean posttest response by comparison subjects for Item #4 replaces the missing response.
- Such replacements account for fewer than 1% of total responses.

Item Categories

- Questionnaire items were later classified into five categories.
  - Knowledge of Rights (KR)
  - Knowledge of Facts (KF)
  - Sensitivity to Victim Plight (SP)
  - Victim Blaming Attitudes (B)
  - Self-Accountability (AC)

- Individual items in each category were excluded if +85% of both groups responded 'correctly' on pretest.

Item Categories

INITIAL FACTOR LIST				
KR	KF	SP	B*	AC
16	2	1	7	13
25	4	3	8	14
34	6	5	11	21
45	9	18	19	23
	12	35	28	29
	15	38	32	36
	17	46	39	41
	22	50		47
	24			
	26			
	27			
	31			
	33			
	37			
	40			
	42			
	48			
	49			

Underlined numbers represent items dropped from analysis.

The 'Blaming' category is of only limited utility, as all but two items were eliminated prior to analysis. Care should be exercised in interpreting differences in this category.

Reverse Coding

- Reverse coding was necessary on several items to make summation scores possible.
  - On some items, low scores were desirable.
  - Before creating summation scores, these items were reverse-coded.
  - Following reverse-coding, higher numbers represented increasingly desirable response on all items.

Category Scores – KR and KF

- Recoded into binary ‘correct’ & ‘incorrect’ response.
  - Response 1, 2, 3 = Incorrect (0)
  - Response 4, 5, 6 = Correct (1)
- Summary scores represent number of ‘correct’ responses in each category.

Category Scores – SP, B, AC

- For these three categories, simple summation scores were created.

- Higher summation scores indicate:
  - More sensitivity to victim plight.
  - Less tendency to blame victim for victimization.
  - Greater recognition of personal accountability.

Age Comparison

Group	N	Mean	SD	*t*	Sig.
Participant	201	35.65	10.39	1.45	.148
Comparison	155	34.06	10.05		
	356				

- In 4 cases age information was missing.
- There was no statistically significant difference between groups.

Race Comparison

	Part	Comp	Total	Phi	Sig.
White	102	77	179	.045	.707
Black	78	70	148		
Other	10	7	17		
	190	154	344		

- In 16 cases race classification information was missing.
- There was no statistically significant difference between groups.

Knowledge of Rights - Participants

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Neg. Ranks	31	43.29	1342
Pos. Ranks	78	59.65	4653
Ties	94		
Total	203		

Knowledge of Rights

	Participant	Comparison
Z	5.235	0.148
Sig.	**.000***	.882

Participant subjects demonstrated **statistically significant improvement** on Knowledge of Rights, while comparison subjects showed no change.

Knowledge of Facts - Participants

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Neg. Ranks	58	91.40	5301
Pos. Ranks	119	87.83	10452
Ties	26		
Total	203		

Knowledge of Facts

	Participant	Comparison
Z	3.808	0.879
Sig.	**.000***	.379

Participant subjects demonstrated **statistically significant improvement** on Knowledge of Facts items, while comparison subjects showed no change.

Sensitivity to Plight - Participants

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Neg. Ranks	48	90.38	4338
Pos. Ranks	139	95.25	13240
Ties	16		
Total	203		

Sensitivity to Plight

	Participant	Comparison
Z	6.013	0.930
Sig.	**.000***	.353

Participant subjects demonstrated **statistically significant improvement** on Sensitivity to Plight items, whil
comparison subjects showed no change

Blaming* - Participants

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Neg. Ranks	56	79.85	4471.5
Pos. Ranks	74	54.64	4043.5
Ties	73		
Total	203		

Blaming*

	Participant	Comparison
Z	0.499	0.545
Sig.	.618	.586

Neither group demonstrated change on Blaming items. However, this measure is based upon only two response items.

Accountability - Participants

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Neg. Ranks	72	92.33	6647.5
Pos. Ranks	99	81.40	8058.5
Ties	32		
Total	203		

Accountability

	Participant	Comparison
Z	1.089	2.334
Sig.	.276	.020*

Participant subjects demonstrated no statistically significant change on Accountability items, while comparison subjects demonstrated a statistically significant change in the negative direction. Put simply, the comparison subjects scored *lower* upon retest!

