



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**THE ROLE OF POLICE
IN ENABLING CRIME VICTIMS
TO ACCESS CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION:
A SURVEY OF FOUR POLICE DEPARTMENTS**

Tim Foran

1991

Submitted to the Department of Criminology,
University of Ottawa, in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts.



Tim Foran, Ottawa, Canada, 1991



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-70510-8

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this study would not have been possible without the cooperation of the four participating police forces: the Ottawa Police; the Nepean Police Service; the Killaloe O.P.P.; and the Renfrew O.P.P. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Professor Irvin Waller, whose thoughtful guidance greatly assisted the completion of this study. Professors Tom Gabor and Ross Hastings also provided valuable comments as readers of this thesis. Finally I would like to thank my family for all of their encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	v
introduction	viii
A. Trends in Criminal Justice Leading to Implementation of Compensation	ix
Chapter 1: Review of the Literature on Criminal Injuries Compensation	1
A. The History of the role of the Victim in the Criminal Justice Process	1
B. Alternatives to Criminal Injuries Compensation	4
a) Civil Suit	4
b) Restitution	5
c) Criminal Code Provisions	6
C. Importance of Victim Cooperation	7
D. Criticisms of Criminal Injuries Compensation	8
a) Low Awareness	9
b) Underfunded	22
c) Discretion and Inequality	23
- Theoretical Orientation of Compensation	26
d) Symbolic	26
Chapter 2: Methodology	32
A. Sampling Design	33
a) Nonprobability Samples	35
b) Purposive Samples	36
B. Research Design	37
a) Stimulus Response vs. Property Disposition Relation	37
b) Contrasted Group Design	40
C. Questionnaire Design	42

Chapter 3: Findings	47
A. Behaviour - What Are Police Officers Doing to Make Victims Aware of Criminal Injuries Compensation?	48
B. Knowledge - How Familiar Are Police Officers With Criminal Injuries Compensation Programs?	52
C. Attitude - How Do Police Officers Feel About Criminal Injuries Compensation Programs	57
D. Police Officers Years of Experience and Previous Involvement with Victims of Violent Crime	62
E. Effect of Knowledge and Attitude on Behaviour	65
Chapter 4: Discussion and Recommendations	72
Recommendation 1: Widespread Implementation of Victim Assistance Units with Forces	83
Recommendation 2: Pro-Active Police Training on Victim Issues Including the Importance of Providing Victims with a Victim Assistance Unit Contact Card	85
Recommendation 3: Standardized Police Policy/Practices Respecting the Treatment of Victims with Support of Senior Management	87
Recommendation 4: Publicity Measures Must Be Directed At Individual Police Departments	88
Chapter 5: Conclusion	91
Appendix A: Questionnaire	96
Appendix B: Selected Data Tables - Phase One and Phase Two Data	99
Bibliography:	115

ABSTRACT

This study begins with a review of the literature on the effectiveness of criminal injuries compensation programs. The underlying theme in the literature is that few eligible crime victims access criminal injuries compensation benefits - largely because the majority are unaware of the existence of the programs. Estimates suggest that only one in fifty-five eligible victims actually access criminal injuries compensation programs (Waller, 1985). Measuring the number of awards granted against the number of crimes known to police, it is apparent that many victims are not accessing criminal injuries compensation. In 1988-89 there were 2247 awards for criminal injuries compensation in the province of Ontario (Ministry of the Attorney General Ontario, 1990). In the same period there were 98,244 crimes of violence reported to police in Ontario (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1990). Taken together, these measures suggest that during 1988-89 only 2.3% of eligible victims made use of compensation programs.

The literature suggests that the small number of victims making use of compensation benefits is even more striking given that there are very few effective alternatives through which victims can obtain financial recompense. Civil suits are slow and expensive. Restitution programs through which victims receive benefits from the offender are ineffective as offenders are often unidentified, unapprehended, unconvicted or without sufficient assets. Criminal Code restitution and compensation provisions require that the victim be proactive in filing a motion. The financial status of many offenders also thwarts the ability of Criminal Code provisions to provide victims with any meaningful reimbursement.

Given that the alternatives through which victims may receive financial reimbursement (including civil suits, restitution, and Criminal Code provisions) are ineffective, it is appropriate to look to means through which greater numbers of victims could access the compensation funds to which they are entitled.

Accordingly, this study examined the role that individual police officers play in making victims aware of criminal injuries compensation. Since police officers are often the first criminal justice agent with whom crime victims come into contact, they have the potential to impact significantly on whether crime victims are made aware of compensation benefits.

Specifically, this study examines the behaviour, knowledge, and attitude of police officers in four police departments - two with a victim assistance unit and two without. It was hypothesized that officers working in a force with a victim assistance unit would be more sensitive to the needs of victims and would thereby have a better knowledge of and attitude towards victim programs which would have an impact on their decision to make victims aware of compensation benefits.

The study found that officers from a department with a victim assistance unit did have a better knowledge of compensation eligibility requirements, including the necessity to suffer injury eligibility provision. Victim assistance unit officers were also found to have more positive attitudes towards compensation programs. They were more likely to be of the view that compensation programs assisted victims effectively and they were more likely to feel that the programs should be expanded to serve greater numbers of victims, including victims of break and enter. They were also more likely to indicate that they had made victims aware of compensation benefits.

However, the presence of a victim assistance unit does not make the situation ideal. Many respondents from a force with a victim assistance unit indicated that they had never made a victim aware of compensation benefits. Of particular relevance is the fact that only sixteen per cent of victim assistance unit officers had ever provided a victim with a card or leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation, even though this is a publicity measure which all compensation boards boast of in their annual reports.

The study concludes with a number of recommendations designed to improve the information crime victims receive with respect to criminal injuries compensation. The hope is that these recommendations will move us towards the goal of having every eligible victim of crime made aware of the availability of criminal injuries compensation.

Recommendation 1: Widespread Implementation of Victim Assistance Units within Police Forces

Recommendation 2: Pro-Active Police Training on Victim Issues Including the Importance of Providing Victims with a Victim Assistance Unit Contact Card

Recommendation 3: Standardized Police Policy/Practices Respecting the Treatment of Victims with Support of Senior Management

Recommendation 4: Publicity Measures Must Be Directed At Individual Police Departments

INTRODUCTION

Whether the informant is the police, the prosecutor, defence counsel or the judge, does not matter very much. The key thing is that someone informs the victim of his (sic) rights and helps him (sic) to apply for reparation.

(Linden, 1977:32)

This quote summarizes the main focus of this thesis - crime victims need to be made more aware of the availability of criminal injuries compensation programs. Criminal injuries compensation programs exist to aid victims of violent crime as well as surviving dependants of victims of homicide and persons responsible for the maintenance of the victim (Ontario, 1988). However these eligible parties are seldom made aware that such benefits are available. Compensation programs suffer from low public and low victim awareness. An overwhelming majority of those that apply for compensation receive it, yet less than two per cent of all eligible victims make claims (Linden, 1977; Canadian Federal Provincial Task Force on Justice for Victims of Crime, 1983; Canadian Urban Victimization Survey, 1984). Clearly, the information is not reaching those who need it most - the crime victims.

A. Trends in Criminal Justice Leading to the Implementation of Compensation

Before outlining the direction that this thesis will take, it is important to place the emergence of criminal injuries compensation within the context of trends in criminal justice in the late 1960s and early 1970s. First, the pro-victim lobby at the time was instrumental not only in increasing the rights and recognition of crime victims, but also in the implementation of criminal injuries compensation programs. Those advocating increased victim services often premised their discussion by stating that, historically, the victim had a much larger and more direct role in the process of criminal justice. Crime was conceived of primarily as an injury to the individual victim, not an attack against society. In the late 1960s, it was argued that the situation was reversed and crime came to be regarded as an offence against the state, while the victim was assigned an increasingly secondary role in the process of trying the offender (McDonald, 1977).

Second, it is important to understand the social context in which victim compensation arose, the emerging liberal ideology of the time, and the public's reaction to it. Penal policies of most common law jurisdictions during the late 1950s and early 1960s were characterized by the "ascendance of what may be loosely termed a liberal ideology in contrast to the moral traditional values" (Miers, 1978:59). There was a shift from crime control to due process and from traditional punitive values to a more liberal ideology (Miers, 1983). This demand for penal reform was matched by an equally vigorous campaign stressing that something be done for the victim of crime. More specifically, in a number a jurisdictions

including Canada, individual acts of victimization prompted public outrage when the victim went uncared for while the offender was accorded rights and privileges.

As well, by the middle of the 1960s, the victim began to gain prominence in law enforcement and public policy as greater concern about the effects of his/her victimization came to light. There were fears that if the victim became alienated from the criminal justice system, its credibility would be seriously undermined since police depend on victims to report crime and to testify as witnesses. At the same time, victimization surveys were suggesting that as high as reported crime was, it represented only the tip of the iceberg. It can be said that new concern for the crime victim arose substantially to respond to their dissatisfaction with law enforcement. At the same time, the womens' movement was increasing in size and force to demand a variety of services for victims of sexual assault.

More recently, in 1983, the Federal-Provincial Task Force Report on Justice for Victims of Crime was released. Among other things the report called for measures to make victims more aware of services available to them - including compensation benefits. In 1985, the United Nations formally adopted the Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power which included a measure calling for member States to "endeavour to provide financial compensation" to victims. In 1988, the Federal - Provincial - Territorial "Statement of Principles for Victims of Crime" stipulated that "victims should receive through formal and informal procedures prompt and fair redress for the harm which they have suffered". More importantly, the agreement stipulated that

information regarding mechanisms to obtain support should be made readily available to victims.

Having provided a brief review of the context within which criminal injuries compensation arose it is appropriate to outline the format and objectives of this thesis. In general, this thesis will thoroughly examine the effectiveness of criminal injuries compensation programs. A detailed literature review will present the limitations of the programs. The fact that very few victims access criminal injuries compensation programs will be highlighted particularly. The findings of a survey of police officers will be presented to gain insights into their involvement in making victims aware of compensation benefits.

Chronologically, Chapter One will examine the historical role of the victim in the criminal justice process. It will look at possible alternatives to criminal injuries compensation. The majority of the chapter will examine studies on the effectiveness of criminal injuries compensation programs. Literature looking at the role that police officers play in making victims aware of criminal injuries compensation will also be highlighted.

Chapter Two will outline the approach used to obtain the data for this study and will justify why alternate methodologies and sampling designs were not used. This Chapter will examine in detail: why police officers were chosen as the study population; how the population study sites were chosen; and why a questionnaire was utilized. This chapter will also outline, in detail, the format of the questionnaire. It is important to note that this is a study of police perceptions of criminal injuries compensation programs. The views of police may be quite different than those of victims or the public.

Chapter Three will present the results of the questionnaire in text and tabular format. Chapter Four will form the discussion part of the thesis. It will flesh out the results of the survey in order to form the analysis component of this work. This chapter will also include recommendations and a call for action to improve the communication network for victims in need of compensation benefits. Finally, Chapter Five will form the summary and conclusion part of the thesis.

In sum, this thesis will focus on the role of individual police officers and specialized police victim assistance units in making victims aware of criminal injuries compensation. The results of a questionnaire designed to gain insights into the behaviour, knowledge, and attitude of area police officers regarding criminal injuries compensation will be presented in detail. This analysis is important as attitudes are generally thought of as having a knowledge component, a feeling component and a behaviour component (Freedman, 1978). As attitudes are learned through one's environment and associations, and to varying degrees a person's behaviour stems from his/her attitudes (Freedman, 1978), it is relevant to examine the effect, if any, that a victim assistance unit has on the environment of police officers.

In large part, the review of the literature will emphasize that compensation programs suffer from a lack of awareness, as well other criticisms such as the view that these programs are discretionary, underfunded and really only symbolic in nature. The importance of effective criminal injuries compensation programs will be stressed by examining the lack of alternatives available to victims and by stressing the need for victim cooperation in the criminal justice system. First, however, the role that the victim played in the criminal justice system historically will be examined.

CHAPTER ONE

Review of the Literature on Criminal Injuries Compensation Programs

In order to fully appreciate the situation of the crime victim today with regard to financial reparation this chapter will begin by placing the issue within an historical perspective. As well, this chapter will examine alternatives to criminal injuries compensation which are available to victims. The majority of this chapter will be devoted to an examination of studies and literature assessing the effectiveness and limits of victim compensation benefits. As well, this chapter will highlight literature on the role of the police officer in ensuring that crime victims access criminal injuries compensation.

A. The History of the Role of the Victim in the Criminal Justice Process

Even though concern for repaying the crime victim for his/her losses seems recent, the practice is actually quite ancient. Before the government began to regulate the criminal process, redress occurred in a "blood revenge" taken by the victim against the offender (Elias, 1983). After the state took control of the criminal justice system, however, such revenge itself became a criminal act. Later, victim restitution occurred through negotiations in either a 'composition' or 'adhesive' procedure, which produced a combined monetary and punitive judgement.

The "composition" system began in the Middle Ages and can be found largely in the Germanic common laws (Schafer, 1970). Restitution to the victim

was included as an aspect of the offender's reparation (Elias, 1983). According to Schafer (1970) the shift from violent retaliation to composition was part of the natural historical process. Composition or compensation served to mitigate blood feuds. It was an alternative equally satisfactory to the victim. "Germanic law provided a touch of self-humiliation which appeased the instinct for revenge felt by the victim (Schafer,1970:7).

Eventually state power over composition increased. The community began to claim a share of the compensation originally intended solely for the victim. In Saxon England, for example, the Wer, payment for homicide and the Bot, compensation for injury, existed in concert with the fine paid to the king (Schafer, 1970). Soon however, the victim's right to restitution decreased. By the time the Frankish Empire was divided by the Treaty of Verdun restitution had been absorbed by the fine that went to the state (Schafer, 1970).

As the state increased its authority over human activities, it also enhanced its control over criminal justice. Restitution previously given by the offender to the victim was taken increasingly by political leaders as fines to help bolster government treasuries (McDonald, 1977). The victim was left to recover his/her losses on his/her own.

The 'composition' process eventually split into the separate criminal and civil systems. Thus, the victim must now resort to a separate civil action to recover damages previously received through restitution. Crime has become an offence not against the victim but against the state, while the civil wrong has become a separate offence against the individual. From its origins in western civilization's primitive

law, criminal justice has moved from an individualistic orientation to a social one, and the victim has been totally shut out of the process (Elias, 1983). The discontinuation of damage payments to victims of crime was the price that English society paid for a centralized system of criminal justice (Schafer, 1970). Although the common law provided a civil remedy for victims of most crime, "the benefits of such actions have been largely illusory because most criminals are financially worthless and judgements of civil courts against them are simply uncollectible debts" (Feeney, 1968:261). Thus in most cases the victim was left to bear his/her own losses.

One of the tremendous ironies in the development of the criminal justice system in Canada is the changed status of the victim. S/he was once the central actor/actress in the system who stood to gain both financially and psychologically from it. Today, s/he is seen at best as the "forgotten man" (sic) of the system and at worst as being twice victimized, the second time by the system itself (McDonald, 1977). Enormous efforts are now made on behalf of criminals. Vast sums have been spent in genuine efforts to humanize punishment, develop rehabilitation programs, and in general to ensure the rights of the accused have been fully met. In contrast, however, there has been little concern for the rights or treatment of victims or for the proper role of victims in the criminal justice system. "In the development of the criminal justice system the victim has gone from central to peripheral actor (sic) in the system, from a prime beneficiary to an also ran" (Waller, 1984:446). Today's victim has not been adequately relieved of major costs associated with victimization. Further, the criminal justice system has denied the victim the satisfaction that follows from participating in the justice system.

B. Alternatives to Criminal Injuries Compensation

Victim compensation opponents have suggested a variety of other possible methods of victim recovery. However, the fact that the financial dilemma that victims face continues to this day is evidence of their ineffectiveness and of the meagre public policy and resource commitment toward the crime victim (Waller, 1985).

a) Civil Suit

One alternative often cited by critics of compensation is the civil suit. This is problematic, however, as it is very slow and expensive. As well, only a small number of offenders are identified, a smaller number of those apprehended are convicted and frequently those convicted do not have the means to pay their victim (Linden, 1977). In sum, the system and the offenders' characteristics tend to frustrate the victim. As well, it should be recognized that civil suits do not account for physical or emotional needs, but rather just financial needs (Elias, 1983).

Other opponents of compensation even argue that the criminal justice system should be allocating scarce resources to crime prevention and that money diverted to provide for the victim is unwarranted. However others, including Elias (1983) argue that millions of dollars have already been poured into crime prevention with no noticeable effect.

b) Restitution

In addition to the inadequacy of civil actions as an alternative to criminal injuries compensation, Lamborn (1978) also cites the inadequacy of other remedies such as restitution through the criminal justice system, and charity. Just as the use of civil courts to obtain reparations is inadequate for most victims, restitution, in which the criminal is generally perceived as the appropriate source of benefit for the victim, is also inadequate for most victims of crime because offenders are usually young, unidentified, unapprehended, unconvicted and without sufficient assets (Lamborn, 1978). As well, for imprisoned offenders the victim's hope for restitution is minimal. Further, it should be noted that the courts have been reluctant to impose a sentence of restitution due to the ambiguous distinction between criminal and civil proceedings. This situation is exacerbated in Canada by the federal-provincial split in responsibility for the administration of justice. In sum, restitution, in theory, recognizes the needs of crime victims, but in practice does little to respond to these needs (Waller, 1985).

