

67583

X
CRIME VICTIM CRISIS CENTERS

-Research Report

March 1, 1979
✓
Research Unit
Minnesota Department of
Corrections

67583
ACA

67583

MINNESOTA CRIME VICTIM CRISIS CENTERS 1977-1978

Purpose

The evaluation of the Crime Victim Crisis Centers was designed in accordance with the directions set forth in the legislation. The evaluation design was to measure:

- The impact of the three Centers in assisting Crime Victims;
- The impact of the Centers on the criminal justice system;
- The nature of community attitudes generated by the Center and;
- The necessity for maintaining the three existing Centers and the desirability of establishing additional centers.

Methodology

The data presented below were gathered by four separate processes:

- 1) Client and Service Information - Information on the types of clients served and the nature of the services delivered was recorded by Center staff as a routine function of service delivery. When services are completed in an individual case, the information is transferred to prepared coding sheets by staff trained in the use of the forms. The coding sheets are examined by a Department of Corrections researcher for incorrect or missing data and added to a computerized file;
- 2) Client Satisfaction - The judgment of the clients as to the quality of service received was solicited by a questionnaire mailed to each client who received a significant amount of service. These questionnaires are returned to the Centers, coded and submitted to the Department as described above;
- 3) Police Opinion - The judgments of police patrol officers as to the effect of the Centers on their work and the general quality of the Centers' services was solicited by a mailed questionnaire

to be completed by each uniformed officer in the Minneapolis Fifth and Sixth Precincts, St. Paul's Section B Team Four (B-4 Team), the Austin City Police and the Mower County Sheriff's Department. The questionnaires were anonymous and returned directly to the Department of Corrections.

- 4) Community Need - Potential needs in the community for the types of services offered by the Centers were measured by telephone interviews with a group of crime victims from the Centers' target communities. The respondents' identities were obtained by a random selection of persons who reported crimes which were committed one to three months before the opening of the Crime Victim Crisis Center in that community. Victims of crimes not reported to the police were, of course, not interviewed.

IA) The Impact of Victims of Crime

Legislated Goal - To provide services (crisis intervention, transportation, advice and referral, among others) to victims of crime, not restricted as to nature of crime, (M.S. 241.55-58, 1977);

Programs' Objectives - To service as described above 1,000 victims of crime in the first year at each urban Center and 1,200 victims of crime in the first year at Mower County. Service delivery was to be concentrated in the communities and neighborhoods defined as primary service delivery areas. (Project proposals from Correctional Services of Minnesota and Mower County, July, 1977.)

- Numbers of Victims Served

The time period for which client data were gathered starts with the official opening of each Center and ends for all Centers on October 15, 1978. Thus only two of the Centers have data for a complete year.

The approximately periods of data collection for each Center are:

Minneapolis - 12½ months, St. Paul - 10 months and Mower County - 12 months. Data are reported below only on cases which were terminated as of October 15; thus a very small number of clients and service deliveries during this time period are not reported.

The data show that as of October 15, 1978 the three Centers contacted or attempted to contact 2758 victims of crime. Services of at least five minutes duration were delivered to 2105 (76%) of these crime victims. It should be noted that some contacts with victims of crime not resulted in service or resulting in only very minor service delivery were not recorded consistently at the Minneapolis Center until the Spring of 1978. Therefore these figures are to an unknown extent underestimates of actual victim impact.

The data show that:

--Between October 3, 1977 and October 15, 1978, the Minneapolis

Crime Victim Crisis Center recorded contact or attempted contact 1566 victims of crime; 1014 (65%) of whom received some form of service from the Center.

--Between December 15, 1977 and October 15, 1978 (10 months) the

St. Paul Center was in contact with or attempted contact with 1044 victims of crime; 945 (91%) of whom received some form of service; and

--Between October 15, 1977 and October 15, 1978 the Mower County

Center was in contact with 148 victims of crime; 146 (99%) of whom received some form of service.

The average numbers of new clients per day of program operation are as follows (The "start-up" period is defined as October 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978):

- Minneapolis - 1.3 new clients per day during the start up period;
3.9 new clients per day subsequently.
- St. Paul - 2.5 new clients per day in the start-up period;
3.4 new clients per day subsequently.
- Mower County - 0.3 new clients per day in the start-up period;
0.9 new clients per day subsequently.

- Types of Victimization

Table I describes the types of crimes committed against only those clients who received some form of service from the Centers. The Table contains information on the most serious crime committed against each client; totals are displayed by each Center individually as well as the aggregate of all three Centers.

TABLE 1: Most Serious Offense Committed Against Clients

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Homicide (Client is Surviving Spouse)	2	0	0	-	0	-	2	0
Assault	224	22	179	19	21	14	424	20
Sexual Assault (Includes Rape)	37	4	28	3	20	14	85	4
Robbery	74	7	51	5	0	-	125	6
Purse Snatch	73	7	38	4	2	1	113	5
Battered Spouse	21	2	16	2	55	38	92	4
Child Abuse	1	-	2	0	26	18	29	1
Burglary/Break-In	467	46	423	45	2	1	892	42
Other Property Crimes	43	4	86	9	2	1	131	6
Other Crimes*	20	2	63	7	9	6	92	4
Client not Victim of Crime**	52	5	56	6	9	6	117	6
Witness to Crime	0	-	3	3	0	-	3	-
Totals	1,014	100	945	100	146	100	2,105	100

*Includes: Terroristic Threats, Kidnapping, Extortion, Telephone Harassment, Personal Harassment, Incest

**Includes: Medical Emergencies, Suicides, Legal Needs, Social Service Needs, Crime Prevention, Missing Persons

Note: In this and all subsequent tables, percentage sums do not necessarily total precisely 100% due to rounding error.

