



Issue 03/2010

Victims of Crime

Research Digest



Documenting the Growth of Resources for Victims/Survivors of Violence

“Explain please!” Working with Victims and Restitution

Aboriginal Victimization in Canada: A Summary of the Literature

Accessing Hard-to-Reach Populations: Respondent-Driven Sampling

Victim Services in Canada: Results from the Victim Services Survey 2007/2008





Research Published by the Research and Statistics Division of the Department of Justice Canada in 2009

Memorializing the Victims of Terrorism

This report presents a review of the international academic literature that has been produced regarding the memorialization of victims of terrorism and terrorist-type events.

Identifying the Issues: Victim Services Workers experiences working with victims with Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder

The purpose of this research was to gain insights from victim services workers' experiences working with victims with FASD (both with and without a formal diagnosis). Anecdotal information suggests that individuals with FASD are at risk of becoming victims of crime. The authors sought to learn from those who work with victims of crime who have FASD to gain further understanding of how this disorder impacts the full participation of victims and witnesses in the criminal justice system.

Inventory of Spousal Violence Risk Assessment Tools Used in Canada

The objective of this project was to identify which spousal violence risk assessment tools are currently being used by criminal justice personnel (e.g., police, corrections, probation officers) with the goal of preventing future risk and harm to victims of spousal violence in Canada.

The Legal Problems of Everyday Life: The Nature, Extent and Consequences of Justiciable Problems Experienced by Canadians

This report examines the incidence of civil justice problems and the extent of unmet need for assistance that justiciable problems in civil matters might represent.

Paths to Justice – Research in Brief

A series of four short articles that describe current research dealing with access to justice, Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD), and the criminal justice system.

The 2008 National Justice Survey: The Youth Justice System in Canada and the Youth Criminal Justice Act

The Department of Justice conducts the National Justice Survey (NJS) on an annual basis to provide the Department with public opinion on current and emerging policy relevant topics. The focus of the 2008 National Justice Survey (the 2nd cycle of this annual survey) was the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* and the youth criminal justice system in Canada in order to provide policy-makers with current information regarding Canadians' perceptions of youth justice issues. The goals of the 2008 NJS were to measure public confidence in the youth justice system, to identify viewpoints on particular responses to youth criminal behaviour, and to assess perceptions of youth crime in Canada.

These reports are available at <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/date.cfm>.



Every Victim Matters

The theme of the 2010 National Victims of Crime Awareness Week is “Every Victim Matters.” For those who work in the criminal justice system, particularly those who work directly with victims, these words ring true. In this third issue of the *Victims of Crime Research Digest*, several of the articles focus on research about under-served victims. Research can help to identify gaps in policy, program development, resources, and service. It can also help to identify needs and risk factors.

This issue begins with an article by Professor Myrna Dawson examining why we need to better understand and document services for victims of violence and their impact in Canada. Susan McDonald’s article discusses the information and assistance needs of victims as identified in a study on restitution in Saskatchewan. Katie Scrim reviews recent research on Aboriginal victimization, and Sidikat Fashola describes the use of the respondent-driven sampling method with “hard-to-reach populations.” Finally, Julie Sauvé summarizes findings from the 2007/08 national Victim Services Survey.

Full reports on most of these studies are forthcoming. For more information, please contact the Research and Statistics Division at rsd-dsr@justice.gc.ca.

Pamela Arnott
Senior Counsel and Director
Policy Centre for Victim Issues

Susan McDonald
Principal Researcher
Research and Statistics Division

Contributors

Editor

Susan McDonald

Editorial Team

Stephen Mihorean
Alyson MacLean
Nicole Crutcher
Kim Burnett
Marguerite Jenner

Publication Officer

Charlotte Mercier

Feedback

We invite your comments and suggestions for future issues of *Victims of Crime Research Digest*. We may be contacted at: rsd-drs@justice.gc.ca

The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department of Justice Canada or the Government of Canada.

Contents

Documenting the Growth of Resources for Victims/Survivors of Violence
By Myrna Dawson 4

“Explain please!” Working with Victims and Restitution
By Susan McDonald 9

Aboriginal Victimization in Canada: A Summary of the Literature
By Katie Scrim 15

Accessing Hard-to-Reach Populations: Respondent-Driven Sampling
By Sidikat Fashola 21

Victim Services in Canada: Results from the Victim Services Survey 2007/2008
By Julie Sauvé 26

Victim-Related Conferences in 2010 31



Department of Justice Canada
<http://canada.justice.gc.ca/eng/index.html>



Policy Centre for Victim Issues
<http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/pcvi-cpci/>



Research and Statistics Division
www.canada.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs





Documenting the Growth of Resources for Victims/Survivors of Violence

By Myrna Dawson
Associate Professor and Canada Research Chair
Public Policy in Criminal Justice
University of Guelph

Introduction

Over the course of the past few decades, crime victims have become more aware of their rights and of the resources available to them largely due to the victims' rights and the violence against women movements. During the same period, there has been significant growth in the number and types of available resources for victims/ survivors of crime. With increasing numbers of victims/ survivors of crime seeking help and limited funding, it is becoming more of a challenge to allocate available resources to meet growing demands effectively. Adding to this challenge is the fact that, despite growing resources in most industrialized countries, there has been little effort to document what these resources are, where they are, and who they serve.

This knowledge gap is significant because access to resources is not equal for all victims/survivors of crime. Identifying and documenting which groups are underserved, and where, requires consistent and detailed information about what services are available, where, and to whom. Such information would contribute to more informed public policy decisions regarding the distribution and allocation of victim resources and to an enhanced ability to examine their impact on victims/survivors of crime, and on levels of crime and violence in communities.

In Canada, the first national Victim Services Survey was conducted in 2003; it was repeated in 2005/ 2006 and again in 2008. Focusing on one "snapshot" day of the year, findings from the first two survey cycles¹ showed that victims/survivors of violence and women represent the majority of those served (72% and 68%, respectively, in the most recent cycle) (Brzozowski 2008, 36). Among female victims of violence who sought help, close to one half had been victimized by current or former intimate partners and one-quarter by family members. This national survey represents an important first step in addressing the dearth of information on available resources in this country and arguably moves Canada beyond other countries in documenting victim resources.

The finding that female victims of intimate partner and domestic violence represent a large proportion of those served by victim services also highlights why much of the research to date, largely conducted in other countries, has focused on documenting resources related to domestic violence or violence against women and examining their impact on levels of violence. These patterns may also be due, in part, to the fact that violence against women, particularly by male partners, has been a key focus of legislative, policy, and program initiatives in many countries that now recognize that these victims/survivors have not historically had equal access to resources or justice overall (Fineman and Mykitiuk 1994).

Given this emphasis, the results from two bodies of research are briefly described below and are followed by a discussion of the challenges of systematically documenting this information even when focusing on one type of crime or group of victims/survivors. Without this research, service providers, policy makers, and researchers lack the information necessary to determine if resources are distributed equally to all victims and to understand the role played by these resources in keeping victims safe and preventing future violence.

Domestic Violence Resources and Intimate Partner Homicide

One indicator of safety for victims that has received significant research attention is the level of lethal violence or homicide in society. In particular, recent documented declines in intimate partner homicide in several countries have led to concentrated efforts to identify factors that may be contributing to these declines using an exposure reduction framework (Dawson et al. 2009; Dugan et al. 1999, 2003). Premised upon the consistent finding that chronic relationship violence often precedes intimate partner killings regardless of whether the victim is female or male, this perspective argues that factors which help abused partners safely leave violent relationships or avoid such relationships in



the first place should reduce levels of intimate partner violence and homicide (Dugan et al. 1999). The increasing availability of domestic violence resources is one of three societal trends that were occurring at the same time as intimate partner homicides were declining, which arguably also contributed to reduced exposure to intimate partner homicide.²

Researchers in the United States examined whether increased resources lead to lower rates of violence and uncovered an unexpected pattern. They focused on the existence of state statutes related to domestic violence, local police and prosecution policies, and existence of crisis hotlines and shelters. The results of the study showed that as domestic violence resources increased over the past few decades, the risk of female intimate partner homicide remained stable or declined only slightly, whereas the risk of male intimate partner homicide significantly declined (Browne and Williams 1989, 1993; Dugan et al., 1999). Similar patterns were documented in England and Wales and in Canada (Aldridge and Browne 2003; Dawson et al. 2009; Ogrodnik 2008). On the one hand, these findings can be viewed as positive; one interpretation is that increased resources are providing women with alternatives to lethal violence against their abusers to escape victimization. US researchers also found, however, that some resources may actually increase the risk for some women, possibly due to retaliatory violence by male partners coupled with inadequate attention to ensuring women's safety as part of the intervention efforts (Dugan 2003; Dugan et al. 2003). Resources were also shown to have different impacts for various types of victims depending, for example, on their race/ethnicity or the type of intimate relationship they shared with their abusers (e.g., married or unmarried). Despite these variations,

Dugan et al. (2003) concluded that, more often than not, communities with more victim resources had lower levels of violence. While this research documents more of a correlation rather than a causal connection between resources and levels of violence, the findings have implications for victims/survivors of crime who do not have equal access to resources, a situation examined and documented by a second body of research conducted in the United Kingdom.

The Geographic Distribution of Violence against Women Support Services

There has been a renewed interest in the geography of crime, or environmental criminology, which draws attention to the fact that crime is not evenly distributed, but is rather concentrated in particular areas (e.g., Brantingham and Brantingham 1981). For example, Statistics Canada has released several recent publications using Geographic Information System (GIS) to examine neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime (e.g., Fitzgerald et al. 2004; Savoie 2008). What has received less attention both historically and today is the way in which the availability of resources for crime victims/survivors may also be concentrated in particular areas or geographic regions which, in turn, may also have implications for the distribution and level of crime and violence in those areas. The dearth of research in this area is due, in part, to the paucity of available data with which to examine these questions. Studies from the UK have moved research in a positive direction with respect to understanding how resources are distributed across jurisdictions, using GIS to map the

existence, or lack thereof, of victim resources, visually displaying those areas that are clearly underserved (Coy et al. 2007; Coy et al. 2008).

Focusing on specialized violence against women support services, this study showed that "access to support is a postcode lottery" for female victims/survivors of violence (Coy et al. 2007, 6). Simply put, depending on where they live, some victims/survivors have access to adequate services while others have little or no access to any services at all. This may seem obvious to many who work in this field and are aware of the often uneven distribution of resources; however, the ability to document and provide evidence of this has been a challenge. Graphically, this study was able to clearly show that one-third of the jurisdictions in the UK had no specialized support services for women experiencing violence. Furthermore, they found that most women had no access to rape crisis centres, less than one quarter had access to any services specializing in sexual violence, and there was only minimal coverage offered by sexual assault referral centres. Less than one in 10 jurisdictions had specialized services for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) women; almost one-third had no domestic violence services at all; and few jurisdictions had services for women involved in prostitution. The authors concluded that few areas could actually claim to have "sufficient" service provision and several areas were particularly underserved. In a follow up in 2008, some improvements had been noted; however, one in four jurisdictions still had no specialized support services, BME women were still underserved, most of the new services were statutory (i.e., primarily related to the criminal justice system), while provision levels in the voluntary/third sector remained static or had declined (Coy et al. 2008, 7).



Challenges in Documenting Victim/Survivor Resources

The above research suggests that it is possible to document victim/survivor resources and to examine their impact on reducing levels of violence for particular types of victims/survivors. These studies also highlight some of the challenges in such documentation. For example, it has been argued that the US study which found that initiatives intended to make women safer actually provided more protection for men may be the result of research which relied upon inadequate or limited data to capture the existence of domestic violence resources (DeLeon-Granados and Wells 2003). Indeed, Dugan and her colleagues (1999, 2003) acknowledged the scarcity of information available. A similar argument can be made about the availability of data documenting victim/survivor resources more generally, which is largely the case in most countries that have experienced the rapid growth in resources since the mid-1970s. While the collection of such information is a large and complex task given the number of changes that have taken place, variations across jurisdictions, as well as the fragmented and unreliable nature of existing data, for example, this information is crucial for understanding the relative impact of these and other social trends on the victimization experiences of women and men. To begin to address this gap, three initial steps are required: defining what is meant by “victim resources”; identifying appropriate measures of resource provision; and determining appropriate data sources and needs.