Besides the inadequacies of the civil action and restitution, Lamborn (1979) contends that the victim is further thwarted by the fact that even victim support organizations cannot provide adequate financial reimbursement. Lamborn (1979), argues that charitable institutions which attempt to serve victims of many types, are usually inadequate sources of reparations for victims of crime because of their lack of specialization and their very limited resources.

c) Criminal Code Provisions

Restitution and compensation are the only sentencing options that may financially benefit the victim, yet the few existing provisions are totally inadequate. Up until 1987, s.388 of the Criminal Code, enabled a summary conviction court to order the accused to pay up to fifty dollars for wilful destruction or damage to property. This, however, only covered cases where the alleged offence did not exceed fifty dollars, which is a sum totally unrealistic with respect to today's prices and values. Further, s.388 did not apply to theft, but only to damage or destruction of property.

Section 725 (b) of the 1990 Criminal Code does allow for restitution in the case of bodily harm to any person injured as a result of the commission of an offence. The Criminal Code provision calls for restitution by paying to the person an amount equal to all pecuniary damages, including loss of income incurred as a result of the bodily injury "where the amount is readily ascertainable". As well, Section 727 of the Code allows for a thorough inquiry concerning the offender's present and future ability to pay and Section 727 (1) allows money in possession of the offender at the time of the offence to be seized. However, the problem with these provisions is that with the vast majority of offenders being indigent, the victim, in reality, has little course of action through the Code.

Section 727 (5) of the Criminal Code does allow for the enforcement of orders of restitution if the order is not complied with forthwith, however, it is incumbent on the beneficiary to file an order in the superior court of the province. Clearly, the victim must be proactive for these measures to take effect and in the

majority of cases he/she is not likely to know of the existence or availability of such options.

C. Importance of Victim Cooperation

Just as effective victim compensation programs are important due to the inadequacy of existing alternatives, so too are they important in achieving the instrumental goals of the criminal justice system. Victims, and citizens who are potential victims, play a vital role in the continuance of the criminal justice system. It is necessary to have their cooperation in order for them to report crimes and to testify as witnesses. Canadian victimization surveys, like those in the United States, report that a large number of victims have stopped reporting crimes to the police. The findings suggest that as high as reported crime is, it represents only the tip of the iceberg.

The 1988 General Social Survey conducted by Statistics Canada found that, in total, only 40% of victimizations were brought to the attention of the police. While 70% of break and enters were reported to the police only 33% of victims of personal victimization bothered to report the crime to police. Assault, at 30%, had the lowest reporting rate (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1990). Waller (1985) states that apparently victims are no longer prepared to recognize a legal system that ignores their concerns but requires them to be present in court at the convenience of the judge, the defence counsel or the prosecutor.

Given these disturbing findings, improvements in victim compensation should be sought in an attempt to increase victim satisfaction and cooperation with

the criminal justice system. It is critical that victims report offences if crimes are to be solved. Whether or not the victim reports the offence soon after its commission, together with the particulars of the offence they provide, and the description of suspects they convey will determine whether or not the crime can be solved. (Sumner, 1987).

Having established that the crime victim was once the central actor/actress in the criminal justice system process who stood to gain both psychologically and financially and that there is a lack of measures to respond to the financial needs of crime victims and that there is a definite need for victim cooperation with the criminal justice system in terms of reporting and testifying, it is appropriate to turn to a discussion of one attempt to deal with these issues - criminal injuries compensation programs.

D. Criticisms of Criminal Injuries Compensation

Numerous and wide-ranging criticisms have been levelled against existing criminal injuries compensation schemes. The programs have been criticized for being discretionary and underfunded. Further, Elias (1986) argues that it should not be surprising that compensation programs are discretionary and underfunded since they were really only a symbolic policy to pacify the public and steer attention away from other more serious problems of crime and law enforcement. Of particular interest in this study is the literature indicating that criminal injuries compensation programs suffer from a lack of awareness by the public and, more

importantly, a lack of awareness on the part of victims. Each of these criticisms will be dealt with in turn.

a) Low Awareness

The major defect of crime compensation programs is that their benefits and their terms of eligibility, and even their very existence, are virtually unknown. Brooks states that "most persons who would have been eligible for compensation have not filed claims, mainly because they knew nothing about it" (1975:55). Brooks argues that two kinds of effort, one general and the other particular, are necessary to respond to the problem of low public and low victim awareness. First, a broad public education campaign is required. Second, a specific routine whereby the police, when informed by the victim of a criminal act, would give him/her a brochure on the criminal injuries compensation program and a form for filing a claim (Brooks, 1975:55). This will be discussed in further detail later.

Linden (1977) in his comprehensive analysis of criminal injuries compensation programs in Ontario, also emphasized that the most glaring defect with the present system is that too few victims assert their rights. Insufficient effort has been exerted to educate the public or victims about their rights under these plans. In Ontario, to advertise the programs all that has been done is the delivery of information about awards to the press, which, surprisingly, often gives them decent coverage (Linden, 1977).

Murphy (1984) also notes that only a very low percentage of eligible victims ever get around to submitting applications. In Great Britain, it was

estimated that the highest percentage of eligible victims that ever applied was nineteen per cent (Shapland et al, 1985). This was attributed largely to ignorance of the existence of the program. However, nineteen per cent of victims applying is significant relative to some of the estimates that have been made regarding the per cent of victims applying in Canada. Linden (1977) notes that in 1972, only four hundred and eighty-eight claims were made in Ontario, but there were probably fifty times that many crimes of violence committed in the province. This implies that less than two per cent of the eligible victims made claims.

In the United States, statistics compiled by the New York compensation board indicate that less than 1% of all victims of violent crimes who reported the crime to the police were applying for an award (Elias, 1983). Elias (1983) found that over half of the victim population studied had never heard of state compensation schemes. Almost half of those that did know about compensation failed to apply either because they felt they were ineligible (11%), thought their claim would be futile (11%) or were unsure of how to make a claim (9%).

Brickey's (1983) study of the Winnipeg Victim/Witness program found that only ten of forty-seven victims who reported that they had received an injury as a result of a crime had been informed of the existence of criminal injuries compensation. Brickey (1983:25) states that "although it would seem unrealistic to conclude that all forty-seven victims could have received compensation, it does seem reasonable that all victims injured should be made aware of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board in order to increase the likelihood of the agency meeting the need for which it was established." Brickey (1983) concluded that the present lack

of awareness of criminal injuries compensation by crime victims would ensure its underutilization.

Marshall (1971) makes similar estimates. He states that in 1969, the Ontario Criminal Injuries Compensation Board received six hundred and fifty applications. This was considered quite low since approximately six hundred and fifty violent crimes were committed in Ontario every week. The low number of applications received was accounted for by the fact that the Ontario criminal injuries compensation scheme had not been in existence long enough to gain widespread recognition. In 1988-89, a full twenty years later, the number of awards granted rose to 2247 yet this still represents a very small number of eligible victims. Given that there were 98,244 crimes of violence reported to police in Ontario during the same period, (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1990), 2247 claimants still represents only two per cent of all eligible victims. Obviously, the continued existence of the programs has not dramatically increased the public's awareness.

The results of the study by Shapland et al (1985) in the United Kingdom further demonstrate that criminal injuries compensation schemes are defective with regard to victim awareness. Shapland's study examined the experiences of victims in two districts in England: Coventry and Northampton. Shapland identifies three main forms of compensation. First, potentially all victims whose cases lead to conviction are entitled to make a claim against an identifiable offender in the civil courts. Second, all victims whose cases lead to a conviction may be awarded a compensation order by the criminal court (the problems with these two forms of reimbursement have been discussed previously). Third, many victims fall within the provisions of the criminal injuries compensation board. Shapland et al (1985) argue

that these are three types of reimbursement venues of which one might hope all victims would have heard. When victims were asked whether they knew of any way in which to claim compensation if they so desired, over half (51%) knew of no means of obtaining compensation. Some victims did indicate that had they wished to pursue the matter they would have taken steps to do so, such as consulting a lawyer.

It is important to stress that the vast majority of victims were ignorant of how to obtain help. Victims either expected the police to provide information or simply had no idea that any form of compensation existed. Shapland (1985:124) quoted one victim's view regarding the role of the police as "I didn't have a chance (to apply for compensation). The police didn't give me any chance."

Seven per cent of the Coventry victims and 10% of Northampton victims specifically mentioned that they felt the police had failed in not providing them with information about the possibility of compensation benefits (Shapland et al, 1985). On some occasions this was due to ignorance on the part of the police, while on other occasions it appeared as though police had mentioned the possibility of compensation at an early stage and the victim had understood that the police would assist them by providing addresses or application forms, but nothing subsequently materialized. Still other victims misunderstood the operation of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board thinking that the offender had to be apprehended in order to make a claim.

Interestingly, when victims that were aware of compensation benefits, but did not apply were asked why, even many in this category cited that they felt the police would take a more active role in their getting compensation. Others

mentioned occasional misinformation by the police and the deterrent effect of the minimum limit (Shapland et al, 1985).

Shapland et al (1985) examined which of the many variables known about victims and their cases would best predict whether a victim would apply for compensation. Overwhelmingly, the most important factor was whether the victim knew about any form of compensation. The amount of compensation wanted and whether any compensation was wanted at all did play a role, but to a much smaller degree. Shapland et al (1985) state that "it was lack of knowledge rather than any lack of a wish for compensation that was preventing applications."

A similar analysis, conducted by Elias (1983) in New York and New Jersey, to distinguish between victims who had applied for compensation and those who had not, also found applicant awareness of the scheme to be the most important variable. Knowledge was determined to have accounted for 45% of the variance. A further 13% was determined by whether the victim had been assisted by some form of victim assistance organization.

Baril and Cusson's Quebec study (1986) also found that large numbers of eligible victims were not availing themselves of compensation simply because they were unaware of the opportunity. Baril and Cusson (1986:13) found that "[m]otivation to apply is largely a factor of the victim's knowledge of the service and its operation".

Given the high degree of importance associated with knowledge or awareness of compensation benefits in the victim's decision to apply, it is relevant to examine how victims became aware of the existence of criminal injuries compensation and whether existing publicity was a factor. Shapland et al

(1985:128) found that it was "extremely rare for any victim other than a police officer (and not even all of them) to have anything other than a vague awareness of the possibility of existence of some compensation body prior to victimization".

Shapland et al (1985) found that the major initial source of information regarding criminal injuries compensation for victims was the police officer who was working on their case (34%). It is important to note, however, that some of the cases included in that percentage were from victim inquiries at police stations. It should also be noted that in still other cases the police, while informing the victim of the existence of such a scheme, did not provide the victim with an address or the appropriate application form.

According to Shapland et al (1985) the failure of the police to inform victims should not come as a surprise given the state of knowledge of many police officers regarding the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. The availability of compensation and the application procedure were not included in either recruitment or other police training programs in the areas studied. Any awareness of compensation benefits "is part of the informal knowledge acquired from colleagues in the police station" (Shapland et al, 1985:129).

Even though the British Criminal Injuries Compensation Board claims to have gone to great lengths to promote and advertise compensation benefits through leaflets and posters, victims in the Shapland study found it very difficult to learn about the scheme and even more problematic to obtain any such publicity material. A full forty-four per cent of victims indicated a difficulty in finding out about the Board. Clearly, there is an important distinction between a general attempt at disseminating information to the general public and the effective provision of

information to a desperate victim. This is a distinction that criminal injuries compensation boards do not seem to understand.

The situation is perhaps best summed up in the following quotation provided by one of the victims in Shapland's (1985) study:

The most difficult thing was finding out they (compensation programs) existed. I went to a couple of police stations and then had to write away. The first police station didn't have the address. Why not posters in public places where you'd expect to find them? I knew you could claim money from somewhere but I'd have passed it by" (p.129)

Shapland et al (1985) suggest a number of reasons for the lack of victim awareness of compensation benefits. First, becoming the victim of a relatively serious crime is quite infrequent. Therefore, only relatively few individuals will have an interest in publicity regarding compensation prior to victimization. Shapland argues that "sums spent on overall media coverage would, therefore, have to be large to make any impact and their effectiveness is likely to be small".

Arguably, knowledge of criminal injuries compensation benefits can best be disseminated through those individuals and groups that deal directly with victims of violent crime. This requires two processes to occur: there must be knowledge of the scheme and willingness to inform victims among the personnel of relevant agencies; and publicity material must be available to victims so that they can decide whether to apply. Clearly, one could propose that the most obvious agency to carry

out this function is the police, which leads directly to the next major reason for the lack of public and victim knowledge about criminal injuries compensation.

Presently police officers acquire knowledge about criminal injuries compensation in a rather haphazard manner and they inform victims in an equally inconsistent manner. Both, according to Shapland et al (1985), reflect the low priority given to victims in the criminal justice system. The first problem could be easily remedied by a training program. The second is more difficult to enforce or monitor. It would require training with a stress on the need to aid victims as being an important part of the police task (Shapland et al, 1985). The police role and the impact of a victim assistance unit in getting the message out to victims will be examined in greater detail later in this text.

Another possibility examined by Shapland et al (1985) would be to include notification as a routine administrative task. In Scotland, for example, prosecutors routinely send a leaflet outlining compensation provisions to all identifiable victims. This would at least ensure that victims whose offender is identified are made aware of criminal injuries compensation.

Just as the police are not always taking a proactive role in informing victims of criminal injuries compensation benefits, neither are other elements of the criminal justice system. In fact, many officials working within the criminal justice system itself are unaware of criminal injuries compensation. Former Chief Justice Brian Dickson states that compensation could be a significant remedy for victims, but its existence is not widely known. Dickson (1984:328) states that "it is possible to complete law school without ever having heard about crime victim compensation; a member of the general public is even less likely to know."

Doerner (1978) also noted the problem of low awareness in his quasi-experimental analysis of selected Canadian victim compensation programs. Doerner states that besides the obvious goal of financial reimbursement to crime victims it was also hoped that compensation programs would encourage victims to cooperate more fully with law enforcement agents. Doerner hypothesized that if greater cooperation was achieved the programs would increase the rate of violent crime known to the police and the volume of violent crimes cleared by the police, particularly since it is necessary to report crime and to cooperate with the police in order to be eligible for compensation. Yet, Doerner found no observable differences in the rate of violent crime known to police.

However, the finding of no demonstrable effects does not necessarily mean that victim compensation programs are totally ineffective. Rather, the results suggest that the blockage of certain anticipated effects may be indicative of malfunctions at earlier stages in the programs themselves. Namely, the reception of compensation benefits is directly related to knowledge that such programs exist. Doerner suggests that it is clear from evidence cited elsewhere that crime victims are simply not being reached. "Such information could be gleaned from comparing the number of compensation applications to the number of known violent crimes" (Doerner, 1978:250). In New York, for example, the compensation program has been receiving approximately fifteen hundred applications annually. Measuring these applications against the number of complaints made to the police of crime victimization in New York State - 38,000 for aggravated assault alone in 1971 - it is apparent that many eligible victims are not seeking compensation (Chappell and

Sutton, 1973) The reason for this low application rate, according to Chappell and Sutton (1973), seems to be that very few people know that the program exists.

Elias (1986) argues that besides reimbursement, these programs try to lower crime rates and improve victim attitudes and cooperation in criminal justice. However, they have not reduced the crime rate or improved clearance and conviction rates. They have also not increased crime reporting or the willingness to prosecute. They have not led to more favourable attitudes largely because people remain unaware of their existence (Elias, 1986). Elias sums up his discussion of compensation programs by stating that "while these various reimbursement methods have provided valuable assistance for some victims, they have been inaccessible to most" (Elias, 1986:177).

Public awareness of state victim compensation programs is almost impossible to quantify, although one study, which defined public awareness as the ratio of filed compensation claims to the number of known crimes, found that ratio to be extremely low (Zagaris, 1977). Bruce Zagaris' five state study found that between 1967-68 and 1974-75, public awareness ranged from a low of .25 per cent in New York in 1967 to a high of 19.74 per cent in Hawaii in 1969. These figures were computed as the ratio of compensation claims filed per 100 violent crimes known to the police. A second estimate, by Garofalo and Sutton (1977), puts the figure somewhat higher, although they still suggest that state programs reach no more than ten per cent of the statutorily eligible victims.

A primary obstacle which limits the visibility of state victim compensation programs according to Vaughn and Hofrichter (1981), lies in the lack of a specific legislative mandate as to the responsibility or requirements for

publicizing the availability of benefits to victims of crime. In California, which implemented the first such legislation in North America, the wording of the Act is vague. Section 13959 of the California Government Code states that "it is in the public interest to indemnify and assist in the rehabilitation of those residents of the State of California who, as the direct result of a crime, suffer a pecuniary loss" (Vaughn and Hofrichter, 1981:31). This phrase, however, as Vaughn and Hofrichter (1981) argue, fails to provide the administering agency with any tangible responsibility for "finding" potential claimants. In fact, no clarifying language exists in most locations having compensation schemes. Therefore, program administrators are under no legal obligation to attempt to increase either the number of claimants who file for aid, or to publicize the program.

In Canada, however, the federal government recognized the awareness deficiency and has accordingly included in all its agreements with the provinces, this clause:

The Attorney General of the province shall take all reasonable steps to give publicity to the availability throughout the province of compensation coming within the scope of this agreement as is necessary to ensure that the public will be adequately informed in this regard.