Table I shows that the most common types of victimizations dealt with by the Centers are burglaries (42%) and non-sexual assaults (20%). It should be noted that the experience of the Mower County Center differs markedly from that of the two urban Centers in that its most common victimizations are battered spouse (38%), child abuse (18%), assault (14%) and sexual assault (14%).

At the Twin Cities Centers, population of victims of property crimes (52%) exceeded violent crime victims (42%) and clients not victimized by crime (6%). The Mower County Center, however, has seen primarily victims of crimes against the persons (91%) as opposed to victims of property crime (3%) and those not victimized by crime (6%). (Non-crime victims who were referred to the Center or asked for help with problems such as suicide attempts, lost senior citizen identification cards or emotional problems.)

Residence of Clients

Most clients (72%) served by the Centers reside in the communities or neighborhoods defined by the Centers as areas of primary service delivery. In addition, certain neighborhoods of specific interest within these larger neighborhoods were defined as "Saturation Areas" for purposes of education and publicity. A high proportion of clients served reside in these saturation areas.

- Clients receiving services from the Minneapolis Center's who live in the "Saturation Area" or Powderhorn Neighborhood represent 21% of the total victims served. Clients residing in the Minneapolis Fifth and Sixth Police precincts, including the Powderhorn Neighborhood, represent 81% of clients served;
- St. Paul Center clients residing in the West Seventh Street neighborhood (the "Saturation Area") represent 21% of its clientele.

The B-4 Police Team area, inclusive of the West Seventh Neighborhood, is represented by 61% of the clients served;

- The county seat of Mower County-Austin-contributed 70% of the victims served by that Center. The total proportion from all of Mower County is 90%.

Services Provided

Table 2 summarizes the primary services delivered by the three Centers in this time period.

TABLE 2 Primary Service Delivery by Center

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Crisis Intervention	50	5	61	7	42	29	153	7
Emergency Building Repair	54	5	9	1	1	1	64	3
Other Emergency Help	40	4	13	1	5	3	58	3
Counseling (one-half hour or more)	43	4	122	13	36	25	201	19
Referral Only	18	2	16	2	10	7	44	2
Court-Related Victim-Witness Assistance	18	2	21	2	3	2	42	2
Catharsis/Counseling (less than 30 minutes)	272	27	223	24	23	16	518	15
Crime Prevention: Information	302	30	317	34	2	1	621	30
Community Organizing	0	0	9	1	0	0	9	0
Other Information	201	20	138	15	23	16	362	17
Other Services	16	2	16	2	1	1	33	2
Totals	1014	100	945	100	146	100	2105	100

Table 2 describes services in terms of the primary, most important or most characteristic service, delivered to each client. Thus, a client experiencing both crisis intervention and subsequent counseling would be tallied only as a "crisis intervention" case in this table. Generally speaking, in the table each category of service may have been followed by service categories listed below it but not vice versa. The table shows:

-- Relatively few clients, 275 or 13%, received services which could be described as crisis intervention or emergency services;

most of the non-emergency clients received services of an informational or advisory character. The proportion of crisis-oriented cases (cases involving crisis intervention, emergency repair or emergency transportation) at the two urban Centers is 12%, 14% in Minneapolis, 9% in St. Paul.

--The proportion of crisis-oriented cases at the Mower County Center is 33%. This is due to the higher proportion of violent victimizations suffered by its clients relative to the two urban Centers.

--The number of cases characterized by victim/witness (court related) services is 42 or 2%.

--Counseling and referral activities characterize 36% of the cases.

The dispensing of information or advice, particularly crime prevention advice represents 33% of the cases at the urban Centers. The St. Paul Center, in addition to other activities, organized 18 block watch crime prevention organizations involving 202 people.

--One hundred one people were helped in filing for Crime Victims Reparations payments; 96 at the urban Centers, 5 at Mower County.

- A type of service described as "catharsis" (counseling activities of moral support or a sympathetic ear generally of less than one-half hour duration) describes 15% of the victims served by all Centers but only very few of the Mower County cases;

- Information requests pertaining to a specific victimization characterize 17% of the cases;
- Crime Prevention advice, information or assistance (including Block Watch community organizing) represent the extent of service to 30% of the victims (and some non-victims) served;

Because many clients received more than one type of service, many services of interest are not shown in Table 2. Other data show:

- Crisis intervention was received by 153 people;
- Emergency building repair was performed for 74 people;
- Eighty-two people were helped with emergency transportation;
- Five hundred twenty-five specific referrals were made to various other agencies for 391 persons;
- Victim/Witness services were received by 147 people - 59 in Minneapolis, 68 in St. Paul and 20 in Mower County;
- Help with offender restitution was received by 36 persons while help in dealing with insurance companies were received by 12 persons;
- Crime prevention advice was given to 666 persons from the two urban Centers.

As true with most other variables, the major differences among centers occur between the two urban centers and the Mower County center. The latter has a higher proportion of cases characterized as crisis intervention or counseling and virtually no cases which deal only with minor types of services, such as crime prevention information or "counseling catharsis". Thus, the Mower County Center seems to deal with proportionately more serious types of situations and proportionately more intense interventions, as shown in Table 2. Other differences between the two urban centers and the Mower County Center are in various case dynamics such as number of contacts with each client,

time from victimization to contact with the Center and length of time spent in service delivery with each client.