Defining Victim/Survivor Resources

Today, there is a multitude of new initiatives that co-exist with long-standing resources for various types of victims/survivors. In the area of violence against women, rape/sexual assault centres and shelters that grew out of the violence against women movement in the 1970s are easily identifiable resources. The more recent implementation of specialized domestic violence courts and police units in some jurisdictions can also be easily used as examples of victim/survivor resources. Focusing only on the more obvious albeit important initiatives does not recognize the wealth of social, health, community, and other resources that are directly or indirectly related to helping victims of violence (e.g., Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners, coordinated community protocols). Therefore, defining what is meant by “victim resources” – the “what are they” question – is the first step towards achieving an understanding of the role particular resources play in the lives of victims. Canada’s national Victim Services Survey defines victim services as “agencies that provide direct services to primary and secondary victims of crime and that are funded in whole or in part by a ministry responsible for justice matters” (Brzozowski 2008, 33). An initial question is whether some important resources integral to victims/survivors are excluded based on these criteria.

In the UK, the term violence against women “support services” was used to encompass agencies and organizations that provided “a range of support options that enable women to create safety, seek justice, and undo the harms of violence” (Coy et al. 2007, 10). Recognizing that these resources are often found in what they refer to as the “voluntary/third sector,” the authors included

organizations in their study if they worked “primarily on violence and... provide significant direct support to female victims/survivors” (2007, 16). Based on these criteria, the following resources were included: refuges (i.e., shelters), community domestic violence projects, rape crisis centres, and sexual violence support services; specialized services within the statutory sector that provide significant support services, including sexual assault referral centres, and specialist domestic violence courts; perpetrator programs belonging to a network that ensures minimum guidelines and standards are followed; prostitution, trafficking, and sexual exploitation services; and, finally, health-sector female genital mutilation services.

In the US, where researchers have focused more narrowly on documenting the impact of domestic violence resources, Dugan (2003) and her colleagues (1999, 2003) included in their definition of resources existing policies and laws pertaining to domestic violence as well as organizations and initiatives that responded to domestic violence. Specifically, they examined the role of shelters, legal advocacy, hotline and counseling services as well as existing state- and local-level policies such as child custody legislation, judicial discretion surrounding protection order violations, warrantless arrest, mandatory arrest, prosecutorial no-drop policies, and firearms legislation. Efforts were also made to capture the level of criminal justice commitment to domestic violence through the existence of specialized police units and training, as well as the prosecution of protection order violations, and/or written policies that standardized the prosecution of cases.

Two definition issues are highlighted by these studies. First, the UK study demonstrates that, before resources are defined, the particular



groups of victim/survivors or crimes/violence being examined will need to be clearly identified because of the broad range of resources available, the varying types of victims, and the particular needs that may be acute in different countries. For example, in Canada, prostitution, trafficking, and sexual exploitation services as well as health-sector female genital mutilation services may not have automatically been included in a definition of “violence against women support services” even though this might well be warranted. Second, research in the US highlights the need to move beyond the narrow conceptualization of victim/survivor resources as only those responding organizations and agencies to encompass existing policy and legislative initiatives that often lead to varying levels of resources in communities or countries.

Measuring Victim/Survivor Resources

Once victim/survivor resources are identified, the challenge is to identify appropriate measures for levels of resource provision. While an important first step, resource availability is only one dimension of provision, representing a basic and somewhat crude measure of whether resources are distributed evenly among all victims/survivors. More detailed measures of resource accessibility, utility, and other important characteristics of an organization or policy will need to be identified. Accessibility measures might include average distance travelled by victims/survivors to access resources (particularly relevant for victims/survivors living in rural or remote areas), languages in which services are available, or whether a victim/survivor accesses services immediately or has their name put on a waiting list. Resource utility can be measured by the characteristics of those victims/survivors who are served, which, in turn, can

be compared to the characteristics of victims/survivors in the population. An area might have a high concentration of Aboriginal persons who have been victims/survivors of crime, but a particular resource is found to serve only a small proportion of such victims/survivors. Such patterns can be used to identify areas for further examination and can lead to more equitable access and use of resources.

Finally, as argued by Coy et al. (2008), documenting where services are and who they serve still provides only part of the story. Measures that capture the characteristics of those resources being examined will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the level of resources that are provided across jurisdictions. For example, documenting the existence of a shelter does not tell us the number of beds available or the services it offers in-house or in the community through outreach programs. Documenting the availability of a specialized domestic violence police unit does not provide information as to the size of the unit (e.g., whether it is comprised of one full- or part-time police officer, 10 police officers with support staff, or a number of civilian employees). Furthermore, sexual violence services available in a jurisdiction may be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, or only for a few days per week. Thus, the documentation process must move beyond availability, accessibility, and utility towards the quality of available resources in terms of size, breadth of services, and level of commitment relative to the population of victims/survivors served. Efforts by US researchers to document the level of police or prosecutorial commitment are an example of this, recognizing that existing policies are often implemented at the local level by various actors, and therefore, policy and/or resource implementation will vary across jurisdictions.

Determining Appropriate Data Sources and Needs

Beyond the national Victim Services Survey, there is currently no central database on legal and/or community-based resources for victims/survivors which would provide a starting point for this type of endeavour, and because information can vary both across and within provinces and territories, there is no consistency in the current documentation of resources at the provincial or local level. Even Canada’s Victim Services Survey has limitations since the majority of responses were received from government-based agencies, and therefore, non-government/community-based agencies are likely underrepresented. In fact, police-based agencies comprised the largest number of respondents (42%), a finding which is consistent with DeLeon-Granados and Wells’ (2003) argument that there is an over-emphasis on criminal justice services, ignoring the wide diversity of community-based resources and non-profit organizations that also offer assistance to women experiencing violence. Therefore, once victim/survivor resources are defined, and measures identified, the final task is to determine whether there are any existing data that are reliable and valid and can be built upon. If not, data needs and methods for collecting these data will need to be identified. Why is it important to document victim/survivor resources?

Why is it important to document victim/survivor resources?

The transformations that have occurred over the course of the past several decades in society’s response to crime victims/survivors has led to a pressing need to begin to identify reliable and valid standardized



measures that can be used to understand the role of this growth in resources in the lives of victims/survivors and in the communities in which they live. An examination of the distribution of these initiatives is vital to the development of public policy over time, but, as argued by DeLeon-Granados and Wells (2003), any efforts to document and ultimately examine the effect of

resources requires “a dialogue among key stakeholders, practitioners, researchers, and policymakers on an important and growing research area; a discussion of the ways to improve data systems and to improve the manner in which data are used for social science; and an enhanced awareness of methods to track efficacy of state and federal policy over time (2003, 150).” Such

a dialogue will begin to respond to the call that policymakers and researchers begin to identify what programs, policies, and/or legislative reforms have provided protection to victims/survivors of crime overall and, in particular, to victims/survivors of violent crime (Campbell et al. 2007). ■

Notes

1. Findings from the 2008 survey were not yet available at the time of writing.
2. The other two trends are increasing gender equality and changing relationship structures (for review, see Dawson et al. 2009).

References

- Aldridge, Mari L., and Kevin D. Browne. 2003. Perpetrators of spousal homicide: A review. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* 4(3): 265.
- Brantingham, Paul J., and Patricia L. Brantingham. 1981. *Environmental criminology*. California: Sage.
- Browne, Angela, and Kirk R. Williams. 1989. Exploring the effect of resource availability and the likelihood of female-perpetrated homicides. *Law and Society Review* 23(1): 75-94.
- Brzozowski, Jodi-Anne. 2008. Serving Canada's crime victims: Results from the 2005/2006 Victim Services Survey. *Victims of Crime Research Digest* 1:33-37.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn C., Nancy Glass, Phyllis W. Sharps, Kathryn Laughon, and Tina Bloom. 2007. Intimate partner homicide: Review and implications of research and policy. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse* 8(3): 246-269.
- Coy, Maddy, Liz Kelly, and Jo Foord. 2008. *Map of gaps 2: The postcode lottery of violence against women support services*. London: End Violence Against Women.
- Coy, Maddy, Liz Kelly, and Jo Foord. 2007. *Map of gaps: The postcode lottery of violence against women support services*. London: End Violence Against Women.
- Dawson, Myrna, Valerie Pottie Bunge, and Thierno Balde. 2009. National trends in intimate partner homicides: Explaining the decline, Canada, 1976-2001. *Violence Against Women* 15(3): 276-306.
- Dawson, Myrna. 2001. *An examination of declines in intimate partner homicide rates*. Final report, 80 pages. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- DeLeon-Granados, William, and William Wells. 2003. The reliability and validity of measures of domestic violence resources as used in intimate partner homicide research. *Violence Against Women* 9(2): 148-162.
- Dugan, Laura. 2003. Domestic violence legislation: Exploring its impact on the likelihood of domestic violence police involvement and arrest. *Criminology and Public Policy* 2(2): 283-312.
- Dugan, Laura, Daniel S. Nagin, and Richard Rosenfeld. 2003. Exposure reduction or retaliation? The effects of domestic violence resources on intimate partner homicide? *Law & Society Review* 37(1): 169-198.
- Dugan, Laura, Daniel S. Nagin, and Richard Rosenfeld. 1999. Explaining the decline in intimate partner homicide: The effects of changing domesticity, women's status, and domestic violence resources. *Homicide Studies* 3:187-214.
- Fineman, Martha A., and Roxanne Mykitiuk. 1994. *The public nature of private violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Fitzgerald, Robin, Michael Wisener, and Josée Savoie. 2004. *Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime in Winnipeg*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue no. 85-561-MIE2004004.
- Ogrodnik, Lucie. 2008. *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile 2008*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue No. 85-224-XIE.
- Savoie, Josée. 2008. *Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime: Edmonton, Halifax, and Thunder Bay*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue no. 85-561-M-No. 010.



“Explain Please!” Working with Victims and Restitution

By Susan McDonald
Principal Researcher
Research and Statistics Division
Department of Justice Canada

“Explain please!” is a quotation from a victim who was interviewed for a research study undertaken by the Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice Canada, on restitution in Saskatchewan.¹ It aptly summarizes the overall tone of the comments from victims when asked about how well they understood restitution. This article draws upon the findings and discussion of this research and will focus on the information and assistance needs of victims dealing with restitution orders. It begins with a brief overview of the *Criminal Code* restitution provisions and the Adult Restitution Program in Saskatchewan. A description of the research study follows with a focus on the findings on victims’ information needs. Discussion and concluding remarks complete the article.

Background

In Canada, since its inception in 1892, the *Criminal Code* has permitted a sentencing court to order “compensation” for property lost as a result of the commission of an offence. These provisions remained unchanged until 1996 when amendments repealed the compensation order provisions, replacing them with restitution order provisions. The terminology was changed to reflect that “restitution” refers to payments the offender

should make, while “compensation” generally refers to payments from the state.²

The Adult Restitution Program in Saskatchewan

The mandate of the Adult Restitution Program is to monitor cases where restitution has been ordered.³ The Program started in 1975 with the provincial ministry for corrections. It is unique in Canada and, as such, provides an important context within which to undertake research on restitution. The Program is currently located with the Ministry of Justice and Attorney General, Victims Services Branch, and consists of one full-time restitution coordinator and one full-time administrative support staff. There is a toll-free telephone number for offenders who are required to report to the restitution coordinator and for victims who have inquiries about restitution. Two plain language information pamphlets have been developed about the Program: one for offenders and one for victims. Applications and information on the Restitution Program are available from police agencies, police-based victims services programs, Crown prosecutors’ offices, or by contacting the Victims Services head office in Regina.

Under the Program, payments continue to be paid to Courts and certified copies of restitution orders

continue to be provided to victims by the courts. Once breach action is initiated, an offender may be brought back before the Court for failure to pay restitution. If restitution is not paid, the victim can register the order with the Court of Queen’s Bench and initiate civil action against the offender. The restitution coordinator assists with inquiries from victims regarding the process of registering their orders and the enforcement measures that are available.