(Linden, 1977:31)

Regardless of the above-noted contractual requirement to publicize victim compensation programs, a 1987 Gallup Poll (Ottawa Citizen, May 4, 1987) found

that nearly three-quarters of Canadians are unaware that provincial schemes to compensate victims of violent crime exist. In the survey, conducted between April 8th and April 12th, 1987, Gallup found that seventy-one per cent of Ontarians were unaware of their province's compensation scheme. Of the twenty-nine per cent who said they knew of the Ontario plan, only four per cent said that the system was adequate for compensating victims of violent crimes, while seventeen per cent said it was less than adequate. Nationally, seventy-three per cent of respondents were unaware of the compensation schemes and only five per cent said the plans were adequate.

Similarly, a poll conducted by Environics Research Group Limited, in January of 1987, found that no more than one-third of the public were aware of victim assistance programs provided by their respective provinces. Thirty-three per cent of respondents indicated that their province had a program to compensate crime victims for lost wages and medical expenses. Twenty-two per cent of respondents indicated that their province did not offer such a program while forty-five per cent indicated that they simply did not know.

More glaring, however, is the fact that the Federal-Provincial agreement makes no mention of the need to directly make victims aware of the program. There is only a vague reference to making sure that the public is adequately informed. No specific enforceable criteria for reaching the critical audience - crime victims is included.

Given such dramatic evidence of low awareness, Linden (1977) argues that better liaison should be established between the victims, the police, the courts, health agencies and the present compensation boards. Linden suggests that

consideration should be given to establishing a Victim's Duty Counsel whose role it would be to advise the victim of his right to restitution and compensation. Linden (1977) also argues that consideration should be given to formalizing the role of the judge in this area. While judges are generally not enthusiastic about handling compensation or restitution questions, they might be willing to refer the victim's case to the compensation board to be dealt with there (Linden, 1977). On being notified of the case, the board could then send out an application form to the victim with instructions about the procedure. It is significant to note that Linden discussed these reforms in 1977, yet today, fourteen years later, little or nothing has been done to respond to the problem. As a result, victims remain largely unaware of compensation benefits.

As regards the problem of low victim awareness, Zagaris states "that the crucial audience is not being reached" (1977:111). Zagaris discusses the situation in California as a good example of passing the buck when it comes to notifying the critical audience. District attorneys were obligated, under the original California act, to notify crime victims of their potential compensation eligibility. The district attorneys protested against this increased burden and eventually the law was amended to place the duty of notification upon the police. However, Zagaris' (1977) interviews suggest that the police are not in the habit of informing victims of possible compensation eligibility. "The question of whose job it is to inform victims of possible benefits seems to be a volatile issue among segments of the criminal justice system without any attention being paid to the plight of the victim" (Doerner, 1977:161). Similarly, Waller (1985) argues that very few victims receive

any help because victims are not informed of the process by the police or other agencies. Waller claims that "only one in fifty-five victims ever apply" (1985:10).

In sum, the critical audience is not being reached. No member of the criminal justice apparatus is required to ensure that victims are made aware of assistance programs. Victims are not accessing these programs largely because they do not know that they exist.

b) Underfunding

Clearly, there is a great deal of literature indicating that the public, and crime victims particularly, remain unaware of compensation benefits. Whose responsibility it should be to inform victims of these benefits remains undetermined. However, there are factors other than low awareness which leave criminal injuries compensation programs open to criticism. To begin, compensation programs are severely underfunded. Waller (1985) argues that the amount of compensation paid is small, usually less than to a victim of an industrial accident and substantially less than a successful civil action.

In fact, one could argue that the lack of funding given to compensation programs contributes to the lack of awareness from which the programs suffer. Without sufficient funding to effective publicity measures the awareness of compensation funds will continue to be problematic for victims and the public.

Recognizing the meagre awards provided to crime victims under compensation programs, the Federal Provincial Task Force on Justice for Victims of Crime (1983:34) stated that "in the present circumstances Canadian criminal injuries

compensation schemes can only make a very limited contribution to alleviating the financial losses of victims of crime." Further, the Task Force (1983:34) reported that "[t]here seems little reason to believe that compensation is making a great contribution to a large number of victims". In Ontario in 1988-89, \$8,206,044 was paid out to 2,247 claimants (Ministry of the Attorney General, Ontario, 1989). This resulted in an average award of just less than \$3,652. While these awards did alleviate, to some degree, the losses of these victims the main problem, which relates back to the awareness problem, is that 2,247 beneficiaries represent only a very small proportion of all victims during the specified period.

The 1984 Ontario Government Consultation On Victims of Violent Crime also recognized the problem of underfunding. Participants of this workshop stressed the need to increase the upper limits of awards under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. Recently the Ontario government increased its maximum lump sum award to \$25,000, but very few victims have qualified for the maximum benefit thus far. The underfunding problem is of particular importance given the lack of viable alternatives available to victims including the problems associated with civil suits and the inadequacy of Criminal Code provisions noted earlier.

c) **Discretion and Inequality**

In addition to the problem of underfunding, the discretionary nature of compensation boards contributes to the low awareness factor. Victim compensation boards disqualify a significant number of victim compensation claims, thereby rendering the programs less effective. In Wisconsin it was estimated that sixty per

cent of all claims filed in the first year of operation were disallowed (Doerner, 1978). The degree of discretion is not as high in Canada, however, there are a significant number of cases in which the compensation boards have used their discretion to nullify or at the very least decrease awards granted. Murphy (1984) argues that compensation boards often callously reduce awards at the slightest hint of victim fault or wrongdoing. The danger is that "the victim may be penalized merely for being at the wrong place at the wrong time with characteristics (wealth, youth, old age, defencelessness, female, a minority) that attract a potential criminal" (Murphy, 1984:533).

The victim's behaviour at the time of the commission of the offence and subsequent to it, significantly effects the amount, if any, of compensation to be awarded. For example, the Nova Scotia legislation states that the board "shall consider and take into account any behaviour of the victim that directly or indirectly contributed to his injury or death" (Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, N.S. 1975 s. 25(2)). This broad wording gives the board considerable discretion in rendering a decision.

In Ontario, the decisions of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board provide a number of examples of what constitutes an unworthy victim. For example, claimants have had their awards reduced or denied for: failing to report to police within a reasonable time; participation in criminal conduct; homosexuality; drunkenness; and immoral behaviour in general. "There seems to be no limit to the circumstances and instances that a board might designate as relevant. But they usually look for circumstances involving illegal, immoral, or imprudent behaviour as defined by the board members themselves" (Murphy, 1984:545).

On the same theme, Miers states that certainly the Ontario Criminal Injuries Compensation Board "takes a dim view of boozing and wenching (1977:244)" In the Thrush case, for example, the applicant for compensation had been living in a hotel with a married woman. The woman's husband discovered them and shot them both, killing his wife and paralyzing the applicant. The Ontario Board ruled that "the victim's conduct during the ten days preceding the shooting was completely irresponsible and morally disgraceful" (Edelhertz and Geis, 1984:244). Correspondingly, the amount of the award was reduced considerably from what normally would have been provided for such injuries.

In the British case of Thompstone the compensation board's ruling also involved discretion. The applicants, who were victims of criminal assault, had previous convictions for offences of dishonesty and in one case for an offence of violence. The board disallowed the applications "on the ground that having regard to the applicants' characters and ways of life it was inappropriate to make an award" (Criminal Law Review, 1983:325). The applicants appealed the decision to the Queen's Bench Division. The court ruled, however, that the Board possessed "wide discretion to reduce or disallow an award having regard to the previous convictions and character of an applicant, even though such matters were wholly unconnected to the injury in respect of which compensation was claimed" (Criminal Law Review, 1983:326).

Theoretical Rationale

To fully understand the criticism that criminal injuries compensation boards are discretionary, it is necessary to briefly comment on the justification or theoretical rationale for compensation programs. The humanitarian model, on which most Canadian schemes, including that of Ontario, are based, is not concerned with the needs of the individual but rather focuses on the needs of the social system (Hastings, 1983). Compensation is based on sympathy for the plight of the innocent victim. Such compensation does not have to be made, but should be made (Burns, 1980). The humanitarian model emphasizes that only innocent and deserving victims should be compensated. Compensation should be reserved for innocent victims of violent crime.

The insurance model, however, focuses on the needs of individual members of society and on the responsibility of social institutions to respond to these needs (Hastings, 1983). Criminal injuries compensation schemes within the insurance model would focus on the individual's needs rather than the moral validity of the claimant. Compensation schemes based on this model, Hastings (1983) argues, would substantially reduce discretion.

d) Symbolic

Many writers have argued that criminal injuries compensation programs are symbolic (Elias, 1983; Elias, 1986; Miers, 1983; Shapland, 1985). They argue, given the evidence of low awareness, underfunding, and discretion, that the

programs were not intended to provide significant assistance to crime victims. They claim that the emphasis that the criminal justice system had placed on offenders in the 1960s resulted in significant public reaction. The criminal justice system saw the credibility of its correctional institutions being seriously undermined. Therefore, an easy and cheap way in which to redress the balance in favour of the victim was through the introduction of a scheme which visibly delivered compensation to victims of crime. "The principal goal of crime victim compensation schemes is therefore, symbolic: it is to reaffirm a set of values about particular kinds of suffering" (Miers, 1983:211).

Miers (1983) argues that while other goals such as financial recompense for loss of earnings or the realization of more favourable attitudes towards the criminal justice system could result, they were subordinate to the symbolic goal. There was very little research put into the implementation of these schemes and there has been very little evaluation of their effectiveness. This, according to Miers (1983), is not surprising if you view these schemes within the framework of making a public statement about crime and the values which are embodied by the criminal justice system.

Clearly, knowledge of the existence of criminal injuries compensation is the most important factor in determining whether victims apply. The challenge to introduce a system for the efficient notification of victims has not been met. Logically, Shapland et al (1985) argue that when, or if, a notification system is developed, the demand for compensation will increase. In the United States, for example, publicity campaigns have been scuttled in response to too large an increase in the number of applications received. This shows up schemes as being wholly

"political" and as having little intention of actually compensating crime victims. A better solution would be to prepare for an additional number of applications.

Elias (1983) further criticizes criminal injuries compensation by stating that the tangible outcomes of such schemes are almost irrelevant and that not much should be expected since the actual purpose of the plans was merely to psychologically elevate crime victims to a status higher than criminals. Elias (1983) states that criminal injuries compensation was clearly an attempt at appeasement by the government. "It must be understood not only as a criminal justice policy but also as a kind of social control policy," (Elias, 1983:217)

Aside from providing political advantages for official supporters of compensation the plans have almost universally had the additional goals of: (a) compensating victims; (b) helping to control crime; and (c) improving attitudes and cooperation among people toward the criminal justice system. Research shows, however, that victim compensation has failed to achieve the goals intended for victims.

First, as noted, compensation programs are providing only very meagre awards. More importantly, the programs are reaching too few victims. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in the United States estimates that only one per cent of crime victims with injuries would be assisted annually (Miers, 1977). Similar estimates have been made in Canada (Linden, 1977; Waller, 1985). As well, research studies, including that of Doerner (1978), indicate that criminal injuries compensation programs have no apparent effect on reducing the crime rate. Compensation programs are not providing a greater certainty of justice that might, if achieved, deter crime (Elias, 1983). Research has discounted the view that criminal

injuries compensation schemes produce an increase in victims' willingness to cooperate with law enforcement agencies. Studies suggest that compensation has not produced a greater level of crime reporting nor willingness to prosecute, nor more favourable attitudes. These are all important signs as to whether or not people have increased their cooperation (Doerner, 1978).

Criminal injuries compensation programs have failed to produce more favourable attitudes or more cooperation among victims. They have failed to alleviate the largely negative experience for most victims, not only of their victimization but also of their treatment in the criminal process. The significant discontent among claimants seems to derive from the fact that many victims had high expectations about getting an award only to be frustrated when applications were unsuccessful (Elias, 1983). But this negative consequence only affects a limited number of people. In the meantime, satisfied claimants show substantial support for the programs, the government and for criminal justice. While most remain unaware of compensation programs, those that are aware but have never been victimized are quite impressed by the fact that policymakers and law enforcers have been considerate enough to show concern for victims and provide compensation programs. This, according to Elias (1983) is a perfect example of symbolic politics. The public is thankful for the program and hopes it will never need it, when in fact, should the program ever be needed, for the vast majority of the people, it will not actually be there (Elias, 1983).

To be balanced, it can be argued that when criminal injuries compensation programs were introduced legislators were simply being cautious. Arguably, it was perfectly reasonable for legislators in the 1960s to have limits and

restrictions on the granting of awards. With this in mind, it can be argued that those espousing the symbolic nature of criminal injuries compensation were overreacting. They were exaggerating to the point of almost labelling the programs a government plot.

However, one cannot ignore the fact that today, twenty five years after the inception of the first criminal injuries compensation scheme in Canada, there is overwhelming evidence that the programs are not being used to their full potential. We know that large numbers of victims are not accessing the programs so why do we not make a change?

There is a long standing principle in society to provide financial redress for harm done. Financial reparation, no matter how great, can provide valuable assistance to those in need. Baril and Cusson's (1986) study of the Quebec criminal injuries compensation system found applicants to be socio-demographically representative of victims of violence. The majority were found to be low income young single males - a group that could clearly benefit from financial aid. More importantly Baril and Cusson (1986) also found compensation to benefit victims in very direct ways. While most medical expenses were covered by the provincial health plan, some, including prostheses, dental care, and psychological treatment were not. As well, a full sixty per cent of applicants in the Baril and Cusson (1986) study had lost employment income. Some victims were unable to work for up to a year.

Clearly, there is substantial evidence which supports the view that criminal injuries compensation programs suffer from a lack of awareness. While eligible victims could benefit substantially, many are not being made aware of the

programs. The fact that the programs are underfunded, discretionary and arguably only a symbolic policy which was never intended to have significant tangible benefits, contributes to the lack of public and victim awareness. This is exacerbated by the fact that there is no specific group or person, such as the police, within the criminal justice system assigned to inform victims of the availability of compensation benefits.

CHAPTER TWO

Methodology

Given that the review of the literature provides considerable support for the view that very few crime victims are accessing criminal injuries compensation, this study seeks to examine the role of one key player in the criminal justice system who could potentially have a great impact on making victims aware of compensation benefits. The police, the first criminal justice agent contacted by most victims, could potentially play a major role in victim awareness. To examine their capacity to make victims aware of compensation, a questionnaire was administered to officers in four police departments in the Ottawa-Carleton region.

Generally, this study seeks to examine what officers do to inform victims of compensation benefits, how they feel about informing victims, and what they know about criminal injuries compensation programs. Specifically, this study seeks to determine what effect, if any, the presence of a victim assistance unit within a police force has on crime victims being made aware of the availability of criminal injuries compensation. A two phase case study approach of contrasted group design was used to compare the Killaloe and Renfrew Ontario Provincial Police detachments, which do not have a victim assistance units, with the Ottawa Police Service and the Nepean Police Service, which do have a victim assistance unit within their respective departments. A questionnaire was administered to officers in each police force to determine their knowledge of and attitude towards criminal injuries compensation programs. The questionnaire also sought to gauge the role of

individual police officers in informing victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation.

The data for the first phase of this research study were collected in February of 1989. In this phase, the Ottawa Police Service (officers who do have a victim assistance unit within their department) were compared with the Killaloe O.P.P. officers who do not have such a unit within their department. To increase the generalizability of the initial findings, data were collected from two further sites approximately eight months later. In phase two, findings were obtained from officers attached to the Nepean Police Service (which does have a victim service unit) and these responses were compared with the responses of Renfrew O.P.P. officers who like their counterparts in Killaloe, also do not have a victim assistance unit within their department.

As there were very few differences in the findings of phase one and phase two of the study, the results of the two urban sites and the two rural sites were combined to simplify the presentation of findings. A separate breakdown of the findings in phase one and phase two format can be found in Appendix B. Before discussing the questionnaire in detail, however, it is necessary to comment upon the different sampling procedures available and on that which was utilized.

A. Sampling Design

There are a number of sampling designs which can be used in survey research. With one of the most common methods, simple random sampling, every member of the population has an equal chance of being selected. Conceptually, this

is like putting the name of everyone in the population, or in this case every police force in a specified jurisdiction, in a hat and drawing out a certain number of names.

In the systematic sampling method, every k th element in the total list is chosen for inclusion (Babbie, 1986). Both the simple random sampling method and the systematic sampling technique were not feasible for this research project. If, for example, the urban site selected was in southern Ontario or the rural site located in northern Ontario, reaching the samples would have been costly and impractical.

Stratified sampling is another method for obtaining a greater degree of representativeness. Rather than selecting a sample from the total population at large you ensure that appropriate numbers of elements are drawn from homogeneous subsets of that population (Babbie, 1986). Another sampling method, "cluster sampling, may be used when it is either impossible or impractical to compile an exhaustive list of the elements composing the target population" (Babbie, 1986:163). There are situations in which the physical constraints, both in time and money, make cluster sampling more desirable than the previously-noted sampling methods. In this study, for example, a specific geographic area could have been chosen from which a random sample of police forces could have been chosen.

The type of sampling discussed thus far is referred to as probability sampling. Probability refers to the predetermined chance of an individual being selected for the study, given the particular constraints under study. It is also possible to use nonprobability sampling. This, however, raises the question of generalizability, which is a very important concept that must be considered whenever one is using a convenient group, as in this case, for research.