- The median amount of time between the crime and initial contact with each center is 2.7 days; thus half of the clients for whom the date of crime is known talk to center staff within three days after the victimization. The two urban centers differ little from the overall figure but the Mower County Center has a much lower median lag from crime to service (1.0 days). This may be due to the proportionately higher amount of emergency type services rendered by this particular Center.
- The medium number of actual contact with clients is 1.2 across all centers as well as for each urban Center, but 2.2 for Mower County.
- The median amount of time spent in actual service delivery is 20 minutes for the urban centers but two hours for the rural center.
- The duration of active contact with the client averaged one-half day overall but over 26 days at Mower County.

For the most part services can be described as short-term, however Mower County has a much higher proportion of longer term cases. Further, the interaction with clients may be described as more intense at the Mower County Center. This is probably due to the greater proportion of violent crime victims seen and emergency services delivered.

The Quality of Service

Each person receiving service from the Centers is asked to complete a short questionnaire concerning their perceptions of the quality and usefulness of the service he or she received.

Scores were derived by summarizing the values of the positive or negative responses given to each item in the questionnaire. Scores may range from -14.00 to +14.00; -14.00 would be a totally negative evaluation, +14.00 a totally positive evaluation, and 0 indicating either a lack of subjective evaluation or one balancing positive and negative response.

A total of 479 usable evaluations were received. Of these, 166 were from clients of the Minneapolis Center, 274 were from clients of the St. Paul Center, and 39 were from clients of the Mower County Center. The response rate of the questionnaires actually mailed is approximately 40% (37% in Minneapolis, 48% in St. Paul, and 43% in Mower County). It must be noted that there was some confusion at the Minneapolis Center concerning when evaluation forms were to be mailed during the summer of 1978; this confusion has been subsequently eliminated but several clients for whom an evaluation was appropriate did not have the opportunity to fill out an evaluation form. Further, most clients receiving substantial amounts of service filled out evaluation forms, whereas clients receiving minimal service tended to ignore these forms. In addition, the proper mailing addresses, indeed the actual identities, of many clients were unknown and thus the mailing of service evaluations was impossible. Finally, in a very few number of cases, no forms were mailed out because of a judgment that such mailing would be harmful to the interests of the client; these cases were usually cases of sexual assault or battered spouse. (In the case of child abuse, service evaluations in Mower County were filled out by the agency referring the case to the Crime Victim Crisis Center.)

- Very few evaluations were more negative than positive - only 11 out of 479 cases (1%) were negative - and only 17 (4%) were neutral. Of the positive evaluations, nearly nine out of ten (87%) ranged from +10 to +14 (a very high score).
- The mean score for the entire population is 10.83 (based on 472 usable evaluations). The mean score for Minneapolis is 9.43; the mean score for St. Paul is 11.61, and the mean score for Mower County is 11.15.

Analysis of the evaluations by type of victimization was done by computing the arithmetic mean summary score for each type of crime broken down by Center. The data show

- Evaluations for services to victims of robbery (11.76), purse snatching (11.68), and burglary (11.18) are the highest evaluations.
- Evaluations from victims of thefts and vandalism (9.74), assaults (other than sexual or spouse abuse) (10.12), and persons not victims of crime (9.52) are the lowest evaluations. However, there is a wide variation among centers on mean evaluation for assaults; at Minneapolis the mean is 8.78 but at St. Paul and Mower County the means for assault are much higher (11.00 and 12.40 respectively). Apparently, some assault victims rated the service from the Minneapolis Center lower than did assault victims at the other two Centers.

The conventional distinction between crimes against the person and property crimes does not seem to differentiate high mean scores from low mean scores as the overall mean for all property crimes (10.96) is only

slightly different from that of crimes against the person (10.77); however, both are substantially higher than the mean for all other presenting problems (9.94).

The data imply that victimizations of involuntary personal confrontation or invasion of personal residence are associated with much higher evaluations of Center performance than are crimes of theft and problems not caused by crime. Perhaps even the wide differences among evaluations made by assault victims may be attributed to the difference between mutual combat types of assault (fights) and involuntary attacks; the data tend to support such inference. Thus one might conclude that victimizations characterized by "invasions of personal sphere or personal space" are associated with more satisfactory outcomes or outcomes judged to be more helpful, than are impersonal crimes or problems not resulting from crime.

Further analysis of client evaluations is displayed in Table 3 which shows the mean evaluation scores for each type of primary service delivery broken down by institution.