A restitution order can be, and often is, given in conjunction with other sentencing options such as probation or a conditional sentence. If the Probation or Conditional Sentence Order containing a restitution condition has expired, or a “stand alone” restitution order was originally imposed, the victim can file his/her restitution order as a civil judgment through the Court of Queen’s Bench. This allows the victim to use the mechanisms available under provincial judgment enforcement law to force compliance of the order. These mechanisms are all debtor-driven and rely on the victim to take steps to enforce the restitution order.

Just as with any other civil monetary judgment, the victim’s ability to collect on a restitution order depends on a number of factors, including the resources the offender has and the type of enforcement tools they have available to access



those resources. This civil enforcement system is a self-help system, and the onus is on the victim to attempt to identify the assets or income of the accused which can be garnished or seized. The victim's ability to recover on the judgment will depend on whether the offender has any resources at his/her disposal.

Research on Restitution in Saskatchewan

The purpose of the research study was to gain a greater understanding of how restitution is working in Saskatchewan and to better understand the application of restitution orders as part of the sentencing process, including their impact on the system, victims, and offenders. Among the specific research questions asked were: How do victims experience the restitution program/process? What are the benefits and challenges for them?

Methodology

For the purposes of this article, I will be drawing on the findings from the following two data sources:⁴

- 1) A mail-out/electronic questionnaire was also sent to all private citizen victims of offenders in four court locations (Regina, Saskatoon, Yorkton and Meadow Lake) who had received a letter from the court indicating that the offender in their cases had received a restitution order in 2007/08 (n=50/295).
- 2) Interviews were conducted with 67 criminal justice stakeholders, including 23 victims as well as offenders, court staff, probation

officers, defence, Crown prosecutors, and Ministry of Justice and Attorney General programs/policy officials, between August and October 2008 in the four court locations noted above.

Research Findings

Demographics

A total of 50 victims responded to the questionnaire, out of a possible 295, for a response rate of 22%. To obtain richer, more detailed information about their experiences a total of 23 victims⁵ were also interviewed and were able to tell their story in more depth. Half of those who responded to the questionnaire were men (52%) and correspondingly, the other half were women (48%). More than four fifths (86%) were over the age of 30; 43% were between the ages of 31 and 50, and another 43% were over the age of 51. Three quarters of the victims (76%) did not identify an ethno-cultural background. Only 6% self-identified as a member of a visible minority group; 6% identified as First Nations, and 2% identified as Métis. The demographic information about the victims described above is quite consistent with the general demographic composition of the province of Saskatchewan in 2006.⁶

In terms of offences for which a restitution order was imposed, mischief was the most common (38%), followed by theft (22%) and fraud (20%). Assault and break and enter were each reported by respondents in 8% of cases, and other property offences made up the remaining cases. The sample contains a large number of fraud cases. In fraud cases where the amount of money lost and the amounts ordered

were often quite large, respondents may have had very strong opinions that they wanted to express by returning the questionnaire.⁷

Information and Assistance

Those who responded to the questionnaire indicated that they had received an explanation of the restitution process from different criminal justice professionals such as police, Crown, Victim Services, the Restitution Coordinator, court staff, their own lawyer, as well as family and friends. More than one third (36%) of victims indicated that police services provided an oral explanation of restitution, and three fifths (61%) of these respondents indicated that the police were very helpful.

Questionnaire respondents were then asked about receiving a written explanation of restitution and the process. Victims responded that court staff provided a written explanation in one fifth of cases (n=10). Four fifths (80%) of victims found this written explanation very or somewhat helpful. In cases where Victims Services provided written explanations, four fifths (80%) of victims found the explanation very or somewhat helpful.

There were a few comments on the written information received:

Full write out of procedure sent to victims... stating their right to follow up, and the actions they may take.

It should be put in easier to understand with less legal jargon that your average person does not understand.

The comments illustrate how important it can be to pre-test all public legal information with the intended audience.



Police were definitely an important source of information, and the information was rated as very helpful in a majority of instances. This may be because the police are often the first responders to a crime incident and are aware, particularly for property crimes, of the importance of documenting the financial costs of the crime.

This research clearly revealed that more than half the victims interviewed and surveyed received little, if any, assistance from the criminal justice system. It must be noted, however, that as the majority of cases are property crimes or fraud, these individuals would often not receive assistance from victim services. This is because victim services are generally prioritized for personal injury and sexual offences. Due to insufficient resources, the Restitution Coordinator's role is limited to providing information when contacted by victims and helping them to help themselves.

All victims interviewed noted that they had received a letter from the court with the restitution order. Some individuals only became aware of the restitution order when they received a letter from Saskatchewan Justice about this study.

No one told me anything about getting evidence until the case was over. No one ever told me about the restitution order. I found out about it when I got a letter from you guys. Otherwise before that I never heard about it, I never went to court, nothing. ... Well, OK, I guess the police asked me how much I paid. I gave them a bill of sale and everything.

There were three individuals who, upon receiving the questionnaire and explanatory letter, called either

the Department of Justice Canada or Saskatchewan Justice. They claimed they knew nothing at all about a restitution order and had never received anything from the court. In at least one instance, it was determined that a letter had not been sent out when the order was imposed.

No, I didn't know when the court cases were or anything. I got something in the mail from Susan McDonald and phoned her up to ask what the survey was all about and she said I was supposed to have received a restitution order and I said I've never received one. Then I phoned the court house and they said they had the original copy and that they never mailed me one. So, I never knew nothing about nothing. They said they'd send me a copy and that was about it. The order was for \$8,500.

It is important to bear in mind that it is possible that victims did receive letters and the information pamphlets about restitution with the 1-800 number for the Restitution Coordinator and do not remember.

Research has shown that trauma has an impact on memory and cognitive functioning (see McDonald 2000; Hill 2007; Miller 2007). Information processing and cognitive impairment have been highlighted as concerns when working with traumatized individuals (Brandes et al. 2002).

Herman (1992, 33) defines traumatic events in this way:

Traumatic events overwhelm the ordinary systems of care that give people a sense of control, connection and meaning. Traumatic events are extraordinary, not because they occur rarely, but because they

overwhelm the ordinary human adaptations to life... They confront human beings with the extremities of helplessness and terror and evoke the responses of catastrophe.

We generally tend to associate trauma with violence and several personal injury or sexual offences. Depending on an individual's situation, property offences such as vandalism or fraud could be very traumatic. For one individual who was defrauded \$100,000, this poignant comment stresses the painful impact that can be inflicted through crimes such as fraud.

It really hurt, and most of all I felt I was really stupid in this.

Feeling "really stupid" is something that is difficult to measure, but it can drain self-confidence in a debilitating way. This victim also talked about "falling into a depression" that she felt was a direct result of the humiliation she felt and the loss of such significant savings.⁸ Limitations to cognitive functioning, such as short term memory loss and difficulty processing information, must be considered when designing restitution information materials for victims and when interacting with victims.

Another source of information for victims is a toll-free number that is used for three programs: Victims Services, Compensation, and the Adult Restitution Program. Callers are prompted to select if they are calling for Restitution, Compensation, or the Victims Services general office. Compensation is distinct from restitution although this may be lost on a distraught victim. The comment below demonstrates the need for all programs involved to communicate.



When it comes to help, where do you turn to in a small town? All I had was a 1-800 number where they had no clue who I was or when I was gonna get my money.

This victim found out about restitution just because he happened to be in court to watch the case unfold.

I heard about it in court. I was only going to watch and nothing else. I do that you know. I go down and watch the cases. There's nothing else to do in town.

How information is presented appears to be very important as well. Even when police, as the first responders, provided some information, many of those who were interviewed noted that they did not clearly understand the process. There is no way of knowing whether the information presented was confusing or whether it was due to the individual not understanding, perhaps because of their level of education or literacy or the impact of the trauma or, most likely, a combination of all of these factors.

I didn't get any information at all, no. The police mentioned it early on and said he should pay it. I didn't understand it all that well and just kind of ignored it. They didn't say that he'd pay me but that the court would pay me. I didn't really understand what restitution was. I took it as the government would pay me and go after him, but that's obviously not the case. I don't know all the details of it.

The confusion expressed above over who would pay – the offender or the government – is understandable. There is a victims compensation program in Saskatchewan, but

personal property damage is not eligible for compensation.⁹ Furthermore, to a victim, it does not really matter who pays, just that he or she is paid, particularly when the court has made an order.

The police didn't tell me much. All they said was something about a surcharge and that I could get money from that because I was a victim. The court told me about restitution at court. During the case, they said he was supposed to pay for my deductible because he smashed my car.

There were many victims who did get information and often some additional assistance.

Yes, I got help from the police; they were very helpful. And also the prosecuting attorney was very good to me. There wasn't too much trouble; the money is starting to be paid on time.

In a few cases of personal injury or violent crime, victims reported that they had received really good, useful help from Victims Services. The tone of these experiences was quite positive.

Victims were asked, on both the questionnaire and in the interview, about how, when, and from whom they learned about restitution. The results show that more could be done to provide victims with appropriate and timely information and assistance at different points of entry in the criminal justice system.

For example, victims repeatedly noted problems that resulted in them not understanding what was happening, particularly around the payment of the order. The following quotations from victims aptly

illustrate some of their frustrations and present some ideas:

Better communication with the victims. I feel extremely ripped off.

Explain please! I didn't understand the impact of filing an insurance claim.

To talk with someone that knows it...

I believe I should be informed of what is going on with the process, like who was caught and charged. The Justice Department should give me a password to a computer system where I can take a look at what's going on. I don't think they need to spend the money mailing me information on every single court date he has; but if I had a way to look myself as a victim that would be better.

It is important to underscore that victims who received specific help from Victims Services or the Restitution Coordinator were very positive about this help and the difference that it made. The police have a key role to play in terms of raising awareness of restitution, but other players such as Crown prosecutors, court staff, and Victims Services (when involved) also have roles to play. Enhanced materials and resources need to be developed for victims, keeping in mind the impact of trauma on learning as well as the potential for unrealistic expectations in terms of the length of time receiving restitution involves.

Discussion

The research findings clearly identified the need for enhanced information and assistance for victims. While seemingly simple,



appropriate information and assistance for victims can be quite complex given the different demographics (literacy, language, access to the Internet, etc.) and the different needs of victims. Due to the nature of the offences, victims who receive a restitution order are frequently not proactively offered personal assistance from Victim Services in the province.¹⁰ This is also true in many parts of Canada. Given that, it would be worth the effort to provide well-tested and thorough materials and assess what levels of assistance could be made available.

Victims indicated that they need information at different stages in the justice system—at the time of the offence, at sentencing, during the term of the sentence (probation, custody, conditional sentence if applicable), and afterwards for civil enforcement. They need information about their personal case, but they also need information about restitution in general to really be able to understand the legislation and what restitution can and cannot achieve. While restitution may improve feelings in citizens about the quality of the justice system in their country (Geiss 1977, 162), the reverse could also be said to be true. It was quite evident from the research findings that if they were not paid in full, within the promised timeframe, many victims held quite negative perceptions of the justice system overall. Empirical research in the United States found that delayed and partial payments are not of sufficient value to victims to justify restitution programs (Sims 2000, 256). As such, it is absolutely critical that victims

have a full understanding of restitution and that their expectations are realistic. Appropriate information and assistance can go a long way towards achieving these objectives.

An example of one simple strategy to improve victims' experiences with the justice system would be providing access to a person by telephone after regular work hours. Other ideas that would have broader resource implications could include having a victim-dedicated restitution coordinator or working with law schools to set up a restitution assistance program as part of a student legal clinic. One victim asked for an on-line resource similar to that which is currently being tested in British Columbia (www.victiminfo.ca) where a victim can access updated information about his or her case with a secure password provided by the Crown.

The Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice and Attorney General is exploring the feasibility of establishing a Restitution Civil Enforcement Program (RCEP). This program would assist victims in collecting restitution in cases where the restitution order does not include any supervision requirement or when the offender has failed to pay restitution within the timeframe of a community-based sentence. This program would be established within the Fine Collection Branch.