Nachmias and Nachmias state that "if a set of units has no chance of being included in the sample, a restriction on the definition of the population is implied; that is, if the traits of this set of units are unknown, then the precise nature of the population also remains unknown" (1981:429). It cannot be said, however, that the "traits of this set of units," the police forces, were totally unknown. Each force follows the directives of the province. Yet it must certainly be acknowledged that statistically, only probability sampling makes representative sampling designs possible.

a) **Nonprobability Sampling**

In spite of the great number of advantages associated with probability samples, social scientists often use nonprobability samples. The major advantages of nonprobability samples are convenience, time and cost. Under certain circumstances, these advantages may outweigh the risks involved in not using probability sampling (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981).

The two major nonprobability sample designs pertinent to this study are convenience samples and purposive samples. A convenience sample is obtained when the researcher selects whatever sampling units are conveniently available (Ray and Ravizza, 1985). For example, sometimes simple surveys use a convenience sampling procedure when people on the street or in shopping malls are interviewed as they happen to walk by the interviewer. There is no way of estimating the representativeness of convenience samples and one cannot attach estimates of standard errors to the sample results (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981).

b) Purposive Samples

With purposive samples, or judgement samples, the sampling units are selected subjectively by the researcher, who attempts to obtain a sample that appears to him or her to be representative of the population. The chance that a particular sampling unit will be selected for the sample depends on the subjective judgement of the researcher. "Because it is impossible to determine precisely why each different researcher judges each sampling unit s/he selects to contribute to the representativeness of the sample, it is impossible to determine the probability of any specific sampling unit being included in the sample" (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981:430).

While it is easy to criticize research designs which utilize convenience or purposive sampling methods, the research in this study can rely on more than just practical considerations of time and cost to justify the sampling method chosen. With any research project in which the permission of the population being studied is a requirement, there are two main goals - to gain entrance and to get the cooperation of respondents. In the initial data collection phase, the rural site without a victim assistance unit (Killaloe) was chosen because the researcher had personal contact with an officer within the force. This increased the likelihood of the above two goals being met. The urban force, the Ottawa Police Force, was selected because the researcher's immediate supervisor had previous experience with the Ottawa Police Victim Unit and they had been helpful and cooperative. In the second data collection phase the sites of Nepean and Renfrew were chosen because of their proximity to the phase one study populations. This was not only

convenient, but it was felt that it would be easier to convince the police chiefs of the respective forces to allow the researcher entrance by indicating that their neighbouring forces had also participated in the research. This strategy was effective, particularly when dealing with the Renfrew population, in alleviating the concerns and apprehensions of the police administration.

B. Research Design

a) Stimulus Response vs. Property Disposition Relations

When choosing a research design, Nachmias and Nachmias (1981) stress the importance of distinguishing between stimulus-response and property-disposition relations. A stimulus-response relationship is characterized by an independent variable that is external, specific and well defined, with a dependent variable being a particular response to it. In property-disposition relations, property usually refers to some background characteristic. Dispositions are attitudes, values and orientations - subjects which are of relevance to this study.

Nachmias and Nachmias (1981) stress that, while stimulus-response relationships are well suited for experimental investigation, property-disposition relationships are not. First, in a stimulus-response relationship the time interval between the effect of the independent variable and the response to it is relatively short. In a property-disposition relationship the time interval can extend over a long period. While the response to a drug or advertising campaign can be observed within a short period, the effects of properties such as age, race, or social class are not of the same immediate nature (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981). Similarly, the

effect of a victim assistance unit within a police force is not something that is easily measured in a short period of time. Its utility and the effect that it may have on the knowledge, attitude and behaviour of police officers may occur gradually over an extended period of time.

Just as the time interval for a stimulus-response relationship is different than a property-disposition relationship, so too is the degree of specificity of the independent variable. "A stimulus is usually easy to isolate and identify, and its effect can be concretely delineated" (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981:106). A property, however, is more general and incorporates various factors. Therefore, it is often difficult with this type of variable to define the relevant causes and to manipulate them experimentally.

The nature of the comparison groups is a further difference between stimulus-response and property-disposition relationships. In stimulus-response relationships, comparisons can be made between one group that has been exposed to the stimulus and one that has not. Comparisons can also be made of a group before and after its exposure to the stimulus. In a property-disposition relationship, a before-after comparison is practically impossible. Similarly, it is difficult to assume that two groups having different properties are comparable in any other respect (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981). Clearly, an urban police force with a victim assistance unit and a rural force without a victim unit may differ in various aspects other than whether or not they have a victim unit. For instance, do they have a common focus? Do they see their mandate as one to apprehend offenders, to keep the peace, to work with the community or do they envision their role in an entirely different way?

Just as the stimulus-response and property-disposition relationships differ as regards time interval, degree of specificity, and nature of comparison groups; so too, is there a difference as regards the time sequence of events. With the stimulus-response relationship the direction of causation is fairly clear, especially when the research design allows for before-after comparisons (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981). However, the time sequence is more difficult to establish with some properties. "With fixed properties such as race and sex there are more difficulties because these can only be the determining factors, but not the determined effects" (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981:107). This is not the case, however, with properties that are acquired, including knowledge and attitude, which are of particular interest in this survey. These properties can both determine and be determined by other factors including, in this case, the presence of a victim assistance unit. Still, however, the time order cannot be easily established.

Due to these distinctions the comparison, manipulation and control components of research designs cannot be applied to property-disposition relationships in the pure experimental sense. Clearly, not all areas of interest to social scientists can be experimentally manipulated (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981). As in the present case, units of analysis cannot always be randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. As well, many social processes can only be studied after a relatively long period of time. Yet social scientists have employed a number of specialized data analysis techniques, including the one-shot case study of contrasted group design in an attempt to compensate for the limitations inherent in property-disposition relationships.

b) Contrasted Group Design

The least elaborated design for contrasted groups is that in which individuals or other units of analysis are regarded as members of categoric groups (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981) such as those working in a force with a victim assistance unit and those working in a force that lacks a victim assistance unit. Members of each group were measured with respect to the dependent variables which, in this case, are behaviour, knowledge, and attitude. Since contrasted groups may differ from one another in many ways, it is difficult to assess the causes for the observed differences. Nachmias and Nachmias (1981) warn that causal inferences concerning the independent variables are especially vulnerable when groups are compared that are known to differ in some important attributes. There is always the danger that when a posttest-only design is used with contrasted groups, that the differences in posttest measures are attributable to initial differences between the groups rather than to the impact of the independent variable. The case study, being pre-experimental, is a design in which one or more of the sources of internal and external validity are not controlled and therefore its causal inferential powers are impaired (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981).

One way in which to reduce the risk of being wrong when making causal inferences based on contrasted group design is to obtain supplementary evidence over time regarding the hypothesized differences. Thus, according to Nachmias and Nachmias (1981), if the same finding is obtained in other settings, and comparisons are made on a number of measures concerning the dependent variables, then such supplementary evidence can increase the inferential powers of a contrasted group

design. Therefore, as noted, in the second phase of this study, the behaviour, knowledge, and attitudes of members of a second rural and urban police force, Renfrew and Nepean respectively, were examined in order to increase the generalizability of the results obtained in phase one.

Given that the underlying theme in literature critical of compensation programs was the lack of public awareness and, more importantly, the lack of victim awareness of compensation benefits, a public opinion survey was considered as a methodology. This method was rejected, however, for it would just serve to reinforce what is already known; compensation programs lack public awareness. A public opinion survey would just serve to duplicate the 1987 Gallup Poll cited earlier, but more importantly it would just provide a picture of the situation at one point in time. A public opinion survey has no comparative value and, therefore, could not provide information on the value of victim services which are of specific interest to the researcher in this study. As well, interviewing victims to get feedback from them on the role that the police played in making them aware of compensation was considered, but this methodology had to also be rejected. It was impossible to gain access to the victim population. Police administrations were unwilling to provide the project researcher access to their victim files.

Therefore, it was decided that police officers should be questioned since they are the first criminal justice official contacted by most crime victims. Having direct contact with victims, police officers can influence them significantly. The behaviour of police officers is dependent on their knowledge of and attitude toward criminal injuries compensation; therefore, two police forces with a victim assistance unit and two forces without such a unit were selected in order to examine how or

to what extent victim service units contribute to victims being made aware of compensation.

C. Questionnaire Design

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was the methodology chosen through which to translate the research objectives into specific questions. The answers to the questions provided the data for hypothesis testing. The content, structure, format and sequence of the questionnaire were all taken into account when it was being developed. According to Nachmias and Nachmias (1981), survey questions may be concerned with facts, attitudes, the respondents' behaviour and their level of familiarity with a certain subject. This survey utilized all four types of questions.

First, the data from fact questions were used to compare responses to substantive questions between different groups. In this survey the fact questions asked respondents to list their number of years experience as police officers and to provide an indication of their relative experience with crime victims; that is, the number of victims of violent crime they had personally dealt with in the previous three-month period.

Second, a number of attitude or opinion questions were included in the survey. Opinion and attitude questions deal with the feelings, beliefs, ideas, predispositions and values related to the topic under study (Backstrom and Hursh-César, 1981). It is important, according to Backstrom and Hursh-César (1981) to distinguish opinion from attitude in that opinion is focused and expressed. Questions about opinions try to learn what people think or feel at a particular point

in time about a particular subject, in this case, criminal injuries compensation programs.

Respondents' thoughts and feelings are, however, the result of an underlying, deeply ingrained attitude system. Since questions about attitudes tap the respondent's personality orientation acquired through years of experience, it is important in this study to gauge differences between and among the two populations on their attitude towards: the adequacy of financial reimbursement of compensation programs; which types of victims should be eligible for compensation; the necessity for victims to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation; and toward whose responsibility it should be to inform victims about the availability of criminal injuries compensation.

Third, surveys usually ask people to describe their own behaviour. Accordingly, this questionnaire asked respondents if they had ever informed a crime victim about the availability of criminal injuries compensation or provided him/her with information about compensation. The survey also asked whether they had ever assisted crime victims in applying for compensation or in accessing any other agency which provides services to crime victims.

Finally, a number of information or knowledge questions were also included in the questionnaire. "Information questions are asked to find out what people know, how much or how little, from which sources and when they first learned about certain events" (Eackstrom and Hursh-César, 1981:126). This survey examined respondents' knowledge of compensation eligibility requirements and about victim services available in their community. Knowledge questions also tested their

awareness of the programs and explored their source of information about the programs.

Knowledge questions are important in this survey because people's knowledge of any subject is related to their attitudes (Backstrom and Hursh-César, 1981). This is the principle of selected behaviour. People selectively expose themselves to information, mostly information they agree with. This principle will be examined in further detail in the fourth chapter of this report. It should also be noted at this time that the sample population for this sample was self-selected which could have a biasing influence.

This chapter will conclude with a brief discussion of the format of the questionnaire and a comment upon the method of analysis. In this survey all but a few questions were structured. The questions were worded in such a way as to induce respondents to answer only in terms of a few alternatives that were provided. Some commentators argue that fixed response categories sacrifice the personal flavour of respondents' answers; however, with fixed responses, people classify themselves rather than being placed in a category subsequently by a researcher (Backstrom and Hursh-César, 1981).

Structured questions were particularly important for this survey because they can be quickly and easily answered by busy police officers. Structured questions were utilized because they are convenient, easily amenable to analysis and because they are based on hypotheses which indicate that the preset alternatives are meaningful. The questions and categories used were chosen following extensive reading and consultation with experts in the field and with the police themselves. In sum, the questionnaire was structured so that analysis would be meaningful in

terms of what the researcher wanted to know about the respondents' actions, thoughts and knowledge regarding criminal injuries compensation programs.

The data, which will be discussed in greater depth in the following chapters, were analyzed with the chi square test. The chi square test deals with frequencies - raw scores - not percentages or other comparative statistics. Frequencies are tested because the categories are discrete, non-continuous and, therefore, assumed to be equal in value but not comparable (Backstrom and Hursh-César, 1981). The chi square test compares the difference between the frequencies 'observed' in a sample against hypothetical frequencies that one would have 'expected' to find if there were no differences in the populations - the null hypothesis. The chi square value, obtained from calculating the differences between the observed and expected frequencies, indicates whether the difference is greater than what could happen by chance.

The discovery of a discrepancy between frequencies observed and frequencies expected does not prove that the two variables are related since normal sampling error may produce discrepancies. The magnitude of the chi square, however, enables us to estimate the probability of that having happened. A chi square value must generally be significant at the .05 level to be considered statistically significant. In this study all chi square calculations have two rows and two columns so there is one degree of freedom. By referring to a table of critical chi square values one can determine that a chi square value of 3.84 is required for relationships in this study to be significant at the .05 level. This means that there is a probability of less than five per cent that the relationship found can be attributed to chance.

In sum, a questionnaire was chosen as the survey instrument to obtain information on the behaviour, knowledge, and attitude of police officers with respect to criminal injuries compensation. The literature suggests that most crime victims are not accessing criminal injuries compensation programs. Police officers were chosen as the study population since they are the first criminal justice agent contacted by most crime victims and they are in a unique position to ensure that they are informed about the availability of criminal injuries compensation. Two police sites with a victim assistance unit and two without such a unit were selected to test whether it has an impact on the behaviour, knowledge, and attitude of officers which may ultimately impact on victims being made aware of compensation benefits.

CHAPTER THREE

Findings

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) for the initial phase of this research study was completed by thirty-nine Ottawa Police officers and eighteen officers stationed at the Killaloe O.P.P. detachment. In the second phase of this research study twenty-eight officers with the Nepean Police Service and twelve from the Renfrew O.P.P detachment completed the same questionnaire. The questions probed the respondents' behaviour regarding making crime victims aware of compensation benefits, as well as their knowledge of criminal injuries compensation programs and their attitude towards the programs. The results of the questionnaire will be presented in this chapter.

In general, the findings from phase two of the research support those found in phase one. Therefore, to avoid repetition and to achieve greater clarity, the findings will be presented together. Where it is of relevance, or when there are contradictions between phase one and phase two, the findings will be discussed separately. For readers who desire greater detail, the complete results from phase one and phase two of the research are presented separately in Appendix B.

As noted, chi square tables which compare the frequencies observed with frequencies one would expect to see by chance are provided to assist in the interpretation of the findings. This statistical measure indicates whether there are greater differences between populations than one would expect to see by chance. The results will be discussed in greater detail in the fourth chapter of this text.

A: Behaviour - What Are Police Officers Doing to Make Victims Aware of Criminal Injuries Compensation ?

As noted previously, the actions and behaviour of individual police officers have the potential to impact significantly on whether victims are made aware of criminal injuries compensation benefits. Police officers are the first criminal justice agent with whom most crime victims come into contact. They have a unique opportunity to ensure that victims are made aware of criminal injuries compensation programs. Therefore, it is important to know what police officers are doing in this regard. What is their perceived role? What is their behaviour? How are their actions impacting on victims being made aware of criminal injuries compensation?

In this study, forty-five per cent of the police officers sampled admitted that they had never made an attempt to make victims aware of compensation benefits. While a significant difference was not found between the two populations (Table 1), it is interesting to note that police officers from a detachment with a victim assistance unit were more likely to indicate that they had informed victims of the existence of criminal injuries compensation. Sixty-one per cent of victim assistance unit officers had previously informed a victim of the availability of criminal injuries compensation, while only forty-three per cent of non victim assistance unit officers had done so.

TABLE 1: BEHAVIOUR MEASURE: POLICE ROLE IN INFORMING VICTIMS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF COMPENSATION

Behaviour: Inform Victims of the Availability of criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	40	26	66
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	13	17	30
	53	43	96

Chi square (1) = 2.49

In this instance, it is worth noting the differences found between phase one and phase two of the research. Phase one found that two-thirds of the Ottawa police officers informed victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation while less than four in ten of the Killaloe sample had ever informed a victim of the availability of compensation. In contrast, phase two of the research found that the Renfrew O.P.P. officers, located in a detachment without a victim assistance unit, were more likely to inform victims of compensation benefits than were their counterparts in Nepean who do have a victim assistance unit. It should be noted, however, that in part c) of this item in the questionnaire (Appendix A), which asked officers to indicate what type of assistance they had provided to victims, a full 81% of the Nepean police respondents indicated that they had referred victims to the victim assistance unit. This suggests that Nepean police officers feel that the dissemination of criminal injuries compensation information should be the responsibility of the specialized victim unit - not individual officers.

When officers from a department with a victim assistance unit and those from a detachment without such a unit were asked about a specific behaviour,

providing victims with a card or leaflet with information on victim compensation, there were marked differences between the sample populations. The chi square value of 5.82 (Table 2) indicates that there is a probability of less than .025 of the difference occurring by chance. Interestingly, however, is the fact that for this question it was the officers without a victim assistance unit who were much more likely to respond positively.

TABLE 2: BEHAVIOUR MEASURE: POLICE ROLE IN PROVIDING VICTIMS WITH SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON COMPENSATION

Behaviour: Provide Victims with a card/ leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	9	46	55
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	12	18	30
	21	64	85

Chi square (1) = 5.82, $p < .025$

Only nine of the fifty-five officers from a force with a victim assistance unit who responded to this question indicated that they had ever provided a victim with a card or leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation. Strikingly, only 16% of officers from a force with a victim assistance unit had ever provided victims with such a card. Forty per cent, or twelve of the thirty O.P.P. officers without a victim assistance unit responding to this question indicated that they had provided victims with such a card.