TABLE 3: Client Satisfaction by Type of Service

<u>Primary Service Delivered</u>	<u>Mean Satisfaction Score</u>			
	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Crisis Intervention	11.88 (N=17)	11.67 (N=24)	11.06 (N=17)	11.55 (N=58)
Building Repair	11.56 (N=27)	12.33 (N=3)	14.00 (N=1)	11.71 (N=31)
Other Emergency Service	6.11 (N=9)	12.00 (N=1)	---	6.70 (N=10)
Counseling	8.47 (N=15)	11.17 (N=53)	11.29 (N=14)	10.70 (N=82)
Referral Only	10.33 (N=3)	11.67 (N=3)	8.00 (N=1)	10.57 (N=7)
Court-Related Victim/Witness	5.50 (N=2)	13.13 (N=8)	---	11.60 (N=10)
Listening/Catharsis	7.33 (N=15)	12.05 (N=58)	9.00 (N=2)	11.03 (N=75)
Crime Prevention Information	9.54 (N=37)	11.65 (N=84)	---	11.01 (N=121)
Other Services	8.69 (N=35)	10.91 (N=34)	12.33 (N=3)	9.89 (N=72)
Total Mean Score	9.41 (N=160)	11.60 (N=268)	11.13 (N=38)	10.81 (N=466)

Table 3 shows that with the exception of the category described as "other emergency service", crisis oriented services rate more highly than less immediate services. Note also that court related victim/witness services rate higher than average, as do services of a much briefer and less intense nature, such as listening/catharsis or the delivery of crime prevention information. Activities such as counseling and referral, the more traditional social service activities, rate at or below average while the category "other services", including the delivery of other types of information, helping with filling out forms for crime victim reparations, and other miscellaneous activities, is far below average.

If the intensity of personal confrontation of type of victimization is a factor in the client evaluation scores received, it would seem reasonable to assume that the degree or intensity of services delivered would also relate to client satisfaction. However, when service delivery was grouped into three levels of intensity of service (based on nature of service as well as time in personal contact with the client), the most intense services - the crisis oriented services - resulted in higher satisfaction scores only at the Minneapolis Center.

Apparently it is the nature of the presenting problem rather than the degree or intensity of involvement with the client that contributes to a positive client satisfaction score. This suggests that the Crime Victim Crisis Center model or techniques work better with victims of certain types of crimes (notably robbery, sex-related offenses, and burglaries) than with others (mutual combat assaults, and minor property crimes) and work relatively poorly for people who are not victims of crime.

The questionnaires were also analyzed on an item by item basis. Each question measured an individual component of Center performance. The results are contained in Table 4.

TABLE 4: Client Opinion about Center Performance*

<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Understanding	2.80 (N=157)	2.89 (N=270)	2.97 (N=39)	2.86 (N=466)
Promptness	2.68 (N=98)	2.91 (N=67)	2.85 (N=39)	2.79 (N=204)
Helpfulness	2.35 (N=153)	2.52 (N=247)	2.82 (N=38)	2.49 (N=438)
Quality of Referrals	1.65 (N=40)	2.31 (N=51)	2.53 (N=15)	2.09 (N=106)
Timeliness	1.83 (N=86)	2.06 (N=66)	1.65 (N=34)	1.88 (N=186)

* 0 - very poor, 3 = very good

Mean scores for each item could range from 0 (very poor) to 3.00 (very good). The results show that overall Centers received highest marks for their "understanding" of the clients' problems and their "promptness" in dealing with the clients' problems after the victimization. The Centers also receive relatively high marks in their "helpfulness" to the client; but this apparently does not extend to the quality of the outside agency referrals made by the Centers as the satisfaction with outside referrals rates at a mediocre level. Often the lag between the victimization and the initiation of contact with the Centers is fairly great; this may explain the relative dissatisfaction with the "timeliness" of Center help. Apparently the greater the distance in time between the crime and the assistance, the less likelihood there is of client satisfaction. This seems reasonable when one relates this finding to the finding that emergency or immediate type services receive the highest marks of any given by the Centers.

It is interesting to note that the dimensions rated the lowest among the five (timeliness of assistance and satisfaction of outside referrals) are the dimensions least under the control of the three Crime Victim Crisis Centers. Further, the scores for these dimensions derived after only six months of Center operation indicated that the satisfaction with outside referrals was the lowest rated dimension of Center performance, whereas after six months of continued operation, this score has increased considerably. Apparently Center staff has better familiarized themselves with the agency resources available and the quality of referrals has increased.

The three individual Centers differ little in their "understanding" of the problems and their "promptness" in rendering assistance. Note, though, that the ratings for helpfulness do vary more amongst Centers with the Mower County Center rated as the highest (2.82), St. Paul Center being somewhat behind (2.52)

and the Minneapolis Center being rated still lower (2.35). Perhaps the Mower County experience in dealing primarily with victims of crimes noted above as the most prone to high satisfaction scores is associated with this higher score. Note also that the quality of outside referrals available to Mower County seems to be higher (2.53) than the quality of outside referrals available to St. Paul (2.31), while both Centers seem to have a considerable advantage over the Minneapolis Center with quality of outside referrals rated as 1.65.

The final questionnaire responses to be analyzed are to the question, "If one of your friends or family became a victim of crime, would you want the Crime Victim Crisis Center to help him or her?"

Overall 434 (91%) of the 479 respondents said "yes"; 11 (2%) stated they would not recommend the Centers and 34 persons (7%) did not answer.

Clearly, the overwhelming majority of people experiencing Crime Victim Crisis Centers' services feel they are worthwhile enough to recommend to other people, regardless of their own satisfaction with the services.

Comments made by Crime Victims

Respondents were also asked to comment freely on the quality of service and to make suggestions as to how the Centers could improve their services.

- Many people from each Center gave very positive words of thanks.

Some comments are as follows:

"Without the help of the Victims Center, I know things would have been alot different and I wouldn't have been in the frame of mind I'm in now. I couldn't possibly put in words how much I do appreciate all the help I did receive and still am receiving. Thank you."

"I am so grateful. Could not have gotten through this terrible experience and inner turmoil without your peoples' help. They cared."