Summary

It is important to recognize that information and assistance both play important roles in ensuring that victim expectations are realistic and that those victims who wish to are able to participate fully in the

justice system. Four key areas can be identified from the research findings where greater information and assistance would make a difference for victims:

1. Raising awareness to foster understanding of restitution at different stages of the criminal justice system through targeted information and education;
2. Providing more assistance with making an application for restitution;
3. Timely up-dates and information on payment status; and
4. More assistance with collection through the civil courts.

Chief Judge Stuart of the Territorial Court summarized the situation very nicely in the case of *R. v. Bullen*:¹¹

To engage a victim as a witness to secure a conviction in the interest of the state and then leave the victim to their own means to pursue their injuries in another process, in another court, raises questions of fairness and practicability. In many respects, victim interests have been unduly subrogated to state interests in the evolution of criminal courts from their beginnings in civil courts.

By undertaking this research study to gain a better understanding of how the restitution process is working in the province, Saskatchewan has taken a positive step towards better assisting victims in the restitution process. The development of a Restitution Civil Enforcement Program (RCEP), as well as enhanced materials on restitution will further demonstrate the province's commitment to victims of crime. ■



Notes

1. The full report is forthcoming.
2. For an outline on the history of the *Criminal Code* provisions on restitution as well as the current provisions, see McDonald (2009).
3. Restitution collected through adult alternative measures programs is not included in the Program because each community justice program is responsible for monitoring its own agreements. In 2007/08, 20% of the agreements in adult alternative measures programs included restitution to victims as part of their successfully completed agreement for a total of \$150,445 and an average of \$614 per agreement. The compliance rate is very high.
4. The study used a mixed-methods approach with additional data from these sources: (1) data on the types of offences and characteristics of victims and offenders that receive restitution orders came from the Corrections Management Information System (N=6290, 2000/01-2007/08); (2) restitution order data for Canada and Saskatchewan from the Adult Criminal Court Survey was provided by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics; and (3) information regarding stand-alone restitution orders (n=36) and orders attached to conditional sentences or probation orders (n=121) were gathered from a manual review of files kept by the Adult Restitution Program (n=157, 2005/06-2007/08).
5. The questionnaire asked for a name and contact information if you wished to be interviewed. A small number of victims were also identified as willing to be interviewed through the Restitution Coordinator.
6. The largest difference seen between the victims in this group and the general population of Saskatchewan is seen in ethnographic make-up: 15% of the population of Saskatchewan identify as Aboriginal, which is much higher than those who responded to the questionnaire. Furthermore, 3.5% of the population of Saskatchewan self-identified as a visible minority in 2006, in comparison to 6% in the questionnaire respondents.
7. Overall, the top three offences which received a restitution order in Saskatchewan in 2006/07 included mischief (23%), fraud (22%), and theft (20%), similar to those reported in the questionnaire sample.
8. Most research on the psycho-social impacts of victimization is derived from work with victims of personal injury or sexual offences or family members of homicide (see Hill 2007). The General Social Survey on Victimization considers eight crime categories, including different property crimes, but not fraud.
9. See the Web site of the Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice and Attorney General at: <http://www.justice.gov.sk.ca/VS-Compensation>.
10. This assistance would generally be available to these victims upon request.
11. (2001) 48 C.R. (5th) 110 (Yukon Terr. Ct.)

References

- Brandes Dalia, G. Ben-Schachar, Asaf Gilboa, Omer Bonne, Sara Freedman, Arieh Y. Shalev. 2002. PTSD symptoms and cognitive performance in recent trauma survivors. *Psychiatry Research* 110 (3): 231-238.
- Geiss, Gilbert. 1977. Restitution by criminal offenders: A summary and overview. In *Restitution in criminal justice*, ed. J. Hudson and B. Galaway. Lexington: D.C. Heath.
- Herman, Judith. 1992. *Trauma and recovery: The aftermath of violence from domestic abuse to political terror*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hill, James K. 2007. *Victim's response to trauma and implications for interventions: A selected review and synthesis of the literature*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- McDonald, Susan. 2009. Understanding restitution. *Victims of Crime Research Digest* 2:10-16.
- McDonald, Susan. 2002. Learning about the law. *The Canadian Journal for Studies in Adult Education* 16 (2): 73-94.
- McDonald, Susan. 2000. *The right to know: Women, ethnicity, violence and learning about the law*. Doctoral dissertation. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.
- Miller, Karen. 2007. *Empowering victims through the use of victim impact statements in cases of sexual assault in Nova Scotia*. Policy Centre for Victim Issues, Department of Justice Canada.
- Sims, Barbara. 2000. Victim restitution: A review of the literature. *The Justice Professional* 13(3): 247-269.



Aboriginal Victimization in Canada: A Summary of the Literature

By Katie Scrim
Research Officer
Research and Statistics Division
Department of Justice Canada

This article is derived from the forthcoming report “A Review of Research on Criminal Victimization and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples 1990 to 2008,” which is an update of the original report entitled A Review of Research on Criminal Victimization and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples 1990 to 2001 (Chartrand and McKay 2006).

Introduction

According to data from the 2004 General Social Survey on Victimization (GSS), 40% of Aboriginal¹ Canadians reported having been a victim of crime in the year leading up to the survey compared to 28% of non-Aboriginal Canadians. With respect to violent crime,² Aboriginal people were three times more likely to have been victimized compared to non-Aboriginal people (319 incidents versus 101 incidents per 1,000 population) (Brzozowski et al. 2006).

These statistics confirm that Aboriginal people are disproportionately represented as victims of crime in Canada. Perpetrators of violence against Aboriginal people are most often other members of the Aboriginal community such as spouses, relatives, or friends of the victim, and as such, victimization among Aboriginal people in Canada is often regarded as a mirror image of Aboriginal offending.

A review of criminal justice studies on Aboriginal representation in the criminal justice system reveals that the literature is largely offender focused. While significant attention is spent addressing questions such as how to make the criminal justice system more relevant for Aboriginal offenders, less attention has been focused on Aboriginal victims of crime.

This article summarizes the findings of a recent literature review on the criminal victimization of Aboriginal people in Canada. This review paid specific attention to demographic and social trends that have been regarded as factors possibly influencing high victimization rates. It also investigated the under-reporting of victimization among Aboriginal people and the particularly high victimization rates among Aboriginal women, youth, and persons with physical and mental health issues. Finally, explanations for the high rate of victimization of Aboriginal people were proposed, and future research areas were identified.

Criminogenic Factors³

Research has identified a connection between certain demographic and social factors and an elevated risk of offending and/or victimization. These factors include being young (Lochner 2004), living in a lone-parent family situation

(Stevenson et al. 1998), living common-law (Mihorean 2005), high levels of unemployment (Raphael and Winter-Ebmer 2001), and the consumption of alcohol (Vanderburg et al. 1995). All of these risk factors are highly apparent in the demographic and social conditions of the Aboriginal population in Canada.

The Aboriginal population in Canada is much younger on average than other Canadians, with a mean age of just 27 compared to 40 for the rest of Canada. Accentuating this further, almost half (48%) of the Aboriginal population is under the age of 25 (Statistics Canada 2008a).

In terms of family composition, Aboriginal children are more likely than non-Aboriginal children to live in lone-parent households, and in 1996, Aboriginal women headed 86% of these households (Statistics Canada 2001).

Although Aboriginal Canadians have been making important gains in educational achievement, they are still significantly underrepresented in educational attainment. While 81% of the non-Aboriginal population aged 20 years or older holds at least a high school diploma, just 62% of the Aboriginal population in that age group does (Statistics Canada 2008c).

The Aboriginal population is also an economically disadvantaged population. The unemployment rate is more than double that of the



non-Aboriginal population in Canada (15% compared to 6%) (Statistics Canada 2008b). As a correlate, Aboriginal people make 33% less income per annum on average than non-Aboriginal people (Statistics Canada 2008d).

Results from the 2004 GSS show that alcohol or drug use was a factor in six out of ten criminal incidents committed against Aboriginal victims. However, this figure was not statistically different from those incidents involving non-Aboriginal victims (Brzozowski et al. 2006).

The disproportionately high rates of violent victimization experienced by Aboriginal people can only be partially explained by the social and demographic characteristics of that population. The findings of one study show that while being young is the single greatest predictor of violent victimization for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, simply being an Aboriginal person significantly increases the likelihood of experiencing a violent victimization (Brzozowski et al. 2006). All other factors held constant, the odds of being the victim of a violent crime is approximately three times higher among Aboriginal people (Brzozowski et al. 2006).

Under-Reporting of Victimization

The under-reporting of victimization, particularly for domestic⁴ violence, is a serious concern in Canada. It is argued that in many Aboriginal communities the problem is far more acute (LaPrairie 1995; McKay 2001). LaPrairie (1995) reported in her study of Aboriginal victimization in urban centres that 74% of respondents who experienced family violence did not report their victimization.

Case Outcomes

Some studies have found that even when incidents of violence are reported by Aboriginal victims and charges are laid, there is a higher rate of dismissed charges or not guilty outcomes. For example, the dismissal and discharge rate of Aboriginal people accused of domestic violence was 60%, compared to 44% of non-Aboriginal accused, mainly due to a significant reluctance on the part of victims to attend court and testify (Ursel 2001). Hence, even when incidents of domestic violence are reported to police, these charges are often dropped more often for Aboriginal accused than for non-Aboriginal accused.

Victimization of Aboriginal Women

Research reveals that Aboriginal women experience dramatically higher rates of violent victimization than non-Aboriginal women do (Proulx and Perrault 2000; Hylton 2002; Brzozowski et al. 2006). Violence within the domestic context is the most pervasive form of victimization experienced by Aboriginal women. Nearly one-quarter (24%) of Aboriginal women in Canada reported having been assaulted by a current or former spouse, compared to 7% of non-Aboriginal women (Brzozowski et al. 2006). Results from other studies suggest that this figure may be as high as 90% in some Aboriginal communities (Ontario Native Women's Association 2007).

The literature shows that Aboriginal women consistently report a rate of partner violence much higher than their non-Aboriginal counterparts, even after

controlling for relevant social variables. For instance, while living common law is associated with a 13 percent greater risk of victimization for non-Aboriginal women, the associated risk for Aboriginal women is 217 percent higher (Brownridge 2008).

Sexual assault against women is particularly prevalent in Northern Canada where there is a much higher proportion of Aboriginal people in each of the territories than in the provinces. In 2002, the rate of sexual assault in Nunavut was 96.1 for every 10,000 people compared to the overall rate in Canada of 7.8 in every 10,000 people (Levan 2001). Aboriginal women have also been found to be greatly over-represented as sex trade workers compared to non-Aboriginal women (Oxman-Martinez et al. 2005; Royal Canadian Mounted Police 2006). In one study of the Vancouver sex trade, 52 of 101 women interviewed were Aboriginal (Farley et al. 2005). The overwhelming majority of these women reported both a history of childhood sexual abuse by multiple perpetrators and a history of rape and other assaults while working as prostitutes.

Victimization of Aboriginal Youth

Much of the literature on Aboriginal victimization is examined within the framework of family violence given the high prevalence of Aboriginal victimization in this context. The victimization of Aboriginal children and youth is not often evaluated independently of spousal violence. There is some evidence suggesting that the victimization of Aboriginal youth is a serious problem in some communities (Kingsley and Mark 2000). Research in this area reveals that there is a



high correlation between childhood domestic victimization and subsequent victimization and criminal activity later in life (LaPrairie 1995).

Research shows that violent incidents are two and a half times more likely to be committed against Aboriginal Canadians aged 15 to 34 than against those aged 35 years and older (Brzozowski et al. 2006). Sexual abuse against Aboriginal children was also found to be quite prevalent. Studies show that on average 25% to 50% of Aboriginal women were victims of sexual abuse as children compared to a 20% to 25% average rate within the non-Aboriginal population (Collin-Vézina et al 2009). Among the Aboriginal population, this abuse is often committed by someone in the victim's immediate or extended family (Bopp and Bopp 1997). However, sexual violence is not only intra-familial. Two separate studies found that sexual abusers come from a wide circle of people outside the family, such as friends, neighbours, and peers (Kingsley and Mark 2000; LaPrairie 1995).