Respondents were also asked if they had ever provided a crime victim with assistance in applying for compensation. The researcher was hoping to get an

idea of what type of assistance police officers provide to victims in the application process. Specifically, do they: provide victims with the necessary forms; explain the program to them; or provide victims with the appropriate address or toll free telephone number. Only twenty-seven of the total population of ninety-seven police officers responded to this question which, in itself, is significant. Of the twenty-seven officers who indicated what type of assistance they provided to victims, twenty-one (78%) indicated that they had referred them to the victim assistance unit while six indicated that they had informed them of compensation benefits verbally. This suggests that police officers see their referral of victims to the assistance unit as assisting victims in accessing compensation. They see referral to the victim unit as the full extent of their role.

The final behaviour that respondents were questioned about was whether they had ever referred crime victims to other services in the community available to crime victims. The majority of respondents in both the urban and rural samples indicated that they had indeed referred victims to varying community services. The vast majority in both populations indicated that they had referred victims to various community services available to them.

In sum, there were a number of behavioral differences found between the two populations. In general, officers from a detachment with a victim assistance unit were more likely to inform victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation. In contrast, it was officers from a detachment without a victim assistance unit who were more likely to provide victims with a card or leaflet on criminal injuries compensation. Yet, among both sample groups only 55% of the officers had informed victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation

and only 24% had ever provided victims with a card or leaflet with information on the programs. It is important to note that the majority of officers from victim assistance unit departments felt that by referring victims to the victim assistance unit they were enabling victims to access compensation benefits. Accordingly, it is important to stress that the majority of officers from a force with a victim assistance unit indicated that they had previously referred victims to the specialized service.

B: Knowledge - How Familiar Are Police Officers with Criminal Injuries Compensation Programs ?

Having found there to be differences between the two populations on behavioral measures, it is now relevant to turn to a discussion of the knowledge that each population has of criminal injuries compensation programs. For example, is one population of officers more aware of the eligibility requirements for compensation and, if so, through what source did they gain their knowledge. Police officers' background knowledge, awareness and understanding of the programs has the potential to impact on their actions - making victims aware of criminal injuries compensation, therefore, it is worthy of examination.

The first substantive knowledge related question asked of police officers was whether they had ever heard of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. The response to this question was overwhelmingly affirmative. All thirty-nine Ottawa Police officers indicated that they had heard of the program as did seventeen of the eighteen Killaloe O.P.P. respondents. Similarly, twenty-six of the twenty-eight Nepean Police officers and all twelve of the respondents from the Renfrew

O.P.P. detachment indicated that they had heard of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board.

Respondents were also overwhelmingly aware of whether or not their police department had a victim assistance unit. Sixty-six of the sixty-seven urban police officers were aware of the unit and sixty-four of them had referred a victim to the unit. All thirty officers from the Renfrew and Killaloe O.P.P. detachments knew that a victim assistance unit did not exist within their respective departments.

Respondents were also asked to indicate where they had first heard about the compensation programs. This was an attempt to gauge whether the officers had heard about the programs through the victim assistance unit or elsewhere. Just over half (20 of 39) of the Ottawa Police officers indicated that they had been made aware of the programs through the Ottawa Police Force or the victim assistance unit. Nine responded by indicating the media, while another three said they became aware of the program through university or police college. Four of the eighteen Killaloe O.P.P. officers indicated that they became aware of the program through work, another four said the media, while one said the court system.

The findings in phase two of the research regarding where the respondents from the Nepean Police Service and the Renfrew O.P.P. became aware of compensation are similar with fourteen of twenty-eight Nepean officers indicating that they became aware of compensation through work, a further eight found out through the media, while three indicated that they first heard about compensation benefits at police college. As for the Renfrew O.P.P. respondents, seven indicated that they became aware of the program through work, a further three became aware through the media while the remaining two officers did not respond.

TABLE 3: KNOWLEDGE MEASURE: HOW POLICE OFFICERS BECAME AWARE OF CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION

Knowledge: Where did you first hear about criminal criminal injuries compensation programs?

	WORK	MEDIA	UNIVERSITY	COURT	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	34	17	6	0	57
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	11	7	0	1	19
	45	24	6	1	76

Clearly these findings are striking. Forty-one per cent of those officers responding indicated that they became aware of the program through a means other than work. A significant thirty-two per cent of the respondents indicated that they became aware of the programs through the media which can only be said to give them cursory attention.

A number of more directed knowledge-related questions were also asked. For example, respondents were asked if victims of a number of specific offences were eligible for victim compensation. With the offence of assault (Table 4) the low chi-square value of 1.62 indicates that there was a high degree of consensus between the urban and rural populations. The majority of officers in both samples knew that victims of assault were eligible for criminal injuries compensation. It is significant to note that for the Nepean and Renfrew police respondents (Phase Two, see Appendix B - Table 3B) there was a greater difference found between the two populations than one would expect to see by chance. This finding could indicate that Nepean Police Service Officers are in part benefiting from a victim assistance

unit in their department by becoming more knowledgeable regarding the eligibility requirements of criminal injuries compensation programs.

TABLE 4: KNOWLEDGE MEASURE: POLICE AWARENESS OF COMPENSATION PROVISIONS FOR ASSAULT VICTIMS

Knowledge: Eligibility of victims of assault for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBILITY	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	40	10	50
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	18	9	27
	58	19	77

Chi square (1) = 1.62

For the offence of sexual assault, both rural and urban samples were overwhelmingly aware that victims of sexual assault are eligible for compensation. No differences were found between the samples. There was also consensus between the urban and rural police populations on knowledge of whether victims of break and enter are covered under the compensation programs. The majority of police officers working in a force with a victim assistance unit and the majority of non victim assistance unit officers were aware that victims of break and enter are not eligible for criminal injuries compensation.

The most significant difference of all the knowledge questions involved the question relating to the necessity to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation (Table 5). A greater number of victim assistance unit officers than one would expect to see by chance were aware of the eligibility provision. Officers working in Ottawa and Nepean, forces with a victim assistance unit, were

much more likely to respond correctly (58%) than the officers from detachments without a victim assistance unit (33%).

TABLE 5: KNOWLEDGE MEASURE: POLICE AWARENESS OF THE NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	32	23	55
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	9	18	27
	41	41	82

Chi square (1) = 4.89 p. < .05

Still, forty-two per cent of those officers working in a detachment with a victim assistance unit were not aware of this eligibility provision.

In sum, it would seem that police officers gather their knowledge about criminal injuries compensation in a rather haphazard manner. While almost sixty per cent of the officers surveyed learned of the programs through work, thirty-two per cent heard through the media, eight per cent through university or police college while the remaining one per cent became aware of criminal injuries compensation through the court system. Those officers working in a force with a victim assistance unit were significantly more likely to be aware of the necessity to suffer injury eligibility provision, (chi-square 4.89, p. < .05) yet even forty-two per cent of them were unaware of this eligibility factor.

Having examined the differences between the two police populations with respect to behaviour; that is, their role in making victims aware of criminal injuries compensation and having examined their knowledge of the programs, it is now

pertinent to turn to an examination of the attitudes that individual officers hold regarding criminal injuries compensation.

C: Attitude - How Do Police Officers Feel About Criminal Injuries Compensation ?

A comparison was made between the samples on their attitudes towards victim compensation by asking respondents whether they felt the programs provided adequate financial reimbursement. A chi square value of 5.09 (Table 6) indicates that there is a significant difference between the two samples. The responses of the officers without a victim assistance unit indicate that they have less regard for victim compensation than their urban counterparts. More officers from a force with a victim assistance unit than one would expect to see by chance indicated that they felt the programs were a good thing.

TABLE 6: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON COMPENSATION PROGRAMS PROVIDING ADEQUATE FINANCIAL REIMBURSEMENT

Attitude: Feel criminal injuries compensation programs provide adequate financial reimbursement

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	26	22	48
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	7	19	26
	33	41	74

Chi square (1) = 5.09, p. < .025

Respondents were also asked their opinion on which types of victims should be eligible for criminal injuries compensation. Specifically, the officers were asked whether they felt victims of assault, break and enter and sexual assault should

be eligible for victim compensation. There was no significant difference found between the two populations as regards the offence of assault (Table 7) or sexual assault. No chi square calculation for respondents' attitudes toward sexual assault victims receiving criminal injuries compensation was provided because the responses were so overwhelmingly positive for both populations that empty cells made the figure impossible to calculate.

TABLE 7: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER VICTIMS OF ASSAULT SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR COMPENSATION

Attitude: Eligibility of victims of assault
for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	41	23	64
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	19	10	29
	60	33	93

Chi square (1) = .02

For the offence of break and enter, however, there was a dramatic difference between the sample populations. The markedly significant chi square value of 6.39 (Table 8) indicates that urban police officers with a victim assistance unit were much more likely to be of the opinion that victims of break and enter should be eligible for compensation than their rural counterparts.

TABLE 8: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER VICTIMS OF BREAK AND ENTER SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR COMPENSATION

Attitude: Eligibility of victims of break and enter for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	30	30	60
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	6	22	28
	36	52	88

Chi square (1) = 6.39, p. < .025

Respondents were also asked how they felt about the provision in criminal injuries compensation programs which stipulates that victims must suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation (Table 9). On this question there was no observable difference between the urban and rural populations.

TABLE 9: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY FOR VICTIMS TO SUFFER INJURY TO COLLECT COMPENSATION

Attitude: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Police Department with a Victim Unit	25	38	63
Police Department w/o Victim Unit	10	18	28
	35	56	91

Chi square (1) = .42

Respondents' attitudes were probed further by asking them whose responsibility they felt it should be to inform victims of the existence of criminal injuries compensation schemes. All thirty-nine of the Ottawa Police officers responded by either circling all three alternatives; that is, the crown, the police and social service agencies or they responded by stating all of the above in the category marked 'other'. The Killaloe O.P.P. respondents had much more varied responses to this question: five officers answered the crown; six stated the police; two said social service agencies while four responded by indicating all of the above. These responses would seem to indicate that the Ottawa Police officers feel that there should be a much more coordinated effort to inform victims about compensation.

When asked specifically whose responsibility within the police department it should be to inform victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation, the Ottawa Police officers again had a much more consistent response. Thirty-eight of the thirty-nine Ottawa Police officers felt that all noted members of the department, namely, the patrol officer, the detective and the victim assistance unit, should play a role in informing victims. Only seven of the Killaloe O.P.P. respondents felt all listed members should play a role in informing, three felt it should be confined to a victim assistance unit, three felt it was the responsibility of the patrol officer while two felt that it was up to the investigating officer.

When police respondents from phase two of the research were asked who should inform victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation the Nepean Police officers also had a much more consistent response. Twenty-two of the twenty-eight Nepean Police officers either felt that the police should make victims aware or else noted that the crown, police and social service agencies

should share the responsibility of informing victims. The O.P.P. officers attached to the Renfrew detachment had much more varied responses. Five officers felt that it should be the responsibility of the crown to make victims aware of compensation benefits, four felt that responsibility should rest with social service agencies while only two officers felt that it should be the responsibility of individual police officers.

When asked specifically who within the police department should be responsible for informing victims of criminal injuries compensation, the results of phase two of the research contrast markedly with those obtained in phase one. While 97% of the Ottawa police officers felt all noted members of the department should share responsibility for informing victims, the Nepean Police Service respondents overwhelmingly (79%) felt that this responsibility should fall on the Victim assistance unit. Specifically, twenty-two of twenty-eight officers felt that the victim unit should make victims aware of compensation, three felt that responsibility should fall on the detective or investigating officer while a further three officers stated that all components of the police department should share responsibility.

In sum, officers from a force with a victim assistance unit were found to have more positive attitudes regarding criminal injuries compensation programming on some measures. Specifically, they were more likely to be of the opinion that further categories of victims, including victims of break and enter, should be eligible for compensation.

As well, victim assistance unit officers, particularly from the Ottawa Police Force were more likely to be of the view that all components of the criminal justice system, including the police, crown, and social service agencies should be

involved in a coordinated effort to ensure victims are made aware of criminal injuries compensation. Rural O.P.P. officers tended to report that it should be the designated responsibility of a particular body.

D: Experience

The relative experience that officers had with victims and the number of years experience that police officers had were examined to determine whether these factors had an impact on the findings. For example, it could be that the majority of Nepean Police Service respondents who feel that responsibility for informing should lie solely with the victim assistance unit are older officers used to law enforcement techniques, not victim servicing. However, the previous experience that officers had with victims and the number of years experience of the respondent were not found to be a factor in any of the behavioral, knowledge, or attitudinal measures.

Specifically, respondents were questioned regarding the number of victims they had personally dealt with in the three months prior to completion of the survey. In phase one it was found that the responses of the Ottawa Police officers ranged from zero to twenty-five. Eleven of the Ottawa Police respondents had no contact with any victims in the previous three months, nine had contact with three or less, seven had contact with between four and nine victims while eleven had contact with ten or more victims. Overall, the Killaloe O.P.P. respondents had much less contact with crime victims. Ten of the eighteen officers indicated that they had not dealt with any victims of violent crime in the preceding three months.

One respondent indicated that s/he had dealt with five crime victims while the remaining seven respondents had dealt with either one or two victims.

As well, in phase two of the research it became obvious that the Nepean Police Service respondents had considerably more recent experience with victims of violent crime than did the Renfrew O.P.P. officers. Four Nepean Police Service officers had contact with ten or more victims, six had contact with between four and nine victims, six had contact with three or less, while the remaining twelve Nepean Police Service officers indicated that they had had no contact with any victims in the previous three months. Seven of the twelve Renfrew O.P.P. officers had no contact with victims in the previous six months, two had dealt with between one and three victims while the remaining three had been in contact with four to six victims.

No chi square values were calculated using the previous experience with victims factor since having empty cells would make the figure meaningless. However, when interpreting the findings of this study, it is important to acknowledge the fact that, as a whole, the Ottawa and Nepean samples had significantly more experience dealing with victims of crime than did those officers in either Killaloe or Renfrew.

The number of years experience of the respondent was also considered for this study. In order to have meaningful numbers of respondents in each cell, respondents were separated into having either eleven or more years of experience or less than eleven years of experience. The responses of these two populations were examined on all behaviour, knowledge and attitude measures. In no instance was the number of years experience that an officer had found to be a factor in the

responses provided. A sample of some the findings broken down by age are found in Appendix B (Tables 9A, 9B, 10A, and 10B).

In sum, there were a number of differences found between the two populations on a number of behaviour, knowledge and attitude measures. The relative experience that officers had with victims and the years of experience of the officer did not have an impact on the findings. It is however, important to note that respondents from a force with a victim assistance unit did have much more experience dealing with victims than their rural counterparts without a victim unit.

Having found victim assistance unit respondents to differ from non victim assistance unit respondents on a number of behaviour, knowledge, and attitude measure it is now relevant to turn to an examination of the relationship between knowledge, attitude and behaviour.

Effect of Knowledge and Attitude on Behaviour

As noted in detail, this study found a number of differences in behaviour, knowledge and attitude measures between officers who were in a detachment with a victim assistance unit and those officers not having the benefit of such a unit. Therefore, as a next step, it is relevant to examine the effect, if any, that knowledge of criminal injuries compensation benefits and attitude towards the programs has on individual police behaviour. Specifically, do officers who have a better knowledge of the programs and who think that they are beneficial take steps to inform victims of their availability. A number of responses were examined more closely to determine whether this, in fact, was the case.

First, the officers' responses regarding the offence of break and enter were examined to see if there was a relationship between knowledge and attitude. A chi square value of 2.0 (Table 10) was calculated for this relationship indicating that there was no significant correlation between knowledge and attitude on the offence of break and enter. Those officers that knew that break and enter victims were not eligible for criminal injuries compensation did not necessarily feel that the program should be expanded to include this category of victim.

TABLE 10: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Knowledge: Are Victims of break and enter eligible for criminal injuries compensation ?

	YES	NO	TOTAL
<u>Attitude:</u> Should Victims of break & enter be eligible for criminal injuries compensation? YES	10	21	31
NO	8	36	44
	18	57	75

Chi square (1) = 2.0

The researcher also explored whether one's attitude regarding whether victims of break and enter should be eligible for compensation was related to behaviour. Here, the significant chi square value of 4.44 indicated that there was a notable difference between respondents who thought victims of break and enter should be eligible for compensation and those who did not. Those officers with a more positive view of the programs, represented by the view that the programs should be expanded to include break and enter victims were significantly more likely to make the effort to inform victims of compensation.

TABLE 11: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Attitude: Should Victims of break and enter be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

		ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Behaviour: Inform victims of the availability of compensation?	YES	21	19	40
	NO	10	25	35
		31	44	75

Chi square (1) = 4.44 p. < .05

The relationship between respondents' knowledge of the necessity to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation and their attitude towards the funding of compensation programs was also examined. The highly significant chi square value of 6.1 (Table 12) which was determined for this relationship, indicates that those with a better knowledge of the program's eligibility requirements were more likely to have a positive attitude towards compensation. These findings suggest that those officers with an awareness and knowledge of criminal injuries compensation programs are more likely to have a positive attitude towards the programs. Those officers familiar with compensation programs were markedly more likely to indicate that they felt the programs were doing a good job. They felt that they were providing needy victims with valuable and necessary funds.