- Several respondents commended individual Center staff by name. For example:

"Words could never say how helpful (name of staff person) was to me. She stayed until I could get ahold of myself. Just to think that with a phone call someone was there to help me and stay with me as long as they were needed. But all I can say is Thank you very much and God Bless You All, and keep up the great help that is needed very much."

- Few people had specific complaints about the quality of service; one person simply stated the program is "a waste of the taxpayer's money".

Impacts on Populations of Special Interest

Although not mandated by legislation, program objectives address specific intent to meet the needs of certain groups of crime victims. These groups include persons of minority race, the elderly, and women.

- Overall, most clients receiving service were white (88% of whom race was known) and female (63% of individual clients). The Mower County Center had even higher proportions of whites (93%) and women (83%);
- Of those for whom age was known, 16% were 20 years old or less, 33% were aged 21-30, 21% were aged 31-45, 17% were 41-65 years old and 25% were 65 years of age or older;
- The largest single group of Crime Victim Crisis Center clients consists of white women between the ages of 21 and 30; such persons represent 16% of the clientele but only 6% of the population.

Race

Both the Minneapolis and St. Paul Centers have seen considerable numbers of persons of minority races. Blacks, Native Americans, and Chicanos account for 131 (13% of the Minneapolis caseload; 52 (6%) of the St. Paul caseload, and account for 188 or 8% of all clients seen by all three Centers. Data on

racial background is of particular importance in the description of social service activities because it is often the most valid indicator of social class and sub-cultural membership within the areas serviced by each Center. The results of the Bureau of Census Criminal Victimization Studies in 22 American major cities indicates that persons of minority race are more often victimized than persons of white race.* Further, the literature also asserts that persons of minority races when victims of crime are under-served by the criminal justice system more than persons of white race.

To check on the success or failure of the urban Crime Victim Crisis Centers in servicing the minority communities, an analysis was made of the minority population proportions in the communities chosen by each Center as their primary service or saturation areas. These findings obtained from the Bureau of Census Reports, were compared to the racial backgrounds of clients serviced by the Centers who lived in those same neighborhoods. These data show that:

--In the Minneapolis "saturation area" 20% of the people are described as Black and 23% of the Center's clientele from the same neighborhood is Black. Other minority races (principally Native American) represent 2% of the population and 6% of the Center's clientele fits that description.

--In the St. Paul "saturation area" only 1% of the population is described as of minority race; the proportion of area residents serviced by the Center who are of minority race is 5%.

--Clients of minority race are less positive in their evaluations (mean score 9.39) than are Whites (11.05). However, only 33 minority persons responded to the questionnaire so the implications of these results are unclear.

* This was not found to be true in Minneapolis.

The results seem to be consistent with an interpretation that the urban Centers are paying special attention to crime victims of minority race.

The Elderly

Although those aged 65 years or older are reported to have the lowest rate of crime victimization, the elderly have been clientele of the Centers' in roughly the same proportions that they represent in the population. Clearly, elderly victims of crime are served in proportions higher than that of other crime victims:

--The elderly are most commonly victims of burglaries (31%), purse snatching (19%), and robbery (11%).

--The evaluations made by elderly clients are the most positive of any age group.

The data imply that any special needs possessed by elderly victims of crime are being addressed by the Centers.

Women

Although the Victimization surveys made by the Census Bureau indicate that men are half again as likely to become victims of crime, the clientele of the Centers show twice as many females as males. While this might be due to the nature of certain crimes such as rape and battering, especially in the case of Mower County Center, other factors must also influence this trend. Perhaps men are less willing to seek or accept help for these types of problems. In addition, women, especially single women of limited financial resources, may be less able to cope with other physical or emotional consequences of a victimization. The evaluations of Center performance made by women are slightly more positive than those made by men.

The Costs of Service

The costs of services delivered were computed by dividing costs attributed to service delivery (excluding community education and evaluation activities) by the number of clients served.

- The cost per victim at the urban Centers averaged \$89.47 during the start-up period and \$69.63 subsequently.
- The cost per client at the Mower County Center averaged \$228.32 during the start-up period and \$156.99 thereafter.
- Based on the proportion of time spent with crisis-oriented cases (which can require considerable follow-up) versus other types of cases, it was found that after the start-up period the average crisis-oriented case at the urban Centers cost \$232.87 to completion; the typical case involving only counseling, referral or victim/witness help cost \$117.43, and the average informational or brief counseling case cost \$32.67.
- These average costs at the Mower County Center subsequently to the start-up period were \$329.16 for the average crisis-oriented case, \$158.05 for counseling, referral and victim/witness cases, and \$62.24 for informational or brief counseling cases.

As noted above, the start-up period is defined as October 1, 1977 to March 31, 1978. Service delivery costs were defined as a specific proportion of all funds spent by or for each center during that time period. Thus, program money spent previously is defined as planning expense. The proportion of dollar outlay (administration, staff, facility expense, mileage, etc.) attributed to delivery of services to victims as opposed to community education, system change or program evaluation was estimated to be .75 (or 75%) as a result of consultation among Department of Corrections research staff and the program administrations.