As previously noted, the experience of intra-familial victimization is linked to subsequent victimization and criminal activity later in life. One study showed that children exposed to violence were 10 to 17 times more likely to have serious "emotional and behavioural problems when compared to children who were raised in a non-violent home environment" (Dumont-Smith 2001, 11). The more severe the child abuse, the more likely the child will become involved in juvenile delinquency, particularly among males (Dumont-Smith 2001). Moreover, males who had experienced abuse as children were found to be at a significantly high risk to

repeat the cycle of violence with their future spouses (McGillivray and Comaskey 1996).

Entrance into the sex trade can also make youth more susceptible to victimization. In fact, one study found that approximately 30 percent of youth employed in the Canadian sex trade were Aboriginal (Koshan 2003).

Victimization of Aboriginal People with Physical and Mental Health Issues

Victimization of Aboriginal people with disabilities is increasingly recognized as a concern (Federal Task Force on Disability Issues 1996), yet little research is available on the topic. One study indicates that Aboriginal people have a disability rate that is double the national rate for adults and three times the national rate for people aged 15 to 34 (Human Resources and Development Canada 2002).

One area that has been the subject of increased attention is Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD). According to the research, individuals with FASD are at an increased likelihood to be involved in the criminal justice system (Streissguth et al 1996). The social and behavioural symptomology of individuals with FASD is very similar to the effects of child exposure to violence in the family, as identified by many health and social services and referred to in a report by the Aboriginal Nurses Association of Canada (Dumont-Smith 2001).

Aboriginal people living with HIV/AIDS are frequently victims of discrimination from their own

communities as well as from the non-Aboriginal community (Matiation 1995). Between 1993 and early 2002, the percentage of all reported AIDS cases attributed to Aboriginal people increased from 2% to 14% (Matiation 1999). The increasing prevalence of HIV/AIDS in federal institutions is also of concern to Aboriginal people, given that they are overrepresented in Canadian prisons (Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network 1999).

Studies have also pointed out the increased risk of HIV/AIDS among Aboriginal youth, particularly those that are involved in intravenous drug use and prostitution as well as those exposed to sexual and physical abuse. Connections between HIV and sexual violence among Aboriginal women, particularly through rape, abuse, and incest, have also been identified (Neron and Roffey 2000).

Understanding High Rates of Victimization

The "trauma theory" has been the main explanation adopted by researchers for the high rates of Aboriginal victimization. The theory posits that the relatively recent victimization of Aboriginal peoples has occurred not only to Aboriginal people as individuals but to Aboriginal people as a society, as a result of the colonization process which saw communities losing control over family and culture. It is the preferred theory in many studies examining family violence in Aboriginal communities, but it can easily be applied to a broader theory of Aboriginal victimization (Ursel 2001). Its effects are often explained as the root causes of social disorder in Aboriginal societies where



alcohol, suicide, abuse, and victims of violence are symptoms of this underlying traumatization.

The impacts of forced removal of children from their families and communities and the abuse many endured in residential schools have been passed down generationally. Ontario Assistant Crown Attorney Rupert Ross (in Brant Castellano et al. 2008) describes how the residential school experience “set in motion an intergenerational transfer of trauma that continues to cause significant downstream damage to Aboriginal families, their children, and their grandchildren.” Survivors of residential schools and their descendents alike report difficulty forming trusting relationships with their spouses and family members. Children growing up without such trusting relationships often develop an inability to respond to stress without resorting to external stimuli such as destructive addictions (Chansonneuve 2007).

The Cycle of Victimization

Many studies highlight that acts of violence are often committed by individuals for whom violence has become normalized, having

themselves been victimized, particularly in childhood (Jacobs and Gill 2002; Rojas and Gretton 2007; Van der Woerd et al. 2006). Increased victim support services may be a step towards breaking the cycle of violence. Levan (2003) describes significant gaps in the availability of victim services in the territories, particularly outside of urban centers, as well as the inadequate supports for volunteers and paid staff working in the few existing victim service organizations. There have been improvements in services in the past several years in many parts of the country, particularly in the Yukon where there may be a possible link between the improvement in services and lower reported rates of spousal assault, sexual assault, and child abuse (Levan 2003). However, many challenges remain in providing accessible and culturally relevant services for all Aboriginal people who have experienced victimization.

Conclusion and Further Research

The majority of the literature available discussing Aboriginal involvement in the criminal justice system is offender-focused. What

literature is available suggests that the victimization of Aboriginal people is both complicated and extensive, and may be a direct reflection of Aboriginal offending given that violent victimizations among Aboriginal people are often carried out by other Aboriginal people.

There are significant gaps in the research, and these gaps may lead to a lack of awareness, understanding, and action towards the correction of these circumstances. Incomplete statistical information may underestimate the full extent of Aboriginal victimization or distort our understanding of the causes and contexts of this violence. Such a state may hamper the delivery of appropriate policy responses (Amnesty International 2004; Kong and Beattie 2005). If the cycle of violence is to be broken, Aboriginal involvement in the criminal justice system must be understood from both an offender and victim perspective. ■

Notes

1. For the purposes of this review, Aboriginal people are defined as First Nations (status and non-status Indian), Métis, and Inuit people.
2. The GSS defines violent crime as robbery, assault, and sexual assault.
3. These are factors that lead to or produce crime, criminality, and/or victimization.
4. For the purposes of this review, domestic violence is analogous to family violence which is defined by the Department of Justice Canada

as violence “that includes the many different forms of abuse, mistreatment or neglect that adults or children may experience in their intimate, kinship or dependent relationships” (Department of Justice Canada 2009).





References

- Amnesty International. 2004. *Stolen sisters: Discrimination and violence against indigenous women in Canada*.
- Bopp, Judie, and Michael Bopp. 1997. *Responding to sexual abuse: Developing a community-based sexual abuse response team in Aboriginal communities*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Corrections Policy Unit and Solicitor General Canada.
- Brant Castellano, Marlene, Linda Archibald, and Mike DeGagné. 2008. *From truth to reconciliation: Transforming the legacy of residential schools*. Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Brownridge, Douglas A. 2008. Understanding the elevated risk of partner violence against Aboriginal women: A comparison of two nationally representative surveys of Canada. *Journal of Family Violence* 23:353.
- Brzozowski, Jodi-Anne, Andrea Taylor-Butts, and Sara Johnson. 2006. *Victimization and offending among the Aboriginal population in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network and Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network. 1999. *Aboriginal people and HIV/AIDS: Legal issues: Fact sheets 1-9*. Montreal and Ottawa.
- Chansonneuve, Deborah. 2007. *Addictive behaviours among Aboriginal people in Canada*. Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Chartrand, Larry, and Celeste McKay. 2006. *A Review of Research on Criminal Victimization and First Nations, Métis and Inuit Peoples 1990 to 2001*. Retrieved February 4, 2010, from http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2006/rr06_vic1/index.html.
- Collin-Vézina, Delphine, Jacinthe Dion, and Nico Trocmé. 2009. Sexual abuse in Canadian Aboriginal communities: A broad review of conflicting evidence. *Pimatisiwin: A journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous community health* 7: 27-48.
- Department of Justice Canada. 2009. *Family violence: A fact sheet from the Department of Justice*. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/fv-vf/facts-info/fv-vf/fv1-vf1.html#whatis>.
- Dumont-Smith, Claudette. 2001. *Exposure to violence in the home: Effects on Aboriginal children, Discussion paper*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Nurses Association of Canada.
- Farley, Melissa, Jacqueline Lynne, and Ann J. Cotton. 2005. Prostitution in Vancouver: Violence and the colonization of First Nations women. *Transcultural Psychiatry* 42:242.
- Federal Task Force on Disability Issues. 1996. Aboriginal Canadians with disabilities: Keeping hope alive. In *Equal citizenship for Canadians with disabilities: The will to act*, Chapter 2. Retrieved October 8, 2009, from <http://www.teamworkcooperative.ns.ca/Documents/EQUAL%20CITIZENSHIP%20FOR%20CANADIANS%20WITH%20DISABILITIES.PDF>.
- Human Resources and Development Canada. 2002. *Future directions to address disability issues for the Government of Canada: Working together for full citizenship*. Accessed February 3, 2010, from: <http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/cs/sp/sdc/socpol/publications/reports/1999-000046/futdire.pdf>.
- Hylton, John H. 2002. *Aboriginal sex offending in Canada*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Jacobs, Kahawi, and Kathryn M. Gill. 2002. Substance abuse among urban Aboriginals: Association with a history of physical/sexual abuse. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse* 1:19.
- Kingsley, Cherry, and Melanie Mark. 2000. *Sacred lives: Canadian aboriginal children and youth speak out about sexual exploitation: Save the Children Canada*. Accessed June 19, 2002 from <http://dsp-psd.communication.gc.ca/Collection/RH34-12-2000E.pdf>.
- Kong, Rebecca, and Karen Beattie. 2005. *Collecting data on Aboriginal People in the criminal justice system: Methods and challenges*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Koshan, Jennifer. 2003. Alberta (dis) advantage: The Protection of Children Involved in Prostitution Act and the equality rights of young women. *University of Toronto Journal of Law and Equality* 2: 210.
- LaPrairie, Carol. 1995. *Seen but not heard: Native people in the inner city*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services.
- Levan, Mary Beth. 2001. *Creating a framework for the wisdom of the community: Victim services in Nunavut: Needs and recommendations*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Levan, Mary Beth. 2003. *Creating a Framework for the Wisdom of the Community: Review of Victim Services in Nunavut, Northwest and Yukon Territories*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Lochner, Lance. 2004. Education, work and crime: A human capital approach. *International Economic Review* 45(3): 811-843.



- Matiation, Stefan. 1995. HIV/AIDS and Aboriginal communities: Problems of jurisdiction and discrimination. Unpublished manuscript. University of Toronto.
- Matiation, Stefan. 1999. *Discrimination, HIV/AIDS and Aboriginal people*. 2nd ed. Montreal and Ottawa: Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network and Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network.
- McKay, Celeste. 2001. *Report on Canada's compliance with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in response to Canada's 13th and 14th reports to the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: FAFIA think tank paper no. 3*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action.
- McGillivray, Anne, and Brenda Comaskey. 1996. *Intimate violence, Aboriginal women and justice system response: A Winnipeg study*. Winnipeg: Research Council on Family Violence and Violence against Women.
- Mihorean, Karen. 2005. Trends in self-reported spousal violence. In *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2000*, ed. K. Aucoin. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Neron, Carole, and Rhonda Roffey. 2000. HIV, sexual violence and Aboriginal women. *Native Social Work Journal* 3:57-72.
- Ontario Native Women's Association. 2007. *A strategic framework to end violence against Aboriginal women*. Thunder Bay.
- Oxman-Martinez, Jacqueline, Marie Lacroix, and Jill Hanley. 2005. *Victims of trafficking in persons: Perspectives from the Canadian community sector*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Proulx, Jocelyn, and Sharon Perrault. 2000. *No place for violence: Canadian Aboriginal alternatives*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Raphael, Steven, and Rudolf Winter-Ebmer, 2001. Identifying the effect of unemployment on crime. *Journal of Law and Economics* 44(1): 259-283.
- Rojas, Erika Y., and Heather M. Gretton. 2007. Background, offence characteristics, and criminal outcomes of Aboriginal youth who sexually offend: A closer look at Aboriginal youth intervention needs. *Sex Abuse* 19:257.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police. 2006. *Control or regulation of prostitution in Canada: Implications for police*. Ottawa: Research and Evaluation – Community, Contract and Aboriginal Policing Services Directorate.
- Statistics Canada. 2001. *Aboriginal peoples in Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics profile series*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Statistics Canada. 2008a. *Aboriginal peoples in Canada in 2006: Inuit, Métis and First Nations, 2006 Census*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Statistics Canada. 2008b. Census Data Products: *Aboriginal Identity, Age Groups, Area of Residence, Sex and Selected Demographic, Cultural, Labour Force, Educational and Income Characteristics, for the Total Population of Canada, Provinces and Territories, 2006 Census*. Catalogue number: 97-564-XWE2006002.
- Statistics Canada. 2008c. Census Data Products: *Aboriginal Identity, Highest Certificate, Diploma or Degree, Major Field of Study – Classification of Instructional Programs, 2000, Attendance at School, Area of Residence, Age Groups and Sex for the Population 15 Years and Over of Canada, Provinces and Territories, 2006 Census*. Catalogue number: 97-560-XCB2006036.
- Statistics Canada. 2008d. Census Data Products: *Income Statistics in Constant (2005) Dollars, Age Groups, Aboriginal Identity, Registered Indian Status and Aboriginal Ancestry, Highest Certificate, Diploma or Degree and Sex for the Population 15 Years and Over With Income of Canada, Provinces, Territories, 2000 and 2005*. Catalogue Number: 97-563-X2006008.
- Stevenson, Kathryn, Jennifer Tufts, Dianne Hendrick, and Melanie Kowalski. 1998. *A profile of youth justice in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Streissguth, Ann P., Helen M. Barr, Julia Kogan, and Fred L. Bookstein. 1996. Understanding the occurrence of secondary disabilities in clients with fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) and fetal alcohol effects (FAE). Unpublished manuscript. Center for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Ursel, Jane. 2001. *Report on domestic violence policies and their impact on Aboriginal people*. Winnipeg: Aboriginal Justice Implementation Commission.
- Van der Woerd, Kim A., David N. Cox, and Tricia McDiarmid. 2006. A preliminary look at aggressive and violent behaviour in Aboriginal adolescent girls. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health* 41:119.
- Vanderburg, Susan A., John R. Weckes and William A. Millson. 1995. Early substance use and its impact on adult offender alcohol and drug problems. *Forum on Corrections Research* 7(1): 14-16.