TABLE 12: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

Attitude: Think criminal injuries compensation programs provide adequate financial reimbursement
YES
NO

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
YES	24	9	33
NO	19	24	43
	43	33	76

Chi square (1) = 6.10, p. < .025

On a related point, the study cross referenced whether those officers aware of the necessity to suffer injury provision felt that it was a valid or appropriate eligibility provision (Table 13). A greater majority of respondents aware of the necessity to suffer injury eligibility provision than one would expect to see by chance, indicated that victims should not have to suffer injury to be eligible for the program. Again, this finding suggests that those officers with a greater understanding and knowledge of the programs view them with higher regard. Those officers with an awareness of compensation programs feel they should be expanded to serve greater numbers of victims. Officers with a better knowledge of the programs feel the necessity to suffer injury limitation should be lifted.

TABLE 13: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
<u>Attitude:</u> Should it be necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation? YES	12	17	29
NO	35	18	53
	47	35	82

Chi square (1) = 4.54, p. < .05

Finally, respondents' attitudes towards this eligibility requirement were correlated with their informing victims of the availability of other community services for crime victims. This relationship was also found to have a highly significant chi square value of 4.67 (Table 14). This indicates that those respondents with a more positive attitude towards criminal injuries compensation, who feel the programs should be expanded are also more likely to refer victims to various community services available to them.

TABLE 14: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Attitude: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
<u>Behaviour:</u> Inform victims of the availability of community services available to them YES	17	43	60
NO	11	9	20
	28	52	80

Chi square (1) = 4.67, p. < .05

The findings of this survey are thought provoking. Officers working in a force with a victim assistance unit were more likely to inform victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation, were more likely to be aware of eligibility provisions and were more likely to be of the opinion that greater categories of victims should be eligible for criminal injuries compensation.

The study also found that both urban and rural respondents who felt that greater categories of victims should be compensated were also notably more likely to inform victims of compensation benefits. As well, those respondents aware of the provision requiring victims to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation were more likely to feel that this restriction is unnecessary. Further, those officers with a more positive view of the programs measured by the attitude the victims should not have to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation were more likely to indicate that they had informed victims of the availability of services in the community for victims.

While the officers in forces with a victim assistance unit responded more positively on a number of behaviour, knowledge and attitude measures the picture is far from rosy. Significant numbers of respondents were either unaware of eligibility provisions or were of the view that the programs were ineffective. A full 45% of respondents indicated that they had never made a victim aware of criminal injuries compensation. Only, 16% of victim assistance unit officers had ever provided a victim with a card or leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation. This can, in part, be attributed to the haphazard way in which police officers learn about criminal injuries compensation programs.

Given these findings, how do we proceed? How do we achieve the goal of having every eligible victim of crime informed of the availability of criminal injuries compensation? Clearly, we cannot disregard the current system just because it is not one hundred per cent effective - very little is. We must work towards responding to the gaps and deficiencies that were identified. We must work towards increasing the measures that have been effective.

This study suggests that more victim assistance units would, in part, be an appropriate means of improving victim awareness of criminal injuries compensation. While a legislated requirement for police officers to inform victims of compensation was found to have a positive short term impact on the number of claims received by the Alberta Compensation Board (Waller, 1982) increasing the knowledge and attitude of officers with respect to victim issues is likely to have a more positive long term impact.

We know that non-focused publicity measures are ineffective. Shapland et al (1985) note that the resources necessary for generalized publicity campaigns are great with very little effect. The target audience is not being reached. It is essential that the role of the individual police officer is emphasised as a means of enabling crime victims to access compensation benefits.

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion and Recommendations

The literature emphasizes that crime victims and the public, who are potential victims, are largely unaware of criminal injuries compensation programs. The data from this survey suggests that police officers are not doing a great deal to rectify the situation. Overall, in both phases of this study, more than four in ten (45%) police officers indicated that they had never informed a crime victim of the availability of compensation benefits. Less than one quarter (24%) had ever provided a crime victim with a card or leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation. These are significant results given that arguably the local police force is the most appropriate agency to inform victims about victim compensation since they are most likely to have the initial and continuing contact with the victim (Vaughn and Hofrichter, 1980, Muir, 1986, Task Force Report, 1983).

The ideal compensation system would ensure that every victim injured in a violent crime, who reported the crime to the police was made aware of criminal injuries compensation benefits. As well, the ideal system would ensure that the dependents of every murder victim were contacted soon after the victimization and informed of the availability of criminal injuries compensation. This ideal, it is clear, is far from being met. Compensation programs lack the resources to make such immediate and individualized contact following the reporting of a crime or to deal with massive new demand. The police, having such immediate and continuing contact with the victim, could be a vital link in moving towards this ideal.

Waller (1982) suggests that police officers could be requested to inform victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation. This could be done by simply requiring officers to provide victims with a card or leaflet outlining key information and telephone numbers. Further, Waller (1982) states that such an initiative would not be costly. "Changes in police procedures require only the printing of the card, modification of forms and the commitment to make it happen" (Waller, 1982:317). Clearly, such a system would go a long way towards ensuring that every eligible victim is made aware of criminal injuries compensation. However, the weak link in this proposal can be tied to the "commitment to make it happen". There must be commitment on the part of the individual police officer and this is far from being assured.

A number of states in the United States have a statutory requirement mandating the police to inform victims of the compensation program's existence and their potential rights to benefits (Vaughn and Hofrichter, 1980). This requirement is based on the view that since the police are the first criminal justice agent contacted by crime victims, they are in a unique position to tell them about compensation. Vaughn and Hofrichter (1980) note that those states instituting the statutory requirement to inform experienced a thirty per cent increase in claims in one year. Similarly, the Edmonton Police Force outreach program, which included a victim assistance unit and encouraged police officers to provide victims with a card with key telephone numbers, saw claims to the Alberta Compensation Board double in the first year of operation (Waller, 1982).

This clearly indicates that the role that the police play can have a significant impact on victims accessing criminal injuries compensation. It is

important to note, however, that the legislated requirement had only a short term impact on the number of claims received (Vaughn and Hofrichter, 1980). The commitment to make it happen was not long term. After initial support and enthusiasm for the task, individual police discretion impacted on victims being made aware of criminal injuries compensation benefits.

The commitment to make it happen, arguably, lies in the structure, goals and emphasis of individual police departments and in the actions or behaviour of individual police officers and on the probability it will make a difference to victims. With this in mind, and recognizing the importance of the police role in informing victims about the availability of compensation benefits, it may be enlightening to expand upon the key responses of the police officers. It is relevant to contrast the responses of officers from an urban site with a victim assistance unit to the responses of officers from a rural site without a victim assistance unit to examine its impact.

Police officers from Ottawa and Nepean were significantly more likely to inform victims of compensation benefits than were officers from either of the detachments without a victim assistance unit. However, very few of those Ottawa and Nepean police officers that indicated they informed victims about compensation provided them with any specific information. In phase one, only eleven of the total sample of fifty-seven police officers had provided victims with a card or leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation. In phase two just twelve of the total sample of forty police officers indicated that they had given victims a card or leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation. Making victims aware of

compensation and providing them with information, it would seem, is very much up to the discretion of the individual officer.

Very few victims receive any help because victims are not informed of the process by the police or other agencies (Waller, 1985). Informing victims of the availability of compensation remains a volatile issue among members of the criminal justice system. "At present there is no uniformity about the provision of information or even any agreement about which component of the system should hold that responsibility - in some cases the information is provided by police, in others by crown Attorneys; in many cases, no information is provided" (Report of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, 1988:23) Arguably, the widespread establishment of victim assistance units could be an effective means through which to help alleviate the volatility of the issue.

John Pullyblank's (1986) evaluation of the Edmonton Victim Police Service Unit involved the comparison of a treatment group of victims who were processed through the victim unit and a control group that were not. On all measures the control group; that is, the group exposed to services provided by the Edmonton Victim Services Unit, responded more favourably than the control group. For example, Pullyblank (1986) found that the treatment group had a higher ratio of needs met for emergency transportation to the hospital (100% versus 83%) and for case information (60% versus 40%).

Most pertinent to this study is the fact that those exposed to the Victim Service Unit had a much higher ratio of needs met regarding crime compensation information. In fact, fifty per cent of those accessing the Edmonton Victim Service Unit were made aware of criminal injuries compensation while no one in the control

group was made aware of compensation benefits. This is a dramatic finding since all other victim needs measured were, at least to some degree, available to the control group. All other services available to victims could, to varying degrees, be accessed by the victim without the assistance of the Victim Service Unit. Only the treatment group could state that they had been made aware of criminal injuries compensation.

When Pullyblank (1986) examined the commonalities between the treatment group and the control group in terms of unmet needs it became apparent that both groups were lacking crime prevention information, case information, practical advice, and most relevant to this study - crime compensation information.

Pullyblank (1986) also found that even though substantial need had been identified in the treatment group, less than one third of the group had been offered Victim Service Unit assistance at the time of the incident. In sum, Pullyblank (1986) argues that although police officers may be in an ideal position to refer victims to an assistance unit it is difficult to get their cooperation in the delivery of information. Similarly, even though police are in an ideal position to provide victims with a card or leaflet with information in criminal injuries compensation, in this study only twenty-four per cent indicated that they had.

With respect to referral to the victim assistance unit, however, the findings clearly indicate that both the Ottawa and Nepean police officers utilize the departmental victim assistance unit a great deal. All but one of the thirty-eight Ottawa Police officers who responded to the question on referral indicated that they had previously referred a victim to the unit. Similarly, twenty-seven of the twenty-

eight Nepean police officers had previously referred victims to their departmental victim assistance unit.

As well, when asked if they had assisted the crime victim in applying for compensation, many officers responded by indicating that they had referred the victim to the assistance unit. This suggests that officers do not really see it as part of their role to explain application procedures or specific eligibility requirements to victims. Officers see the provision of detailed information as a function of the victim assistance unit, but they appear to be willing to refer victims to the assistance unit. The findings from both phase one and phase two suggest that officers attached to forces with a victim assistance unit do refer victims to the unit on a regular basis.

Clearly, officers from a force with a victim assistance unit are willing to refer victims to the unit. As well, officers attached to a department with a victim assistance unit were more likely to inform victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation and they were also more informed on eligibility requirements. Ottawa and Nepean Police Service officers ($\chi^2(1) = 5.58, p. < .025$) were significantly more aware of the eligibility requirement which stipulates that victims must suffer injury in order to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation than their counterparts without a victim assistance unit in Killaloe and Renfrew. This is of particular importance given the possible relationship between knowledge, attitude and behaviour noted previously.

In the field of policing, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours are strongly influenced by an organization or police culture. Those persons having common backgrounds, experiences, and interests tend to develop similar beliefs and attitudes,

which in turn, will most likely impact on behaviour (Royberg and Kuykendall, 1990:114).

As regards police behaviour there are two major theoretical orientations. First, the predispositional theory suggests that the behaviour of a police officer is primarily explained by the characteristics, values, and attitudes that the officer had prior to being hired. Since the 1960s, however, the socialization theory has gained wide acceptance. The socialization process suggests that police officers are influenced more by their work experiences than by preemployment values and attitudes.

Just as a great deal of research suggests that problem police behaviour is more likely caused by the socialization process, rather than be the result of preemployment attitudes (Bennett and Greenstein 1975; Lundman 1980) so too could it be hypothesized that sensitivity to victim issues could be socialized into police officers through their environment.

To further explore the view that police behaviour can be linked to the socialization process this survey examined the relationship between the knowledge, attitude and behaviour of police officers. When the knowledge-attitude relationship was examined by looking at the offence of break and enter there was no significant correlation. Those officers with the knowledge that victims of break and enter are not eligible for compensation did not have attitudes strikingly different than those unaware that break and enter victims are not eligible.

There was, however, a correlation found between the officers' attitudes on whether victims of break and enter should be eligible and their behaviour - informing them of the availability of compensation. Those officers who felt that

victims of break and enter should be eligible for compensation were considerably more likely to indicate that they had informed victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation. This suggests that those officers who think positively about the programs and those officers who think the programs should be expanded to serve greater numbers of victims are more likely to take the opportunity to provide victims with information on the program.

Similarly, those officers with a knowledge of the eligibility provision which requires victims to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation, were much more likely to think that compensation programs do provide victims with adequate financial reimbursement. Those officers with no knowledge of this provision were more likely to view the programs negatively; that is, feel that they do not provide adequate reimbursement. This is an important finding since, as noted, the Ottawa and Nepean police officers were significantly more likely to be aware of the eligibility provision.

It is also notable that those officers with a knowledge of eligibility requirements were more likely to hold the attitude that victims should not have to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation. Further, those officers, being of the opinion that crime victims should not have to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation, were more likely to inform victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation.

Similarly, those officers with a positive attitude measured by having the view that crime victims should not have to suffer injury were also significantly more likely to inform victims of the availability of other relevant community services. These are all significant findings, given that it may be the victim

assistance unit which is a factor in producing a better knowledge of and attitude towards the programs which, in turn, impacts directly upon victims being made aware of compensation benefits and other community victim services.

In the past, police organizations have been criticized for their overreliance on the military model (Royberg and Kuykendall, 1990). That is, police organizations have been criticized for the overly traditional design of police jobs. Police organizations tend to emphasize a narrow perspective concerning the police role. However, to be fair, there have been a number of changes given recognition of the diverse role that police officers must now play. Police work now involves providing needed services, maintaining order, making referrals and providing temporary solutions to community problems (Royberg and Kuykendall, 1990).

The police role has changed such that it "requires a whole set of human relations and problem solving skills that can be applied to the wide range of complex situations which police confront daily" (Sandler and Mintz, 1974,:460). In the Ottawa Carleton area we have seen police departments recognize their changing role indicated most prominently by the name change from Ottawa Police Force and Nepean Police Force to the Ottawa Police Service and Nepean Police Service respectively.

While recognizing the need to change the role of the police officer there has also been an emphasis on the recruitment of more highly educated officers. Yet, "without changes in the function and working environment of the police, the potential contribution that these officers could make to policing has not been fully realized" (Royberg and Kuykendall, 1990). More disturbing, is the fact that the

very qualities anticipated from the more educated officers will be smothered within the traditional policing atmosphere.

The work environment of police officers must continually evolve around the goals you want to achieve from the police service. If, as this study proposes, you want to emphasize victim issues, it is absolutely critical for officers to have a knowledge of victim issues and to be understanding and sympathetic towards the plight of crime victims.

With this in mind, it is important to realize that a given attitude that a police officer may have is a quasi-open structure. It functions as part of a wider context (Jahoda and Warren, 1966). Being structured cognitively, it is necessary to understand attitudes within the organization of the wider system or scheme in which they are formed. Because an attitude is a semi-autonomous system, it is necessary to study its formation and change within the context of conditions directly relevant to it (Jahoda and Warren, 1966).

It is plausible that the variation between the two samples on behaviour - informing victims of the availability of compensation - is, in part, related to the presence of a victim assistance unit which provides police officers with a knowledge of the needs of victims and an awareness of programs available to respond to these needs. Just as Roberts and Grossman (1990) found that public participation in crime prevention methods is dependent largely upon both public knowledge of and attitudes towards the initiatives, so too could it be speculated that police participation in assisting victims to access criminal injuries compensation is dependent upon their knowledge of and attitude towards victim issues generally, and compensation programs specifically.

Jahoda and Warren (1966) stress that since attitude is a dependent part of a wider system, it is necessary to understand its place and function in the person's scheme of things, in their own setting. People look to the environment for the information that they need to form their attitudes. This information can be acquired from friends, the media or any number of varying sources (Gergen and Gergen, 1981). It is quite plausible that the information coming from an environment which includes a victim assistance unit contributes to the attitudes which police officers develop. " The actual environment and people's association to it can influence the success or failure of a message" (Gergen and Gergen, 1981:198).

It certainly must be recognized, however, that the presence of a victim assistance unit is only one explanation for differences found between the two populations of knowledge, attitude and behaviour measures. The fact that some officers come from a rural area while others are from an urban force could in itself cause differing responses. As well, it is possible that crime rates and the types of offences dealt with are very different in rural and urban areas. This could also result in differences in the knowledge, attitude, and behaviour of the populations studied. It is also plausible that rural police forces make greater use of informal referrals to victim service options in their communities.

While in some jurisdictions legislating police responsibility for informing victims of the availability of compensation was found to have a positive short term impact, measured by an increase in the number of applications received, the majority of the evidence suggests that most victims are still not being made aware of compensation programs. Zimbardo (1970) states that by changing underlying attitudes, more enduring changes in behaviour are likely to be produced than by

trying to directly change the behaviour in question. Therefore, the presence of a victim assistance unit through which individual officers could gain knowledge of criminal injuries compensation, and thereby a more positive attitude towards the programs, would likely be more effective in producing long lasting changes in behaviour than a legislated police mandate.

Recommendation 1: Widespread Implementation of Victim Assistance Units within Police Forces

The Ontario government has passed a landmark bill on police services which clarifies that police officers, police chiefs, and police review boards have a duty to provide victim assistance. One of the underlying principles of the Act notes "the importance of respect for victims of crime and understanding their needs" (Ontario Police Services Act, 1989).