The Minneapolis and St. Paul Centers together between October 1, 1977 and October 15, 1978 spent \$196,340. Of that money, \$61,436 was spent during the start-up period (through March) and the remainder (\$134,904) was spent during the final six and one-half months. These sums were reduced by 25% to yield service delivery expenses. The number of clients served (defined by number of cases closed) during these period was 515 for the start-up period and 1,444 subsequently. Since about 19 cases were in various stages of completion on October 15, 1978, half of those cases (or 9) were added to the post start-up period total yielding 1,453. The number of clients were then divided into the amount spent during those periods to yield the percent cost reported above. Comparable figures for Mower County are:

Start-Up Period

Program cost	\$15,215 X .75	=	\$ 11,412
Number of clients (terminated)			50
*Cost per client			\$228.23

Subsequent Period

Program Cost	23,235 X .75	=	\$ 174.26
Number of clients terminated			96
Number of clients in progress X $\frac{1}{2}$		=	15
Total clients			111
*Cost per client		=	\$156.99

The Impact of the Criminal Justice System

Legislated Goal--The Centers shall impact on the Criminal Justice System, presumably in ways contributing to the interests of the victim of crime.

Program Objectives -- To work closely with the police to rely on the police as a major source of clients; (in St. Paul and Mower County specifically) to provide victim/witness services.

Referral of Victims

The police are considered to be the most important segment of the criminal justice system in relation to victim services. Because of their direct and timely contact with victims, the Centers must rely on their judgment and efforts in referring people to the Centers. In addition, it was anticipated that other officials of the Criminal Justice System would refer some clients occasionally.

An examination was made of the ways in which victims of crime come into contact with the Centers. The results are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: How Clients Came into Contact with Each Crime Victim Crisis Center

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Outreach Attempts (VCC attempts to contact potential clients from police records not result in service)	552	35	99	9	2	1	653	24
Resulting in Service	596	38	685	63	14	10	95	47
Victim Contacted Center directly (Self-Referrals)	200	13	74	7	22	15	296	11
Friend or Relative of victim contacted center	66	4	46	4	28	19	140	5
Police Contacted Center	85	5	60	6	22	15	167	6
County or City Attorneys	2	-	28	3	4	3	34	100
Other Agency or Official	65	4	52	5	56	38	173	6
TOTALS	1566	100	1044	100	148	100	2758	100

Table 5 shows that most contacts or attempts at contact with victims of crime at the two urban Centers (74%) were the result of Center staffs' regularly scheduled examination of police reports of crime. The police have made these records freely available to the Centers, usually within one day of the victimization, but the

actual decision to contact and resulting contact attempt is made by Center staff.

These "outreach" attempts represent 73% of contact possibilities in Minneapolis, 75% in St. Paul and only 11% in Mower County. Most such attempts result in actual contact and subsequent service delivery. However, Minneapolis seems less successful in this endeavor than St. Paul; it has been suggested that a difference between the respective communities is the principal reason.

Victims contacting the Centers directly represent the second most common method of obtaining clients; proportionately 11% of the client contacts (14% of those receiving service) were self referrals. However, the role of the police or other professionals in advising the victims to approach the Centers is largely unknown and may represent a substantial portion of those percentages. Similarly, the role of the police in urging friends or relatives of the victim to contact the Center (5% of the contacts and 7% of service delivery) is also largely unknown.

During the start-up period, police are known to have made direct referrals to the Centers in only 5% of the cases at each urban Center and 10% at the Mower County Center; subsequent to the start-up period, the proportions remained at 5% at the urban Centers and improved to 15% at Mower County. As mentioned above, these figures probably somewhat underestimate the actual extent of police referral.

County and City attorneys provided an additional one percent of the referrals, mostly to the St. Paul Center and usually connected with the provision of victim witness services.

Finally, other agencies (social welfare, hospitals, etc.) not in the Criminal Justice System contributed six percent of the client referrals. This is the primary source of referral at the Mower County Center.

Thus, the Criminal Justice System, represented by the police and to a lesser extent prosecuting attorneys, is a major source of clients through giving Center access to reports of crimes but only a minor source of direct referrals, exceeding only slightly the number of referrals from the social welfare systems.

The Police

Further details of the impact on the police were obtained by a questionnaire administered to relevant police officers.

A total of 136 law enforcement officers completed questionnaires for an overall response rate of 54%. Response rates for each precinct are as follows: Minneapolis Fifth - 47%, Minneapolis Sixth - 48%, St. Paul B-4 - 78%, Austin Police - 63%, and Mower County Sheriff - 41%.

The question was asked "About how often do you call the Crime Victim Crisis Center to help a victim of crime?"

- Few respondents from any police agency responded "almost daily" or "twice weekly" (three from 8% at St. Paul B-4, and 3 or 16% from the Austin City Police).
- Weekly interaction was reported by 11% of the Minneapolis Fifth Precinct, 5% of the Sixth, 11% of the St. Paul B-4, 37% of the Austin Police, and none of the Mower County Sheriff's office. Most policemen reported "monthly" interaction: 57% of the Fifth, 33% of the Sixth, 42% of the B-4, 26% of Austin's police and 50% of Mower County deputies.
- A relatively high proportion of responding police officers reported never having called the Centers: 32% of the Fifth, 63% or nearly two-thirds of the Sixth, 37% of the B-4, 21% from Austin, and 40% of Mower County.
- Reported frequencies of dispensing Crime Victim Crisis Center brochures or calling cards were slightly higher than those of direct referrals: more officers reported such activity at least weekly and fewer (from one-sixth to one-half) reported no such interaction.