Accessing Hard-to-Reach Populations: Respondent-Driven Sampling

By Sidikat Fashola
Research Assistant
Research and Statistics Division
Department of Justice Canada

According to Lauritsen and Archakova (2008), one of the primary challenges of empirical research concerning victims of crime relates to collecting data that is representative of a known population of victims. Recruiting victims of crime to participate in research studies is difficult for a number of ethical and methodological reasons. The General Social Survey on Criminal Victimization, currently undertaken by Statistics Canada every five years, has the most representative sample of victims of crime in Canada. It is limited to prevalence, types, basic impacts of victimization, and risk factors. Researchers seeking to better understand victims' experiences with the criminal justice system and with programs and services or to better understand victimization must look elsewhere for a more nuanced picture of victimization in Canada.

This article focuses on one particular method for recruiting hard-to-reach populations. It is important to study hard-to-reach populations for the purposes of informing the evidence-based policy development process. Having no empirical evidence about the hard-to-reach population(s) of interest may limit the effectiveness of policy. Hard-to-reach populations include groups for which no exhaustive list of the population members is available; they may be widely distributed, and there may be no specific knowledge about them. There may also be

strong privacy concerns; the group may be engaged in illicit behaviour (for example, HIV-infected drug users, sex-trade workers) or may not trust the dominant culture (for example, undocumented migrant workers). In particular, this article discusses how respondent-driven sampling (RDS) was recently employed in a research project undertaken by the Research and Statistics Division of the Department of Justice Canada on the community impact of hate crimes. A description of RDS, its advantages and disadvantages, and the reasons it was chosen for this research project are provided.

Respondent-Driven Sampling

RDS uses a modified snowball sampling method to recruit research participants (Heckathorn 1997, 2002). Snowball sampling, also known as a reputational sampling, relies upon personal contacts of the people interviewed to gather information about other prospective respondents (Trochim 2006). In snowball sampling, initial samples cannot be drawn at random. As a result, snowball samples may be biased because they tend to attract more co-operative participants who volunteer to be part of the study, while less co-operative subjects are excluded. Such samples may also be biased because participants may try to protect friends

by not referring them or because participants only recruit friends who share the same characteristics as them. In addition, since referrals occur through network connections, network outsiders are excluded from the sample (Heckathorn 1997, 2002).

RDS is similar to snowball sampling in that respondents recruit their peers, and researchers keep track of who recruited whom into the sample, as well as the number of people each participant reports having in their social network (Heckathorn 1997, 2002). Unlike snowball sampling, RDS requires direct recruitment of peers by their peers, recruitment quotas,¹ and a system of incentives to recruit peers, where respondents are rewarded for their participation and for their referrals (Abdul-Quader et al. 2006).

Similar to a snowball sample, an RDS sample is collected with a chain referral design. The sampling process begins with the selection of a set of people from the target population who serve as "seeds." After participating in the study, these seeds are provided with a fixed number of recruitment coupons, which they use to recruit other people in the target population with whom they have a pre-existing relationship. Each recruitment coupon has a unique numerical code. Seeds are also requested to report their "degree."² After participating in the study these new sample members are also provided with the same fixed



number of coupons, which they then use to recruit others. The new recruits are also asked to report their “degree.” This sampling process continues until the desired sample size is reached (Heckathorn 1997).

The mathematical model upon which RDS analysis is based eliminates some of the biases typically associated with snowball sampling (Heckathorn 1997, 2002). The RDS mathematical model combines principles from Markov chain theory³ and biased network theory⁴ into a single data analysis framework. The RDS mathematical model suggests that if peer recruitment occurs through a sufficiently large number of recruitment waves, the representativeness of the population within the sample will stabilize and further recruitment waves will not change the sample’s representativeness by a significant amount. This process is called “reaching equilibrium” (Heckathorn 1997, 2002). The RDS model of the recruitment process mathematically weights the sample and by doing so creates a sample that is independent from the biases that may have been introduced by the non-random choice of “seeds” from which recruitment began (Heckathorn 1997, 2002). Within this framework, unbiased prevalence estimates for the population of interest can be produced and confidence intervals⁵ can be constructed around these estimates (Salganik 2006).

Respondent-driven sampling can be used as a sampling method to recruit research participants from a hard-to-reach population. In addition to the capacity to recruit research participants from hard-to-reach populations, there is an RDS statistical software package available that allows researchers to analyze their data using the RDS

mathematical model, called the RDS Analytical Tool (RDSAT) (RDS Incorporated 2006). RDS has been used to study a wide range of “hard-to-reach populations” including injection drug users (Heckathorn and Rosenstein 2002), HIV epidemiology (Frost et al. 2006), sex workers (Johnston et al. 2006), and jazz musicians (Heckathorn and Jeffri 2001, 2003). RDS was developed by Douglas Heckathorn in 1997 as part of an HIV-prevention research project funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse and targeting drug injectors in various Connecticut cities (Heckathorn n.d.).

Advantages and Disadvantages

RDS’s recruitment method allows researchers to access, in a systematic way, members of typically hard-to-reach populations who may not otherwise be accessible. Because RDS is a probability sampling method, researchers are able to provide unbiased population estimates as well as measure the precision of those estimates. It also has the potential for rapid recruitment because every participant becomes a recruiter. So, for each subsequent participant, there is the potential for exponential growth in recruitment. This is particularly true when participants have large social networks and strong ties within those networks. RDS can be especially successful at rapid recruitment in dense urban environments (Abdul-Quader et al. 2006).

While the potential for rapid recruitment is one of the advantages to using RDS, there is still the possibility that recruitment may be very slow if participants are not recruiting their peers. There are a

variety of reasons why rapid recruitment may be a challenge, including small network size, lack of connections among members of the target population, privacy concerns, or a high level of stigma associated with the target population. As a result, recruitment rates may be unpredictable. One solution to privacy concerns would be to provide alternative options to respondents which would allow them to complete the selected data collection method without having to make face-to-face contact with the researchers, for example telephone interviews or a self-administered online questionnaire.

Other disadvantages to using RDS relate to the difficulties that may arise when analyzing collected data. For instance, since RDS must take into account weighting for network size and recruitment patterns, the statistical strength of the sample as it applies to the target population decreases if participants only recruit people who share the same characteristics as themselves. In addition, the RDSAT only provides basic statistical estimates, such as estimates of population proportions, and cannot handle more complicated statistics, such as the sample size required, design effects, and statistical significance between groups. Moreover, researchers using RDS often ignore the fact that their data was collected with a complex sample design and construct confidence intervals as though they had a random sample. This is called the “naïve method” (Salganik 2006, 100).

To estimate the sample size required, Salganik (2006) proposes selecting a sample size for RDS that is twice as large as the sample size that would be needed under simple random sampling. He also proposes



that a bootstrap sampling method be employed to overcome the “naïve method” built into RDS. Bootstrapping is a sampling method whereby the data collected in an initial sample is randomly resampled over and over again. You can take any number of resamples and compute statistics for each resample. The average statistical values from all of the resamples are used to evaluate the statistical accuracy of the original sample’s statistics (Howell 2002). While bootstrapping may not be exact, as confidence intervals are constructed for an imaginary population, the bootstrap method is still argued to be better than the naïve method because resamples are created in a randomized way.

Researching the Community Impact of Hate Crimes

The main purpose of this research was to understand the impact of hate crimes on different communities—geographic as well as ethnic/racial or “identity” communities. The research design involved two case studies where an allegedly hate-motivated crime had occurred.

The first case study was a violent attack on a Sudanese refugee by a group of about 10 men at Victoria Park in Kitchener, Ontario, in 2006. The second case study involved the assault by two men of a Chinese-Canadian male who was fishing near the Mossington Bridge on the Black River in Sutton, Georgina by two men. This particular incident was one of a series of attacks against Asian-Canadian anglers on Lake Simcoe in Georgina.

Data were collected at the two sites where the incidents took place, specifically in Kitchener—Waterloo

and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). At each site, two main communities were selected for data gathering. At the first site, data was collected from the “African identity community” of Kitchener-Waterloo (individuals from the racial/ethnic community of the victim) and the “Kitchener geographic community” (individuals living in the Kitchener, Ontario, region). At the second site, data was collected from the “Chinese identity community” of the GTA (individuals from the racial/ethnic community of the victim) and the “Georgina geographic community” (individuals living in the Georgina, Ontario, region).

A survey was administered to the geographic and identity communities. After describing the allegedly hate-motivated incident, the survey asked a number of questions about the “impact of the event” (Marren 2005) on the community. RDS was chosen as a sampling method for this study because the racial/ethnic identity communities were communities for which no exhaustive list of all their members was available for the purpose of simple random sampling. The RDSAT was employed for data analysis because it allows researchers to make population prevalence estimates with confidence intervals. Using only a sample of individuals from each identity community, it was possible to draw conclusions about the identity community populations with a greater degree of statistical reliability than that which would be possible without the bootstrap method. Stratified random sampling was used to generate a statistically reliable sample for the geographic communities.

Using RDS recruitment (i.e., a chain referral design), the study began with five seeds in each of the two identity communities — the

African identity community and the Chinese identity community. Each seed was given four coupons with which to recruit four new participants from his/her social network (degree). The four referred participants received four coupons each and were expected to refer four more participants with the coupons. There were a total of five recruitment waves in the sample. As a reward for their participation, respondents were given the option to enter into a raffle draw for a prize.

Generally, a 95% confidence level is considered statistically reliable. In most cases, this would entail collecting a sample of about 400 for each identity community. Using RDS to collect a sample of 400 for each identity community proved to be a challenge because many participants were unwilling to provide contact information for their friends. There also appeared to be little motivation for them to contact their friends on behalf of the researchers. In total, there were 196 survey respondents from the African identity community in Kitchener and 288 survey respondents from the Chinese identity community of the Greater Toronto Area.

Conclusion

RDS is a sampling method utilized in instances where researchers are attempting to study hard-to-reach populations. RDS combines “snowball sampling” with a mathematical model that weights the sample in such a way that eliminates some of the biases that may have been introduced into the sample by the non-random choice of initial recruits. Less biased prevalence estimates can then be produced and confidence intervals can be constructed around those estimates.