One way in which to achieve these desired goals would be through the widespread implementation of victim assistance units. Such a proposal would not be costly. It would simply require that at least one person within each police detachment throughout the province be designated the "victim specialist". It would be the responsibility of this person to be up to date on programs and services available to victims in their community, including criminal injuries compensation. This individual would anchor the information base through which other police officers would be made aware of victim issues and of programs available to assist victims.

This study has shown that victim assistance units provide an information base for police officers to gain an awareness and understanding of services available to crime victims, including criminal injuries compensation. More importantly, to the extent the victim assistance unit can be credited for urban officers having a better knowledge of, and attitude towards, compensation programs it was impacting on their behaviour - making victims aware of the programs.

It is dangerous, however, to assume that a knowledge of attitudes is, in itself, predictive of behaviour in specific situations. The link between attitude and behaviour sometimes fails to occur (Bem, 1968). Yet, while it is easy to argue that behaviour is linked to many situational factors, the influence of attitude should not be dismissed.

It is also important to remember, particularly for this study, that self-reporting is grounded in self-perception. Accounts of behaviour may be accounts of how people think they should behave. People see themselves as they want to be in relation to others (Backstrom and Hursh-César, 1981). Therefore, it is necessary to look for consistency and patterns of relationships among reported behaviours in order to be confident that the behaviour described is actual. In both phase one and phase two of this study, those with more positive attitudes towards criminal injuries compensation programs reported consistently on the behavioral questions. Those respondents with more positive attitudes were more likely to inform victims of both the availability of compensation benefits and of the availability of other community services pertinent to victims of violent crime.

The findings suggest that those officers with more positive attitudes towards criminal injuries compensation programs are taking steps to inform victims

of their availability. To the extent that victim assistance units are providing police officers with a better knowledge of the programs and more positive attitudes towards the programs, which influences their decision to inform victims, it is a big step towards the ideal of ensuring that every eligible crime victim is made aware of criminal injuries compensation benefits.

Recommendation 2: Pro-Active Police Training on Victim Issues Including the Importance of Providing Victims with a Victim Assistance Unit Contact Card

The presence of a victim assistance unit was shown to have a positive impact measured by greater numbers of victim assistance unit officers informing victims of the availability of criminal injuries compensation. As well, the victim assistance unit population were found to be more knowledgeable of the programs and to feel that they were a positive means through which victims could seek redress. However, only 16% of victim assistance unit officers indicated that they had ever provided a victim with a card with information on victim services or criminal injuries compensation.

There must be active training to demonstrate to police officers the importance of their actions. Officers must be made aware that they are a vital link in victims accessing compensation. In addition to the general information disseminated from victim assistance units, there must be specific training exercises which stress to individual police officers the magnitude of their role in this matter.

An officer with many years experience handling complaints in a certain manner is not likely to change simply on someone else's advice. An officer must

be convinced in his/her own mind that the new behaviour holds some benefit over the old. The training that officers receive must stress that "the provision of victim services by police officers is part of the legitimate repertoire of policing activities (Muir, 1986:18). Brickey's (1983:12) interviews with police found many officers of the view that "[w]e are police, not social workers, but people want us to be social workers. We don't have the time to hang around and hold the victim's hand". Training should endeavour to eradicate the view that the provision of victim services is nuisance work that does not fall strictly within the realm of law enforcement activities. Training must stress that "victim care is a valid, integral part of police work" (Muir, 1986:68).

An individual officer making a traumatized victim aware of a victim assistance unit, as was found to be a common occurrence in this study, is likely to have little effect. The Police Services Act (1989) calls for the Solicitor General of the province "to develop and promote programs to enhance professional police practices, standards and training". Training that officers receive must include a sensitization to victim issues. Officers must understand that the traumatized victim is not likely to recall verbal reference to a victim services program. Later, when the victim attempts to access varying services available to him/her they may well have difficulty knowing where to turn.

Harris (1990) found that citizens who attempt to deal with the maze of social services by using the telephone directory face immense confusion. Specifically, Harris (1990) found that victims of spousal assault had tremendous difficulty anticipating the types of headings that might be meaningful places to look in a telephone directory.

If all victims were provided with a card with key contact numbers that they could refer to later, at their convenience, greater numbers of victims would be likely to access services available to them including criminal injuries compensation. The combined impact of a victim assistance unit and specialized training for police officers would go along way towards ensuring that greater numbers of victims have the opportunity to access victim services including criminal injuries compensation.

Recommendation 3: Standardized Police Policy/Practices Respecting the Treatment of Victims with Senior Management Support

Police policy must stress the importance of treating crime victims with respect. Police officers at all levels must understand that the provision of victim assistance is a regular and important part of their function as police officers. To ensure the success of such a policy, it must have the support of senior management (Muir, 1986). Therefore, criminal injuries compensation boards must deal directly with provincial police commissions and the Chiefs of Police to ensure that they are well informed about compensation benefits and that they support the police role of making victims aware of compensation programs.

There must be senior management commitment, persistence and effort to see it implemented. The commitment must be demonstrated and visible to those who receive the orders. Officers will know if the policy is mere lip service on the part of senior management.

Recommendation 4: Publicity Measures Must Be Directed At Individual Police Departments

Criminal Injuries Compensation Boards must work collaboratively with police forces and victims assistance units to ensure that all departments across the province are kept completely informed about compensation programs. Compensation Boards must direct their limited publicity resources to individual police departments which have the means through which to ensure that the vast majority of eligible victims are reached.

Shapland et al (1985) argue that since serious crime is quite infrequent only relatively few individuals will have an interest in publicity regarding compensation benefits prior to victimization. Therefore, the use of public advertising is likely to be expensive while the effectiveness will be small. There is a great difference between a general attempt at disseminating information to the general public and the effective provision of information to a needy, traumatized victim. This is a distinction that criminal injuries compensation boards do not seem to address with any degree of success.

If compensation boards were to channel their advertising budgets to individual police departments which were trained and sensitized to the needs of crime victims and the availability of criminal injuries compensation, greater numbers of victims would be provided the opportunity to access criminal injuries compensation. To direct publicity resources to the public at large rather than the target population is a waste of limited government resources.

The Report of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General on its Review of Sentencing, Conditional Release and Related Aspects of

Corrections (1988:245) recommended "that all participants in the criminal justice process give high priority to the provision of general and appropriate case specific information to victims and their families". The police and compensation boards, as two key components of the criminal justice process, should work in concert to ensure that victims are made aware of compensation benefits. In fact, the report recommended that "at a minimum, general information include the victim's right to seek compensation and restitution...(and that) basic information should identify who is responsible for providing it and where further information can be obtained" (Report, 1988:245).

In sum, if we are to reach the ideal of having every eligible victim informed of the availability of compensation benefits there indeed must be a commitment to make it happen. There must be commitment on the part of individual police departments and there must be cooperation from criminal injuries compensation boards. The findings suggest that officers from a police department with a victim assistance unit have better knowledge of the criminal injuries compensation programs; are of the attitude that the programs are a good thing; and are more likely to make victims aware of compensation programs. Yet, even many victim assistance unit officers were not informing victims of compensation benefits. Training must sensitize officers to the unique problems that crime victims face. Police procedures supported by senior management must stress the importance of victim assistance within policing activities. As well, compensation boards must lobby for increased resources. If we are successful in meeting the proposed recommendations there will be an increase in the compensation paid. The state would have to come up with additional resources in a time of fiscal restraint.

Therefore, compensation boards must use resources wisely. The resources spent on publicity should be directed towards individual police departments which have the means to ensure that large numbers of victims are reached.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Only very few eligible crime victims are accessing criminal injuries compensation benefits - largely because they are unaware of the existence of the programs. Estimates suggest that only one in fifty-five eligible victims actually access criminal injuries compensation programs (Waller, 1985). Measuring the number of awards granted against the number of crimes known to police it is apparent that many victims are not accessing criminal injuries compensation. In 1988-89 there were 2247 awards for criminal injuries compensation in the province of Ontario (Ministry of the Attorney General Ontario, 1990). In the same period there were 98,244 crimes of violence reported to police (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1990). These two measures suggest that during 1988-89 only 2.3% of eligible victims made use of compensation programs.

The small number of victims making use of compensation benefits is even more striking given that there are very few viable alternatives through which victims can obtain financial recompense. Civil suits are slow and expensive. Restitution programs through which victims receive benefits from the offender are ineffective as offenders are often unidentified, unapprehended, unconvicted or without sufficient assets. Criminal Code restitution and compensation provisions require that the victim be proactive in pursuing the measures. The problem with this option also stems from the fact that its very existence is not well known. More importantly, the indigent nature of many offenders impedes the ability of Criminal Code provisions to provide victims with any meaningful reimbursement.

Given that the alternatives through which victims may receive financial reimbursement, including civil suits, restitution, and Criminal Code provisions are ineffective, it is appropriate to look to other means through which greater numbers of victims could be enabled to access the compensation funds to which they are entitled. Accordingly, this study examined the role that individual police officers play in making victims aware of criminal injuries compensation since they are often the first criminal justice agent with whom crime victims come into contact.

Specifically, this study examined the behaviour, knowledge, and attitude of police officers in four police departments - two with a victim assistance unit and two without. It was hypothesized that officers working in a force with a victim assistance unit would be more sensitive to victim issues and the needs of victims. It was speculated that victim assistance unit officers would have a better knowledge of and attitude towards victim programs which would have an impact on their decision to make victims aware of compensation benefits.

Overall, the study found that officers from a department with a victim assistance unit had a better knowledge of compensation eligibility requirements including the necessity to suffer injury eligibility provision. Victim assistance unit officers were also found to have more positive attitudes towards compensation programs. They were more likely to be of the view that compensation programs assisted victims effectively and they were more likely to feel that the programs should be expanded to serve greater numbers of victims, including victims of break and enter. Finally, victim assistance unit officers had more positive behaviours. They were more likely to indicate that they had made victims aware of compensation benefits.

However, many respondents from a force with a victim assistance unit indicated that they had never made a victim aware of compensation benefits. In fact, very few victim assistance unit officers (16%) indicated that they had ever provided a victim with a card or leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation which is a publicity measure that all compensation boards boast of in their annual reports.

In sum, while the findings suggest that victim assistance units are beneficial to the extent that they can be attributed to officers responding more favourably on a number of behaviour, knowledge and attitude measures, there is still much room for improvement. Many victims are not being afforded the opportunity to access the criminal injuries compensation benefits to which they are entitled. Therefore, the study concludes with a number of recommendations aimed at enabling greater numbers of eligible victims to access the benefits to which they are entitled.

Given the finding that those officers from a department with a victim assistance unit had a better knowledge of eligibility provisions; were of the attitude that greater numbers of victims should be compensated; and were more likely to inform victims of the availability of compensation, this study recommends that victim assistance units should be expanded to all police departments. However, many victim assistance unit officers did indicate that they had never provided a victim with a card with information on criminal injuries compensation. Therefore, police officers should receive training to sensitize them to the problems that victims must endure. Training should include information about services available to victims including criminal injuries compensation. Officers must be shown by senior

management that providing assistance to victims, including information on compensation, is a critical part of the police role.

The study also recommends that criminal injuries compensation boards work more closely with police departments and victim assistance units to ensure that police are kept up to date on compensation provisions. More importantly, this study recommends that compensation boards direct their publicity budget towards individual police departments rather than the public at large. Resources apportioned to general publicity measures are wasted. Police departments, having regular and continuing contact with crime victims, have the means to ensure that the majority of eligible crime victims are made aware of the availability of criminal injuries compensation.

Clearly, the findings of this study are thought provoking. The literature suggests that the vast majority of eligible crime victims are not accessing criminal injuries compensation programs simply because they are unaware that the programs exist. The police, being the first criminal justice agent contacted by most crime victims could have a significant impact on victims being made aware of compensation benefits. The data from this study of police officers' behaviour, knowledge, and attitude suggest that officers from a victim assistance unit force have a better knowledge of compensation programs, are more likely to view the programs positively, and are more likely to take steps to ensure that victims are made aware of criminal injuries compensation. However, there is still a great deal of room for improvement. Through police training emphasizing the importance of victim assistance within policing activities, particularly the importance of providing victims with a victim assistance unit contact card, it is hoped that greater numbers

of victims will be made aware of compensation benefits. A closer more cooperative effort by criminal injuries compensation boards and police departments to work together would ensure that police officers are kept up to date on criminal injuries compensation programming. As well, a more united working relationship between these two criminal justice bodies would ensure that police officers are continually reminded of the critical role that they play in enabling crime victims to receive the compensation funds to which they are entitled.

Questionnaire

I am a student in the Master of Criminology program at the University of Ottawa. My thesis research is on criminal injuries compensation programs. The criminal justice system has in recent years begun to focus more attention on the needs of crime victims. I am examining how criminal injuries compensation schemes aid crime victims. Being the first official contracted by most crime victims, your insights are very important and it will take only a few minutes to complete. Please note that the questionnaire is anonymous. The information you provide below will be used in an individual student research project. Thank you for your time.

1. Number of years experience as a police officer. _____

2. Have you heard of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 - (a) Where did you first hear about criminal injuries compensation programs?

 - (b) Do you think criminal injuries compensation programs provide crime victims with adequate financial reimbursement?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. No opinion

3. How many victims of violent crimes have you personally dealt with in the past three months? _____

4. Have you ever informed a crime victim about the availability of criminal injuries compensation?
 1. Yes
 2. No

If yes, answer (a), (b) and (c).

(a) Did you give them a card or leaflet with information about the criminal injuries compensation program?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

(b) Did you give the victim any assistance in applying for compensation?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

(c) If yes, what type of assistance did you provide to the victim?

5. Which of the following types of victims are eligible for criminal injuries compensation under the Criminal Injuries Compensation programs and which, in your opinion, should be eligible?

		Eligible	Not Eligible
Victims of common assault	Under the program	()	()
	In your opinion	()	()
Victims of break and enter	Under the program	()	()
	In your opinion	()	()
Victims of sexual assault	Under the program	()	()
	In your opinion	()	()

6. Does a victim need to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation under the Criminal Injuries Compensation programs and, in your opinion, should they need to suffer injury to be eligible?

		Yes	No
Victims must suffer injury to be eligible	Under the program	()	()
	In your opinion	()	()

7. Whose responsibility should it be to inform victims of the existence of criminal injuries compensation schemes?

- 1. The Crown
- 2. The Police
- 3. Social Service Agencies
- 4. Other (please specify) _____

(a) If the police should inform victims of the existence of criminal injuries compensation programs, whose responsibility should it be specifically?

1. Patrol Officer
2. Detective/Investigating Officer
3. Victim assistance unit
4. All of the above

8. What agencies in your community provide assistance for crime victims?

(a) Have you ever referred a crime victim to one of these agencies?

1. Yes
2. No

9. Does your department have an individual or unit that is designated to assist crime victims?

1. Yes
2. No

(a) If yes, have you ever referred a victim to this individual or unit?