One may assume that at least some of these respondents are new to these particular precincts and thus have yet had no chance to refer clients; however,

the fact remains that after 10-12 months of operation, the Centers have yet to regularly receive direct referrals from one-fourth to two-thirds the police officers in their own precincts.

The reasons for this lack of referrals from certain officers could be due to their perception as to the utility of Center services to victims, their perceptions of the value of the Centers' services to their own work or both.

Officers were also asked "for what types of crimes have you referred people to the Crime Victim Crisis Centers?" Respondents were allowed to designate more than one type of victimization.

- . Most metropolitan officers referred burglary victims to the Centers, 79% in the Fifth, 45% in the Sixth, and 63% in the B-4. Few Austin or rural Mower County burglary victims were so referred.
- . Other commonly cited referrals in all metro and rural agencies were assault (including spouse abuse) and rape or sexual assault. Robbery was mentioned by about one-fourth of the metro police but only one Austin policeman. Purse snatching was mentioned by about a fifth of all Twin City and Austin police. Overall, very few theft referrals were noted.

A question asking for what types of crimes they could foresee future referrals.

- . The most commonly cited in all jurisdictions was rape-sexual assault, assault (including spouse abuse) and robbery.
- . Burglary (and to a lesser extent theft) are judged appropriate by many Twin Cities officers but few rural officers.
- . None of the crimes was judged appropriate by several officers in the Minneapolis Sixth Precinct and one or two in almost every precinct.

Clearly, police officers do not wish to refer victims of certain crimes to the Centers, and have been selective in the past. Overall, do the police see the Crisis Centers as functioning poorly or as of value in only certain situations? Table 6 attempts to answer this question.

TABLE 6: Quality of Crime Victim Crisis Center Work - Police Opinion

	Minneapolis Fifth Precinct		Minneapolis Sixth Precinct		St. Paul B-4 Team		Austin Police		Mower County Sheriff		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Excellent	4	14	4	10	14	37	8	42	0	-	30	22
Good	20	71	18	45	18	47	9	47	8	73	73	54
Poor	0	-	3	8	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	2
Very Poor	1	4	5	13	0	-	0	-	1	9	7	5
No Answer	3	11	10	25	6	16	2	11	2	18	23	17
Totals	28	100	40	100	38	100	19	100	11	100	136	100

Table 6 shows that thirty (22%) of all officers judged the quality of CVCC work as excellent, 73 (54%) judged it as good and four (3%) judged it as very poor ((23 or 17% did not answer the question). Over three-fourths of the police queried rated the Centers services as good to excellent. Negative judgments were totally absent from the St. Paul and Austin police departments.

What then are the opinions of police regarding the impact of the Centers on their own work? When asked if the Centers help them do police work "more efficiently or less efficiently", the responses were:

- Overall, 58 (43%) of the responding police officers answered that the work of the Centers made their functioning more efficient. This answer was proportionately highest in the Austin Police Department (68%), St. Paul B-4 Team (53%) and lowest is the Minneapolis Sixth Precinct (20%).
- The most common response overall was that the Centers neither helped nor hindered police work (47% of all police responding) while only a few (3% overall) felt it hindered them.

The final judgment made by these police officers concerns whether the Centers should continue to operate. This is displayed in Table 7.

TABLE 7: Should the Crime Victim Crisis Centers Continue to Operate?

	Minneapolis Fifth Precinct		Minneapolis Sixth Precinct		St. Paul B-4 Team		Austin Police		Mower County Sheriff		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	18	64	18	45	30	79	18	95	7	64	91	67
No	2	7	14	35	0	-	0	-	0	-	16	12
No Opinion	8	29	8	20	8	21	1	-	4	36	29	21
Totals	28	100	40	100	38	100	19	100	11	100	136	100

Overall, 91 (67%) of the 135 officers said "yes", 16 (12%) said "no" and 28 (21%) had no option. Only Minneapolis officers oppose Center continuance, 14 (35%) in the Sixth and two (7%) in the Fifth.

Clearly, with the exception of the Sixth Precinct in Minneapolis, police generally have high opinions of the performance of the Crime Victim Crisis Centers and want them to continue to operate but have rather limited perceptions of the Centers' usefulness in their day-to-day duties. They apparently perceive the Centers as a valuable resource to be used only occasionally, and with only certain types of victimizations.

Opinions were also solicited from these officers as to how the Centers' performance could be improved. Eleven officers (five in Minneapolis and six in Austin and Mower County) asked for better communication between Centers and patrol officers. Four officers in St. Paul suggested making the services available city-wide and two in Minneapolis want the Centers physically staffed twenty-four hours a day.

Austin officers had some negative comments on the quality of volunteer staff and suggested better training. Finally, more publicity about the Centers was desired by a few officers in all agencies.

Courts and Prosecution

One objective of the St. Paul and Mower County Centers (and to a lesser extent the Minneapolis Center) is the provision of victim/witness services. These are services to help victims or witnesses of crime meet their obligations to the courts, testify against offenders and possibly influence their conviction rate.

Formal programs offering these services exist only in one of these three areas - Minneapolis. However, all three Centers have performed these services for clients.

The data show that

- . A total of 147 clients received some sort of victim/witness service, alone or as part of other services; 68 from St. Paul, 59 from Minneapolis and 20 from Mower County;
- . The persons receiving these services were primarily victims of violent crimes (assaults and threats 48%, sexual assaults 11%, spouse abuse 11%, robbery or purse snatch 12%) rather than property crime (burglary 11%; other property crimes 1%) while six percent were only witnesses, not victims of crime.
- . Services received by this group include -
 - transportation to court (40 persons),
 - notifying eight persons of court appearance times,
 - accompanying 30 persons for an average of 2.7 hours each,
 - other court-related services to 18 people.