RDS is a relatively new sampling method, and as its use increases, so will researchers' familiarity with its possibilities and limitations. In this study, RDS did not eliminate some of the challenges in recruiting victims of crime; there remained issues where potential participants

did not trust the researchers or just did not want to talk about the incident. As such, recruitment was still difficult. Using RDS, however, contributed to increasing the statistical reliability of the sample compared to using a snowball sample. It also made possible

drawing conclusions from the sample about the impact of hate crime on communities of identity with a greater degree of statistical reliability. This, in and of itself, suggests that RDS merits further attention as a sampling method when trying to reach hard-to-reach populations. ■

Notes

1. A recruitment quota refers to the fixed number of individuals a respondent is allowed to recruit, e.g., four people.
2. A "degree" is the number of people in the seed's personal network.
3. According to Markov chain theory, if there are a fixed number of states/conditions, one can calculate the probabilities of moving from one state/condition to another. In this way, future states/conditions depend only on the present state/condition and are independent of past states/conditions, and probabilities are determined by random chance (Heckathorn 1997, 2002). For example, if you look at religious affiliation: Christian, Muslim, and

Buddhist, p_{ij} represents the probability of a child belonging to religion i if his parents belonged to religion j .

4. Biased network theory is based on the assumption that social network connections are formed randomly, through a non-deterministic process. Proponents of biased network theory also make the assumption that friendships tend to form among those who are similar. This phenomenon is termed "homophily." Proponents also recognize that connections can be formed based on how one group complements another, e.g., dating relations among heterosexuals. This is termed "heterophily." In an unstructured system of networks, connections

are formed through random mixing. For example, if a group makes up 75% of the population, it will have 75% in-group connections. Biased network theory defines the parameters for how to calculate the percentage of time in-group connections are formed and the percentage of time out-group connections are formed in the social networks of a given sample (Kendall 2006).

5. A confidence interval is an estimation based on the survey data obtained from a sample. It is an estimation of the statistical values the entire population would have, based on the statistical values obtained from the sample.

References

- Abdul-Quader, Abu S., Douglas D. Heckathorn, Keith Sabin, and Tobi Saidel. 2006. Implementation and analysis of respondent-driven sampling: Lessons learned from the field. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 83(7): 1-5.
- Frost, Simon D. W., Kimberly C. Brouwer, Michelle A. Firestone Cruz, Rebeca Ramos, Maria Elena Ramos, Remedios M. Lozada, Carlos Magis-Rodriguez, and Steffanie A. Strathdee. 2006. Respondent-driven sampling of injection drug users in two U.S.-Mexico border cities: Recruitment dynamics and impact on estimates of HIV and syphilis prevalence. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 83(7): 83-97.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D. 1997. Respondent-driven sampling: A new approach to the study of hidden populations. *Social Problems* 44(2): 174-199.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D. 2002. Respondent-driven sampling II: Deriving valid population estimates from chain-referral samples of hidden populations. *Social Problems* 49(1): 11-34.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D., and Joan Jeffri. 2001. Finding the beat: Using respondent-driven sampling to study jazz musicians. *Poetics* 28:307-329.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D., and Joan Jeffri. 2003. Social Networks of Jazz Musicians. In *Changing the beat: A study of the worklife of jazz musicians, Volume III: Respondent-Driven Sampling*, National Endowment for the Arts Research Division Report no. 43, 48-61. Washington DC: National Endowment for the Arts.



- Heckathorn, Douglas D., and Judith E. Rosenstein. 2002. Group solidarity as the product of collective action: Creation of solidarity in a population of injection users. *Group Cohesion, Trust, and Solidarity* 19:37-66.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D. n.d. Respondent-Driven Sampling. <http://www.respondentdrivensampling.org>.
- Howell, David C. 2002. *Statistical methods for psychology*. Belmont, CA.: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Johnston, Lisa, Keith Sabin, Mai Hien, and Pham Huong. 2006. Assessment of respondent-driven sampling for recruiting female sex workers in two Vietnamese cities: Reaching the unseen sex worker. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 83(7): 16-28.
- Kendall, Carl. 2006. *Respondent-driven sampling*. Paper presented at FIOCRUZ, New Orleans.
- Lauritsen, Janet L., Ekaterina Archakova. 2008. Advancing the usefulness of research for victims of crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 24(2): 92-102.
- Marren, Joan. 2005. Horowitz's impact of event scale an assessment of post-traumatic stress in older adults. *MedSurg Nursing* 14(5): 329-331.
- RDS Incorporated. 2006. *RDS Analysis Tool v5.6 User Manual*. Ithaca, NY: RDS Incorporated. Accessed July 14, 2009, from http://www.respondentdrivensampling.org/reports/RDSAT_56_Manual.pdf.
- Salganik, Matthew J. 2006. Variance estimation, design effects, and sample size calculations for respondent-driven sampling. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 83(7): 98-112.
- Trochim, William M. K. 2006. *Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Accessed February 2007 from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/samponn.php>.



Victim Services in Canada: Results from the Victim Services Survey 2007/2008

By Julie Sauvé
Analyst
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics
Statistics Canada

Introduction

In the last 30 years, there has been increasing recognition of the rights and needs of victims in the area of justice. At the international level, the United Nations adopted the *Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power* in 1985. In 1988, it was the Canadian government's turn to draft its own *Canadian Statement of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime*.¹ Following this, legislation recognizing victims' rights was passed by the provinces (Boudreau, Poupart and Leroux 2009). Since then, the need for victims to be heard and to be informed, to express themselves and to be protected, and as a result to obtain support and assistance, has been recognized.

The Victim Services Survey (VSS), which is funded by the Policy Centre for Victim Issues of the Department of Justice Canada, collects data for a 12-month period on agencies that provide services to both primary and secondary victims of crime. It also provides a snapshot of the clients served on a given day. This article presents a profile of services offered to victims in Canada, based on the results of the third cycle of the VSS.² It also includes an analysis of victims who sought assistance during the 2007/2008 reference period and of victims served on May 28, 2008.

Methodology

The survey was developed in 2002 in consultation with federal, provincial and territorial ministries responsible for justice and victim services, and with a number of victim services providers from across Canada. The objectives of the survey are to provide a profile of victim services providers, information on the types of services offered, and an overview of the clients who use them through a snapshot of clients served on May 28, 2008. In addition, the survey collects standardized information from criminal injuries compensation and other financial benefit programs regarding applications for compensation and awards to victims of crime.

Victim services are defined as agencies that provide direct services to primary or secondary victims of crime and that are funded in whole or in part by a ministry responsible for justice matters. The survey covered system-based, police-based, court-based and community-based agencies, sexual assault centres, criminal injuries compensation programs, and other financial benefit programs.

Results

In 2008, a questionnaire for the VSS was sent to 556 agencies, covering 939 locations offering services to victims. To be included

in the sample, each provider had to offer services or programs to victims of crime. Among the 939 victim services providers, 884 were considered eligible to be included in the sample. In total, responses were received from 771 victim services providers, of which 5 are criminal injuries compensation programs or financial benefit programs for victims of crime.

Of the 766 victim services providers³ reporting data for the period from April 1, 2007, to March 31, 2008, a large proportion were police-based (40%). These were followed by community-based agencies (23%), sexual assault centres (17%), court-based agencies (8%), system-based agencies (6%), and the Ontario Victim Crisis Assistance and Referral Service (5%).

Victim Services Providers

Four out of 10 victim service providers offer specialized programs to victims

Canada's population is characterized by its diversity. Victims can be distinguished by their age, sex, culture, language, or sexual orientation, or by a physical or mental disability. To take this diversity into account, 42% of victim services agencies have developed



and implemented specialized programs or services for victims to address their particular needs.

Thus, 32% of service providers had specific programs for children and youth, 28% offered specialized programs for adult victims, both women and men, and the same proportion (28%) had programs geared toward Aboriginal people. Elderly people and people with mental or physical disabilities also received services through specialized programs made available by 20% of victim service providers.

Victim services providers offer services specific to the needs of victims of sexual abuse and younger victims

Victim service providers offer a wide range of services to help their clients, who are a diverse group with regard to both the type of victimization they have suffered and the specific services they need. More specifically, 329 out of 766 victim services providers indicated that they offered services to victims of specific types of crimes. Of those, three-quarters offered specific services to meet the needs of family members of children who had been victims of sexual abuse. Regardless of the victim's sex, 71% offered specific services to adult victims of sexual assault, and 70% were able to help child and adolescent victims of sexual abuse, assault, or exploitation.

General information and emotional support are the services most frequently offered

Victims' needs vary with their particular situation, the quality of their support network, their vulnerability, and their relationship

with the aggressor (Boudreau et al. 2009). People who turn to victim services agencies for help most often indicate a need for information and support (Alberta Solicitor General and Public Security 2009; Prairie Research Associates 2005; Wemmers and Canuto 2002).

Victim services agencies in Canada offer a wide range of services, whether directly or by referral to other agencies. They offer services that are directly related to criminal justice as well as services of a more general nature. It is the latter type of service that is more often provided to victim services clients.

In 2007/2008, the types of assistance most often provided directly by victim services agencies were general information (95%), emotional support (93%), liaison with other agencies on behalf of clients (91%), information on criminal justice system structure and process (91%), public awareness and prevention (90%), as well as immediate safety planning (87%). In terms of referral to other services, 87% of service providers referred victims to other agencies, for example, for long-term housing or child protection services (86%).

In the case of justice-related services, 90% of victim services providers directly offered information on the criminal justice system structure and process, and 86% provided court accompaniment services. While the majority of justice-related services were provided directly by service providers, some were offered through referral, for example, legal information (61%) and restorative justice orientation and information (58%).

A significant proportion of victim services providers can help victims in a language other than English or French

Service providers must adapt to Canada's cultural diversity. According to census data, in 2006, 13% of Canadians belonged to a visible minority group, and 8% of people belonging to a visible minority group could speak neither English nor French (Perreault, 2008). In 2006, people whose mother tongue was neither English nor French made up 20% of the Canadian population, up from the 2001 Census (Statistics Canada, 2007). Although not all agencies could offer their services in a language other than English or French, 79% of victim services providers were able to help clients who could speak neither of the official languages through informal interpreters (family member, friend, or caregiver of the victim) or volunteer interpreters.

There were over 3,200 paid employees working in victim services agencies in Canada in 2007/2008

In total, 739 victim service agencies (96%) indicated that the equivalent of more than 3,200 paid employees⁴ had worked from April 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008, in victim services. During that period, three-quarters of agencies received the services of nearly 8,700 volunteers.

The capacity to offer services to victims of crime requires training on the part of both paid and volunteer workers. However, requirements for volunteers are less stringent. While 70% of agencies indicated that the minimum level of education required for employees was a university degree



or a college diploma, only 8% of agencies indicated that they required this level of education for volunteers.

Eighty-three percent of respondents indicated that they expected their employees to continue their training by participating in workshops, seminars, and professional skills training directly related to the delivery of victim services, whereas 76% of respondents had the same expectations for the volunteers. Eight out of 10 agencies also reported offering some type of training to their employees, and a little more than 7 out of 10 agencies reported offering training to the volunteers.

Victims Served

Almost 406,000 victims were assisted by victim services providers from April 1, 2007, to March 31, 2008

In 2008, 686 victim services providers indicated they had assisted close to 406,000 victims⁵ of crime from April 1, 2007, to March 31, 2008. According to the respondents providing this information, the number of women receiving assistance from a victim services provider was three times higher than the number of men. More specifically, slightly more than 181,000 women were helped by a victim services provider, compared with 55,000 men. However, the sex of the victim was unknown for a significant proportion of victims (42%).

The majority of victims who received assistance from a victim services provider on May 28, 2008, were victims of violent crimes

On May 28, 2008, the survey snapshot day, 9,808 victims received formal assistance from a victim services office.⁶ Of these victims, a large proportion received help in regard to a violent crime⁷ such as a sexual assault (21%) or another type of violent crime (40%) such as an assault. Data from the 2004 General Social Survey on Victimization show that 9% of victims of violent crimes turned to formal service agencies for assistance, while a slightly larger percentage of victims of sexual assault (13%) turned to these agencies for assistance (Gannon and Mihorean 2005).

Another 16% of victims who obtained assistance from a service provider did so because they had been the victim of another type of incident, such as a property crime, a traffic violation, another *Criminal Code* offence or another incident.⁸ Victim services providers also assisted people who were indirectly victimized through a suicide, a drowning, or another undetermined type of criminal incident.