SUMMARY

	Rights	Facts	Sensitivity	Blaming	Accountability
Part.	+	+	+	0	0
Comp.	0	0	0	0	-

+ : Statistically Significant Positive Change

0 : No Statistically Significant Change

- : Statistically Significant Negative Change

Comparison to Previous Connecticut Study*

	VOICES (n=339)	Control (n=92)
Knowledge		
Victim Facts	2.17*	-0.17
Victim Rights	1.10*	0.49
Sensitivity		
Victims Plight	2.55*	1.33
Avoid Blame	1.88	0.79

*Reported in Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, Vol. 39 (3), 2004, pp. 21-33

Victim/Speaker Reactions

- Scale 6= Strongly Agree; 1 = Strongly Disagree
  - 1.) 5.667 – Overall Positive Experience
  - 2.) 5.417 – Adequate Advance Information
  - 3.) 5.818 (plus one n/a) – Safety and Security Provided
  - 4.) 5.667 – Participation Well Organized and Structured
  - 5.) 5.75 – Participation was Beneficial to Participants
  - 6.) 5.333 (plus three n/a) – … Beneficial to Victim Speaker
  - 7.) 5.5 (plus four n/a) - … Beneficial to Advocate Speaker

N=12 (9 Victims/Survivors; 3 Professionals/Advocates)

Speaker Comments: Items 1-4

- "The class went very well." "The staff are extremely hospitable, organized and friendly." "Very positive, enhancing." "Mrs. Kauffman went to lengths to assure this." "I saw people (prisoners) who thought they could change and were willing to try."
- "Because I work in the system I was a little afraid to give too much information. However, it went along very well." "They worked completely around my schedule and gave me advanced notice." -"Mrs. Kauffman's explanations were helpful in pulling me in a more comfortable frame of mind."
- "I work at the prison so it was not an issue." "As an employee of the institution I know safety and security are very important." "My personal escort, Sgt. Kauffman, made sure that I was fore-informed (?) of what to expect and was careful to have me as worry free as he could. (good job)" "I was very comfortable." "At no time did I feel unprotected or my safety was at risk."
- "I think so." "Very organized!" "Mrs. Kauffman was concise and informative – the transition into/out of my talk was flawless and set me up to be able to speak w/o embarrassment or fear." "The prisoners interacted well with staff." "Attention was given to structure, content and format. I could tell by the questions and comments of the audience."

Speaker Comments: Items 5-7

- "The inmates were very receptive and showed concern for my loss." "The offenders had high participation and asked very appropriate questions. The interaction between inmates was great." "The inmates seemed glad for the opportunity to listen and ask questions – their questions made me think that they may have understood what I was trying to say." "Good feedback with both thru eye contact and verbal response." "They saw real people like themselves and their loved ones and could relate to the impact or domino effect."
- "It proved to be some closure for me." "When I first started speaking I felt that it was beneficial but after 10 years it is hard." "I am at a place where I am not so impacted by my past as I once was but I can see how it would have been beneficial to me earlier had it come up." "I've already dealt with most of the issues surrounding the crime." "It gave me a chance to do something to relieve the feelings of helplessness. It allowed me to talk about the pain. There is nothing else a person can do but talk about the pain it can't be healed or medicated only expressed. Expression gives some release."
- "The opportunity to speak w/ such an interactive group always assist me in professional and personal growth." "As above" – ("I've already dealt with most of the issues surrounding the crime.")

Additional Speaker Comments

- "Having been a victim/survivor but given the opportunity to speak as an advocate was a great privilege for me. From the questions the students/offenders asked, for the first time I could see the pain they suffer continuously also."
- "I think this is a great program."
- "ORC has the best program across the state."
- "I will speak at any times I am needed to try to make a difference in the crime victims and survivors."
- "I feel that the inmates benefit from learning. What to say when they talk to themselves i.e.: how to turn their habitual negative thought patterns into more healthy, positive ones. Thank you for this opportunity."
- "For those individuals who are forgiving it is not very helpful. But those that are in a world of hate it is sad, maybe they could also use it to heal. I believe this program is good for both sides of the fence."
- "I enjoyed the whole experience and would love to come back anytime." "I was very impressed with this program. I can see that it will be beneficial to all involved."

Contact Information:

Mario T. Gaboury, J.D., Ph.D.

Professor and Chair of Criminal Justice

Oskar Schindler Humanities Foundation Endowed Professor

Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice & Forensic Sciences

University of New Haven

300 Boston Post Road

West Haven, CT 06516

Phone: (203) 932-7041 or 932-7253

Fax: (203) 931-6030 or 931-6071

E-mail: mgaboury@newhaven.edu

University of New Haven
300 Boston Post Road
West Haven, CT 06516
Phone: (203) 479-4509
Fax: (203) 931-6071
E-mail: csedelmaier@newhaven.edu