1. Yes
2. No

APPENDIX B**TABLE 1A: BEHAVIOUR MEASURE: POLICE ROLE IN INFORMING VICTIMS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF COMPENSATION**Behaviour: Inform Victims of the Availability of criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 26	13	39
	Fe 22.58	16.42	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 7	11	18
	Fe 10.42	7.58	
	33	24	57

Chi square (1) = 3.89, p < .05

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 1B: BEHAVIOUR MEASURE: POLICE ROLE IN INFORMING VICTIMS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF COMPENSATIONBehaviour: Inform Victims of the Availability of criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 14	13	27
	Fe 13.85	13.15	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 6	6	12
	Fe 6.15	5.85	
	20	19	39

Chi square (1) = .012 p < .05

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 2A: BEHAVIOUR MEASURE: POLICE ROLE IN PROVIDING VICTIMS WITH SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON COMPENSATION

Behaviour: Provide Victims with a card/ leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit			
Fo	5	34	39
Fe	7.53	31.47	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit			
Fo	6	12	18
Fe	3.47	14.53	
	11	46	57

Chi square (1) = 3.34, p < .10

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 2B: BEHAVIOUR MEASURE: POLICE ROLE IN PROVIDING VICTIMS WITH SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON COMPENSATION

Behaviour: Provide Victims with a card/ leaflet with information on criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit			
Fo	4	12	16
Fe	6.86	9.14	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit			
Fo	8	4	12
Fe	5.14	6.86	
	12	16	28

Chi square (1) = 4.92, p < .05

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 3A: KNOWLEDGE MEASURE: POLICE AWARENESS OF COMPENSATION PROVISIONS FOR ASSAULT VICTIMS

Knowledge: Eligibility of victims of assault for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBILITY	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 29	5	34
	Fe 29.33	4.67	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 15	2	17
	Fe 14.67	2.33	
	44	7	51

Chi square (1) = .08

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 3B: KNOWLEDGE MEASURE: POLICE AWARENESS OF COMPENSATION PROVISIONS FOR ASSAULT VICTIMS

Knowledge: Eligibility of victims of assault for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBILITY	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 11	5	16
	Fe 8.62	7.38	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 3	7	10
	Fe 5.38	4.62	
	14	12	26

Chi square (1) = 3.71, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 4A: KNOWLEDGE MEASURE: POLICE AWARENESS OF THE NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury
to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 24	13	37
	Fe 20.56	16.44	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 6	11	17
	Fe 9.44	7.56	
	30	24	54

Chi square (1) = 4.12, p < .05

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 4B: KNOWLEDGE MEASURE: POLICE AWARENESS OF THE NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury
to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 8	10	18
	Fe 7.07	10.93	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 3	7	10
	Fe 3.93	6.07	
	11	17	28

Chi square (1) = .56,

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 5A: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON COMPENSATION PROGRAMS PROVIDING ADEQUATE FINANCIAL REIMBURSEMENT

Attitude: Feel criminal injuries compensation programs provide adequate financial reimbursement

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 14	18	32
	Fe 11.33	20.67	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 3	13	16
	Fe 5.67	10.33	
	17	31	48

Chi square (1) = 2.92, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 5B: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON COMPENSATION PROGRAMS PROVIDING ADEQUATE FINANCIAL REIMBURSEMENT

Attitude: Feel criminal injuries compensation programs provide adequate financial reimbursement

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 12	4	16
	Fe 9.85	6.15	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 4	6	10
	Fe 6.15	3.85	
	16	10	26

Chi square (1) = 3.19, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 6A: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER VICTIMS OF ASSAULT SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR COMPENSATION

Attitude: Eligibility of victims of assault for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 26	13	39
	Fe 27.37	11.63	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 14	4	18
	Fe 12.63	5.37	
	40	17	57

Chi square (1) = .73

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 6B: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER VICTIMS OF ASSAULT SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR COMPENSATION

Attitude: Eligibility of victims of assault for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 15	10	25
	Fe 13.89	11.11	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 5	6	11
	Fe 6.11	4.89	
	20	16	36

Chi square (1) = .67

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 7A: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER VICTIMS OF BREAK AND ENTER SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR COMPENSATION

Attitude: Eligibility of victims of break and enter for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 17	18	35
	Fe 14.13	20.87	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 4	13	17
	Fe 6.87	10.13	
	21	31	52

Chi square (1) = 2.98, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 7B: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER VICTIMS OF BREAK AND ENTER SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR COMPENSATION

Attitude: Eligibility of victims of break and enter for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 13	12	25
	Fe 10.42		
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 2	9	11
	Fe 4.58		
	15	21	36

Chi square (1) = 3.59, P. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 8A: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY FOR VICTIMS TO SUFFER INJURY TO COLLECT COMPENSATION

Attitude: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 13	24	37
	Fe 12.33	24.67	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 5	12	17
	Fe 5.67	11.33	
	18	36	54

Chi square (1) = .18

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 8B: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY FOR VICTIMS TO SUFFER INJURY TO COLLECT COMPENSATION

Attitude: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 12	14	26
	Fe 11.95	14.05	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 5	6	11
	Fe 5.05	5.95	
	17	20	37

Chi square (1) = .0029

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 9A: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY FOR VICTIMS TO SUFFER INJURY TO COLLECT COMPENSATION

Attitude: Officers with less than 11 years experience regarding the necessity to suffer injury to collect compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 2	11	13
	Fe 2.83	10.17	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 3	7	10
	Fe 2.17	7.83	
	5	18	23

Chi square (1) = .72

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 9B: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY FOR VICTIMS TO SUFFER INJURY TO COLLECT COMPENSATION

Attitude: Officers with less than 11 years experience regarding the necessity to suffer injury to collect compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 3	8	11
	Fe 3.67	7.33	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 2	2	4
	Fe 1.33	2.67	
	5	10	15

Chi square (1) = .69

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 10A: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY FOR VICTIMS TO SUFFER INJURY TO COLLECT COMPENSATION

Attitude: Officers with more than 11 years experience regarding the necessity to suffer injury to collect compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Ottawa Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 11	13	24
	Fe 10.06	13.94	
Killaloe O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 2	5	7
	Fe 2.94	4.06	
	13	18	31

Chi square (1) = .67

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 10B: ATTITUDE MEASURE: POLICE VIEWS ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE NECESSARY FOR VICTIMS TO SUFFER INJURY TO COLLECT COMPENSATION

Attitude: Officers with more than 11 years experience regarding the necessity to suffer injury to collect compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Nepean Police with a Victim Unit	Fo 8	4	12
	Fe 7.06	4.94	
Renfrew O.P.P. w/o Victim Unit	Fo 2	3	5
	Fe 2.94	2.06	
	10	7	17

Chi square (1) = 1.04

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 11A: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Ottawa/Killaloe Sample

Knowledge: Are Victims of break and enter eligible for criminal injuries compensation

Attitude: Should Victims of break & enter be eligible for criminal injuries compensation? YES

NO

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Fo	8	12	20
Fe	5.17	14.29	
Fo	6	23	29
Fe	8.29	20.71	
	14	35	49

Chi square (1) = 2.17

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 11B: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Nepean/Renfrew Sample

Knowledge: Are Victims of break and enter eligible for criminal injuries compensation

Attitude: Should Victims of break & enter be eligible for criminal injuries compensation? YES

NO

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Fo	2	9	11
Fe	1.69	9.31	
Fo	2	13	15
Fe	2.31	12.69	
	4	22	26

Chi square (1) = .12

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 12A: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Ottawa/Killaloe Sample

Attitude: Should Victims of break and enter be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

		ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Behaviour: Inform victims of the availability of compensation?	YES	Fo 14	14	28
		Fe 11.43	16.57	
NO	Fo	6	15	21
	Fe	8.57	12.43	
		20	29	49

Chi square (1) = 2.28

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 12B: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Nepean/Renfrew Sample

Attitude: Should Victims of break and enter be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

		ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Behaviour: Inform victims of the availability of compensation?	YES	Fo 7	5	12
		Fe 5.08	6.92	
NO	Fo	4	10	14
	Fe	5.92	8.08	
		11	15	26

Chi square (1) = 2.43

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 13A: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Ottawa/Killaloe Sample

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	TOTAL
Attitude: Think criminal injuries compensation YES programs provide adequate financial reimbursement NO	Fo 12	5	17
	Fe 9.21	7.79	
	Fo 14	17	31
	Fe 16.79	14.21	
	26	22	48

Chi square (1) = 2.86, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 13B: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: BREAK AND ENTER ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

Nepean/Renfrew Sample

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Attitude: Think criminal injuries compensation YES programs provide adequate financial reimbursement NO	Fo 12	4	16
	Fe 9.71	6.29	
	Fo 5	7	12
	Fe 7.29	4.71	
	17	11	28

Chi square (1) = 3.2, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 14A: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Ottawa/Killaloe Sample

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation

		YES	NO	TOTAL
Attitude: Should it be necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation? YES	Fo	7	11	18
	Fe	10	8	
NO	Fo	23	13	36
	Fe	20	16	
		30	24	54

Chi square (1) = 3.04, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 14B: KNOWLEDGE/ATTITUDE RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Nepean/Renfrew Sample

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation

		YES	NO	TOTAL
Attitude: Should it be necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for compensation? YES	Fo	5	6	11
	Fe	6.68	4.32	
NO	Fo	12	5	17
	Fe	10.32	6.68	
		17	11	28

Chi square (1) = 4.50, p. < .05

Fo = Frequency observed
Fe = Frequency expected

TABLE 15A: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Ottawa/Killaloe Sample

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

		YES	NO	TOTAL
<u>Behaviour</u> : Inform victims of the availability of compensation	YES	Fo 7	24	31
		Fe 10.33	20.67	
NO	YES	Fo 11	12	23
		Fe 7.67	15.33	
		18	36	54

Chi square (1) = 3.78*, p. < .10

* very close to significance at 1% level

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 15B: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Nepean/Renfrew Sample

Knowledge: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

		YES	NO	TOTAL
<u>Behaviour</u> : Inform victims of the availability of compensation	YES	Fo 6	10	16
		Fe 6.29	9.71	
NO	YES	Fo 7	5	12
		Fe 4.71	7.29	
		11	17	28

Chi square (1) = 0.2

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 16A: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Ottawa/Killaloe Sample

Attitude: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

		YES	NO	TOTAL
Behaviour: Inform victims of the availability of community services available to them	YES	Fo 11 Fe 13.67	30 27.33	41
	NO	Fo 7 Fe 4.33	6 8.67	13
		18	36	54

Chi square (1) = 3.25, p. < .10

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

TABLE 16B: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR RELATIONSHIP: NECESSITY TO SUFFER INJURY ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Nepean/Renfrew Sample

Attitude: Necessary to suffer injury to be eligible for criminal injuries compensation

		YES	NO	TOTAL
Behaviour: Inform victims of the availability of community services available to them	YES	Fo 6 Fe 7.31	13 11.69	19
	NO	Fo 4 Fe 2.69	3 4.31	7
		10	16	26

Chi square (1) = 4.41, p. < .05

Fo = Frequency observed Fe = Frequency expected
--

REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. (1986) The Practice of Social Research 4th Ed., Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Backstrom, C. and Hursh-César, G. (1981) Survey Research 2nd Ed., Toronto, Ontario: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bailey, S. (1989) "Pennies from Heaven: The Ontario Criminal Injuries Compensation Board", Journal of Law and Social Policy, V, pp. 121-164.
- Bennett, R. R. and Greenstein, T., (1975) "The Police Personality", Journal of Police Science and Administration, 3, 439-445.
- Brickey, S. L. (1983) Winnipeg Victim/Witness Program: Planning Phase and Technical Report, Ottawa, Canada: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Brooks, J. (1975) "How Well Are Criminal Injury Compensation Programs Performing", Crime and Delinquency, XXI, 50-56.
- Burns, P. (1980) Criminal Injuries Compensation, Vancouver, British Columbia: Butterworth Company.
- Canada (1983) Justice For Victims of Crime, Ottawa, Ontario: Supply and Services Canada.
- Canada (1983) Criminal Injuries Compensation, Ottawa, Ontario: Supply and Services Canada.
- Canada (1986) Criminal Injuries Compensation, Ottawa, Ontario: Supply and Services Canada.
- Canada (1986) Criminal Injuries Compensation in Canada, Ottawa, Ontario: Supply and Services Canada.
- Canada (1988) Criminal Injuries Compensation in Canada, Ottawa, Ontario: Supply and Services Canada.
- Canada (1987) Victims and Corrections, Ottawa, Ontario: Solicitor General of Canada.

References (Cont'd)

- Canada (1985) Pocket Criminal Code, Agincourt, Ontario: The Carswell Company Limited.
- Canada (1990) "Criminal Victimization in Canada: The Findings of a Survey" Juristat, Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada.
- Chappell, D. and Sutton, P. (1974) "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Programs to Compensate the Victims of Crime" in Victimology: A New Focus, Toronto, Ontario: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Chen, C. and Herson, P. (1982) Information Seeking: Assessing and Anticipating User Needs, New York, N.Y.: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.
- Compensation For Victims of Crime Act, N.S., 1975.
- Compensation For Victims of Crime Act, R.S.O, 1980 c82, as am. S.O 1986 c.37 and c.64
- Criminal Law Review. (1983) Agincourt, Ontario: Carswell Co.
- Dickson, B. J. (1984) "The Forgotten Party - The Victim of Crime", U.B.C. Law Review, XVIII, 319-334.
- Doerner, W. (1978) "A Quasi-Experimental Analysis of Selected Canadian Victim Compensation Programs", Canadian Journal of Criminology, XX, 239-251.
- Doerner, W. and Silverman, S. (1981) "The Diffusion of Victim Compensation in Canada", Canadian Journal of Criminology, XXI, 75-82.
- Doob, L. W. (1971) Social Psychology: An Analysis of Human Behaviour, New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Edelhertz, H. and Geis, G. (1974) Public Compensation to Victims of Crime. New York, New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Elias, R. (1986) The Politics of Victimization. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

References (Cont'd)

- Elias, R. (1983) "The Symbolic Politics of Victim Compensation", Victimology, VIII, 213-224.
- Elias, R. (1983) Victims of the System. New Jersey: Transaction Books Inc.
- Enviro-nics Research Group Limited. (1987) Survey of Public Attitudes Toward Justice Issues in Canada. Ottawa, Ontario: Enviro-nics Research Group Limited.
- Faieta, M. (1989) "The Ontario Criminal Injuries Compensation Board: Applications by Victims of Spousal Assault", Advocate's Society Journal, VIII, 9-17
- Freedman, J. L. (1978) Social Psychology 3rd Ed. Toronto, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd.
- Feeney, T.G. (1968) "Compensation for Victims of Crime", Canadian Journal of Criminology, XX, 261-271
- Garofalo, J. and Sutton, P. (1977) Compensating Victims of Violent Crime: Potential Costs and Coverage of a National Program, Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.
- Gergen, K. J. and Gergen, M. M. (1981) Social Psychology, Toronto, Ontario: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Greenwald, A. (1968) Psychological Foundations of Attitudes, New York, New York: Academic Press.
- Harris, R. M. and Dewdney, P. (1991) Community Information Needs: The Case of Wife Assault, London, Ontario: School of Library and Information Science, University of Western Ontario.
- Hastings, R. (1983) A Theoretical Assessment of Criminal Injuries Compensation in Canada: Policy, Programs and Evaluation, Ottawa, Ontario: Supply and Services Canada.
- Jahoda, M. and Warren, N. (1966) Attitudes. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books Ltd.

References (Cont'd)

- Kocken, M. and Donohue, J.C. (1976) Information for the Community, Chicago, Ill: American Library Association.
- Lamborn, L. (1976) "Crime Victim Compensation: Theory and Practice in the Second Decade", Victimology, IV, 503-516.
- Lamborn, L. (1976) "Compensation for the Child Conceived in Rape", in Emilio C. Viano Victims and Society, Washington, D.C.: Visage Press, Inc.
- Lamborn, L. (1979) "Reparation for Victims of Crime: Developments and Direction in the Second Decade", Victimology, IV, 214-222.
- Libman, R. (1990) "Legislative Update - Bill C-89: Victim Fine Surcharges", Journal of Motor Vehicle Law, Toronto, Ontario: Carswell.
- Linden, A. (1977) "Restitution, Compensation for Victims of Crime and Canadian Criminal Law", Canadian Journal of Criminology, IXX, 3-49.
- Lundman, R.J. (1980) Police and Policing: An Introduction, New York, N.Y: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- McDonald, W. (1977) Assessing the Criminal: Compensation, Retribution and the Legal Process, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Co.
- Maguire, M. and Corbett, C. (1985) The Effects of Crime and the Work of Victim Support Schemes, Cambridge: Oxford University Press
- Marshall, D. (1971) "Compensation - New Atonement for Old Guilt", Canadian Bar Association Journal, II, 109-117
- Mieners, R. (1978) Victim Compensation. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath Company.
- Miers, D. (1983) "Compensation, Conceptions of Crime Victims", Victimology, VIII, 204-211
- Muir, J. (1986) A Model Victim Service Program for Police Officers, Ottawa, Canada: Solicitor General of Canada.

References (Cont'd)

- Murphy, R. (1984) "Compensation for Victims of Crime: Trends and Outlooks", Dalhousie Law Journal, VIII, 530-548.
- Nachmias, D. and Nachmias, C. (1981) Research Methods in the Social Sciences 2nd Ed., New York, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Ontario (1984) Consultation Report on Victims of Violent Crime, Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of the Attorney General.
- Ontario (1968) The First Report of the Law Enforcement Compensation Board, Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of the Attorney General.
- Ontario (1982) The Thirteenth Report of the Ontario Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of the Attorney General.
- Ontario (1984) The Fifteenth Report of the Ontario Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of the Attorney General.
- Ontario (1988) The Nineteenth Report of the Ontario Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of the Attorney General.
- Ottawa Citizen (1987) May 4
- Pullyblank, J. (1986) The Victim Services Unit of the Edmonton Police Department: An Evaluation, Ottawa, Ontario: Ministry of the Solicitor General.
- Ray, W. and Ravizza, R. (1985) Methods, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Roberts, J.V. and Grossman, M.G. (1990) "Crime Prevention and Public Opinion", Canadian Journal of Criminology, XXXII, 1, 75-90.
- Royberg, R.R. and Kuykendall, J. (1990) Police Organization and Management: Behaviour, Theory and Process, Belmont, California: Brooks Cole Publishing Co.
- Runyon, R. and Haber, A. (1984) Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics, New York, New York: Random House.

References (Cont'd)

- Shapland, J., et al. (1985) Victims in the Criminal Justice System, Hants, England: Gower Publishing Company.
- Sumner, C.J. (1987) "Victim Participation in the Criminal Justice System", Australia and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, XX, 195-217.
- van Dijk, J.M., Mayhew, P., Killias, M. (1990) Experiences of Crime Across the World: Key Findings of the 1989 International Crime Survey, Boston, Massachusetts: Kluwer Publishing Co.
- Vaughn, J. and Hofrichter, R. (1980) "Program Visibility in State Victim Compensation Programs," Victimology, V, 30-41.
- Voos, H. (1969) Information Needs in Urban Areas: A Summary of Research Methodology, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Waller, I. (1984) "Crime Victims Need Not be Orphans of Social Policy: Needs, Services and Reforms", Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, 302-322.
- Waller, I. (1984) "Victims", Ottawa Law Review, XVI, 444-454
- Waller, I. (1985) "Victims v. Regina v. Wrongdoer: Justice?" Canadian Community Law Journal, VIII, 1-20.
- Zagaris, B. (1978) "Victim Compensation in Finland," Victimology, II, 102-105.
- Zimbardo, P. and Ebbesen, E. B. (1970) Influencing Attitudes and changing Behaviour, Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.