Among the primary or secondary victims who were served on May 28, 2008, and whose gender is known, three-quarters were female. In addition, 36% were from 18 to 34 years of age, and another 36% were from the ages of 35 to 64. Slightly more than one third of male victims were from 35 to 64 years of age.

Among the women who sought assistance, almost half (46%)⁹ did so because of a violent crime committed by their spouse, ex-spouse, or intimate partner. Thirty-seven percent were victims of a violent crime (other than a sexual assault) at the hands of their spouse, 6% had been sexually assaulted, and 3% were victims of criminal harassment. With regard to men who were victims of violent crimes (58%), the victimization involved mostly violent crimes other than sexual assaults, the perpetrator usually being someone other than a member of the family.

Criminal Injuries Compensation Programs and Other Financial Benefit Programs for Victims of Crime

Three-quarters of requests submitted to compensation programs and other financial benefit programs are approved

Data from the VSS show that, during the 2007/2008 fiscal year, nine provinces offered criminal injuries compensation programs for victims of crime.¹⁰ The objective of the compensation programs¹¹ is to ease the financial burden placed on victims and their families as a result of a crime (Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime 2009). Each program is established under the respective province's legislative authority and is administered either by the department responsible for victim matters or by a compensation board.



While there are differences in eligibility criteria among the provinces, the programs are generally open to victims of criminal offences (usually violent crimes), to family members or dependants of deceased victims, and to persons who were injured or killed while trying to assist a police officer or while preventing or attempting to prevent a crime (Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime 2009).

In addition to the 5 programs offering only compensation services to victims of crime, 65 of the victim services offices providing a wide range of services also offered compensation or other financial benefit programs for victims. In total, these offices reported 16,448 adjudicated or completed applications in 2007/2008, as well as 10,894 applications carried forward to the next year. Of the total number of applications that were adjudicated, 75% were approved and 14% rejected. For the remainder of the applications (11%), other outcomes were

indicated, such as decision pending or application withdrawn or dropped by the applicant.

Moreover, 45 participating agencies¹² reported having awarded a total of \$131 million in compensation to victims of crime in 2007/2008.¹³ The highest proportion of this amount was awarded for pain and suffering (19%), followed by loss of support to dependents (17%), and medical, rehabilitation, dental, or eyewear costs (13%). The remaining compensation amount (42%) was awarded for other reasons, such as child care, counselling services, and funeral and burial costs.

Approved applications for compensation involve primarily crimes against the person

From April 1, 2007, to March 31, 2008, over 10,000 applications were approved by 55 compensation

programs and other financial benefit programs for victims of crime.¹⁴ Of this total, 36% were submitted by female victims, and 21%, by male victims.¹⁵

Slightly more than three-quarters of women who received assistance from a compensation program requested services in relation to an assault (43%) or a sexual assault (34%). While 45% of applications related to assaults were submitted by women from 35 to 64 years of age,¹⁶ 49% of applications concerning sexual assaults were submitted by female victims younger than 18.¹⁷

Men turned to compensation programs more often for assault (35%) and assault with a weapon or causing bodily harm (30%). Another 13% of all male applicants were victims of sexual assault, and 67% of them were younger than 18. ■

Notes

1. The Statement was revised in 2003.
2. Previous cycles of the Survey were conducted in 2002/2003 and 2005/2006. Comparisons between data in this analysis and those from the previous cycles are not recommended, as different methodologies were used to count victim services providers.
3. Criminal injuries compensation programs and other financial benefits programs for victims of crime are analyzed separately in this report.
4. Expressed as full-time equivalents.
5. In the survey, a victim is defined as either the primary or secondary victim of a crime. Primary victims are those who were the direct target of the crime, while secondary victims are those who were not the direct target of the offence but who were affected by it (e.g., family members, friends, classmates).
6. Based on answers given by 728 victim services. On the day of the snapshot, 9,881 victims requested formal assistance although for 1%, the age, sex and type of crime were not known.
7. Excludes secondary victims of homicide and other offences causing death.
8. Includes criminal incidents, traffic incidents of undetermined criminal nature, and other incidents of undetermined criminal nature.
9. Based on 9,808 victims, since for 1% of victims, the respondents could not report the age, sex, and type of crime distributions.
10. Of the 10 provinces, only Newfoundland and Labrador did not have a compensation program in 2007/2008.
11. Aggregated counts for provincial criminal injuries compensation programs and other financial benefit programs may be influenced by activities undertaken in the largest provinces.



12. Other respondents were not able to provide that information.
13. Data cannot be compared with those from 2005/2006 because a different method was used to count agencies that year.
14. Other programs were not able to provide the information.
15. For 43% of applications that were approved during the reference year, the age and sex of the victims were unknown.
16. Thirty-nine percent of applications involved women from the ages of 18 to 34, and 12%, females younger than 18. Four percent of women who submitted applications were either 65 and older, or their age was unknown.
17. Twenty-eight percent of applications involved women from the ages of 18 to 34, and 21%, women from 35 to 64 years of age. Two percent of women who submitted applications were either 65 and older, or their age was unknown.

References

- Alberta Solicitor General and Public Security. 2009. *Status report 2007-2008: Victims deserve to be heard*. Edmonton: Victim Services Branch. Accessed August 25, 2009, from https://www.solgps.alberta.ca/programs_and_services/victim_services/Publications/2008%202009%20Victims%20Status%20Report.pdf.
- Boudreau, Jean, Lise Poupart, and Katia Leroux. 2009. *Introduction à l'intervention auprès des victimes d'actes criminels*. Montréal: Association québécoise plaidoyer-victimes.
- Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime. 2009. *Compensation*. Accessed August 25, 2009, from <http://www.crcvc.ca/en/compensation.php>.
- Gannon, Maire, and Karen Mihorean. 2005. Criminal victimisation in Canada, 2004. *Juristat* 25 (7). Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE. Accessed August 25, 2009, from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/85-002-x2005007-eng.pdf>.
- Perreault, Samuel. 2009. *Criminal victimization and health: A profile of victimization among persons with activity limitations or other health problems*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue no. 85F0033M. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series, no. 21. Accessed August 26, 2009, from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85f0033m/85f0033m2009021-eng.htm>.
- Perreault, Samuel. 2008. *Visible minorities and victimization*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue no. 85F0033M. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series, no. 15. Accessed August 26, 2009, from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85f0033m/85f0033m2008015-eng.htm>.
- Prairie Research Associates. 2005. Victim respondents' overviews of their experiences. *Multi-site survey of victims of crime and criminal justice professionals across Canada: Summary of victims of crime respondents*. Ottawa: Policy Centre for Victim Issues, Department of Justice Canada. Accessed August 26, 2009, from http://canada.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2005/rr05_vic1/sum2-som2/index.html.
- Statistics Canada. 2007. *2006 census: The evolving linguistic portrait*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Catalogue no. 97-555-XWE2006001. Accessed August 25, 2009, from <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-555/index-eng.cfm?CFID=3469753&CFTOKEN=28093065>.
- Wemmers, Jo-Anne, and Marisa Canuto. 2002. *Victims' experiences with, expectations and perceptions of restorative justice: A critical review of the literature*. Ottawa: Policy Centre for Victim Issues, Department of Justice Canada. Accessed July 20, 2009, from http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2001/rr01_9/index.html.





Victim-Related Conferences in 2010

Justice for Women and Children

January 18-21
San Diego, California, USA, and Tijuana, Mexico
<http://www.hearts4justice.org/>

Cyber Crime Conference 2010

January 22-29
St-Louis, Missouri, USA
<http://www.dodcybercrime.com/10CC/>

APSAC's 2010 Advanced Training Institutes

January 24-25
San Diego, California, USA
<http://www.apsac.org/mc/community/eventdetails.do?eventId=231114>

San Diego International Conference on Child and Family Maltreatment

January 24-29
San Diego, California, USA
<http://www.chadwickcenter.org/conference.htm>

Child Welfare League 2010 National Conference

"Children 2010: Leading a New Era"
January 25-27, 2010
Washington, DC, USA
<http://cwla.org/conferences/conferences.htm>

Early Years Conference 2010: The Rights of the Child

February 4-6, 2010
Victoria, British Columbia, Canada
http://www.interprofessional.ubc.ca/Early_Years_2010.html

Mother Against Murder And Agression Conference 2010

"Secondary Victims of Violent Crime"
February 23
London, England, UK
<http://www.mamaa.org/CMS/conf-2010.php>

National Summit on Interpersonal Violence and Abuse Across the Lifespan Forging a Shared Agenda

February 24-26
Dallas, Texas, USA
<http://www.reisman-white.com/associations/4888/files/SAVE%20THE%20DATE%20-%20For%20APA%20Convention.pdf>

2010 Conference on Crimes against Women

March 8-10
Dallas, Texas, USA
http://www.ccaw-online.org/2010_Conference.html

9th Global Conference

"Violence: Probing the Boundaries"
March 12-14
Salzburg, Austria
<http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/probing-the-boundaries/hostility-and-violence/violence/call-for-papers/>

Male Survivor 2010 International Conference

"Healing and Hope for Male Survivors"
March 18-21
John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, New York, USA
<http://www.malesurvivor.org/conference-2010.html>

26th National Symposium on Child Abuse

March 22-25
Huntsville, Alabama, USA
http://www.nationalcac.org/professionals/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=158&Itemid=130

2010 International Conference on Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence and Stalking

April 19-21
Atlanta, Georgia, USA
<http://www.evawintl.org/conferencedetail.aspx?confid=8>



5th Annual National Victims of Crime Awareness Week

April 18-24
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
<http://www.victimswweek.gc.ca/home-acceil.html>

2010 Crime Victim Conference

“Every Victim, Every Time”
April 20-21
TBD
<http://www.evetbv.org/index.html>

10th Annual International Family Justice Center Conference

April 27-29
San Antonio, Texas, USA
<http://www.familyjusticecenter.org/index.php/our-conference/conferences/2010-international-fjc-conference.php>

2010 Fraser Valley Criminal Justice Conference

“Youth, Communities and the Criminal Justice System”
April 27-30
Abbotsford, British Columbia, Canada
www.fvcjc.ca

Alaska Peace Officers Association 2010 Crime Conference

May 10-14
Fairbanks, Alaska, USA
<http://www.apoaonline.org/crimeconf.htm>

7th Cultural Intersections International Symposium

“Exploring the Edge of Trauma”
May 13-16
West Dean College, Chichester, London, UK
<http://fass.kingston.ac.uk/activities/item.php?updatenum=1167>

9th Annual Crime Victim Law Conference

June 3-4
Portland, Oregon, USA
<http://www.ncvli.org/conference.html>

18th Annual APSAC Colloquium

June 23-26, 2010
New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
<http://www.apsac.org/>

International Family Violence Research Conference

July 11-13
Portsmouth, New Hampshire, USA
<http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/FRLconferencesavethedate2010.pdf>

NCADV’s 14th Conference on Domestic Violence

“Changing Faces of the Movement”
August 1-4
Anaheim, California, USA
<http://www.ncadv.org/conferences/GeneralConferenceInformationandOverview-2.php>

2010 National Sexual Assault Conference

September 1-3
Los Angeles, California, USA
<http://www.nsvrc.org/calendar/1733>

11th International Conference on Shaken Baby Syndrome/Abusive Head Trauma

September 12-14
Atlanta, Georgia, USA
<http://www.dontshake.org/conferences.php?topNavID=5>

18th ISPCAN International Congress

“One World, One Family, Many Cultures”
September 26-29
Honolulu, Hawaii
<http://www.ispcan.org/congress2010/>

The Midwest Conference on Child Sexual Abuse

October 18-21
Middleton, Wisconsin, USA
<http://www.dcs.wisc.edu/pda/midwest/index.html>

Children and Crime: Victims or Villains’

November 5-7
Robinson Executive Centre, Wyboston, UK
<http://www.forensic-science-society.org.uk/Resources/Forensic%20Science/Call%20for%20Papers%20-%20Autumn%202010.pdf>

2010 Texas Crime Victim Clearinghouse Conference

(Details to come)
<http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/victim/victim-home.htm>