The victim/witness services offered by the Centers generally represent part of a continuum of service for the individual client, that is as service offered in addition to crisis intervention, counseling or other services. Thus, the services provided have as goal the clients' welfare as well as the conviction of the offender.

The Need for Continuence

As noted above, police officers who have had an opportunity to interact with the Crime Victim Crisis Centers generally support the maintenance, and even expansion, of these Centers. Clearly, they see the role of the Centers in narrower focus than is contained in the Centers original project proposals. Further, Center experience as described above is more limited in the delivery of crisis oriented services than perhaps was initially estimated. The data to be described measure crime victims' perceptions of need for Center services as they may have existed prior to the opening of each Crime Victim Crisis Center.

The techniques used are described in the Methods section above. Certain limitations of this survey must be pointed out.

- 1) The interviews reported here are only one-half of a study measuring these needs before and after the Center' existence. Full results will be ready in Spring, 1979;
- 2) Since the sample was drawn from police reports of crime, an entire category of victims (those who do not report the crime to the police) are ignored.
- 3) At the time of each interview from nine to twelve months had passed since the victimization experience. A high proportion of persons had moved and were unable to be contacted. Further the effects of imperfect memories on victims' reported perceptions is unknown.
- 4) Since victims are assumedly not used to the concept of services to victims of crime, they may have needed them without being so aware or willing to admit, such.

Victims' Perceptions

A total of 399 victims of reported crime were randomly selected from victimizations in the target communities of each Center. Victimizations

occurred before the Centers opened. The number of completed interviews (by phone or mail) is 138 or 44%. The completion rate is highest in St. Paul (56%) and lowest in Minneapolis (35%); Mower County's rate is 51%. Only 27 people (7%) refused to respond, and 197 were unable to be contacted after at least three attempts by phone and mail.

An analysis of the returns implies that the victims responding to the questionnaire generally represent the white, middle class crime victims rather than the poor, the transient, or the minority victim of crime. A lower proportion of Blacks responded than would have been estimated based on Census Bureau data. Further, more men responded than women. Finally, the ones who had moved and left no forwarding address as well as the victims of unreported crimes tended to be excluded as mentioned above.

Most respondents were victims of property crimes (burglary, thefts, and vandalism - 76%) as opposed to crimes against the person (assaults and threats - 12%, robberies and purse snatch - 3%, sex offenses - 6%). Other crimes numbered only 3%. Compared to the original unsampled pool of crime victims (80% victims of property crimes, 17% victims of crimes against persons, and 2% other) the resulting respondents seem to reflect proportionately the victimizations reported.

Some of these victims of crime (56%) reported actually having received some services for their victimizations, however few of the services were crisis related. Thus 44% report no services at all.

- Of the victims of assault, 43% received no services; 50% of the robbery victims received no services; all victims of rape or sexual assault received some help; 39% of the burglary victims received no services; 54% of the theft-damage victims received no services, and 33% of the six victims of other crimes received no services.

- Despite the finding of a considerable report of service delivery the most common help received after a victimization is crime prevention advice, received by 61 (35%) of the 175 victims and accounting for well over half of all services received by all victims. For half of the victims of rape or sexual assault to other service besides "crime prevention advice" was therefore available.
- Other services were each received by very few victims of crime. Services fitting the "crisis intervention" description were reported received by only two victims, one for assault, the other for a theft. Building repairs were also received by only two people, one a victim of sexual assault in her home, the other a vandalism victim. Other emergency help, transportation, protection, etc. was reported by 6% of the victims including 29% of the assault victims.

Clearly, other than some crime prevention advice, few services were delivered to help victims of crime cope with the specific effects of the victimization. Most services that were delivered, primarily crime prevention advice, but including crisis oriented service, were provided by the police. Police were reported as giving some help or advice to 107 (61%) of the 175 respondents. Only 9 (5%) reported receiving any help from friends or relatives; 6 (4%) reported help from a church or social service agency and 4 (2%) reported other sources. Clearly, if Crime Victim Crisis Centers have displaced any services already significantly available it will be services then rendered by the police.

Table 8 describes possible service needs that were perceived as unfulfilled after these victimizations; in other words, services that were desired but not received.

TABLE 8: Perception of Service Needs by Type of Victimization

	Assaults, Threats		Robbery		Sex Offenses		Burglary		Thefts		Other		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Further Services Desired	13	62	6	100	5	50	48	89	67	86	4	67	143	82
Emergency Repairs	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	16	2	1
Emergency Services (including transportation, protection)	4	19	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	2
Clean Up Premises	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	2	0	-	0	-	1	1
Recovery of Property	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	2	3	4	1	16	5	3
Help with Insurance/ Forms	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	0	-	1	1
Counseling	4	19	0	-	3	30	1	2	0	-	0	-	8	5
Moral Support/ Listening	0	-	0	-	2	20	0	-	2	3	0	-	4	2
Notification of Time of Court Appearance	1	5	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1
Crime Prevention	3	14	0	-	0	-	1	2	0	-	0	-	4	2
Total	21	100	6	100	10	100	54	100	78	100	6	100	175	100

NOTE: Column percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

The table shows that 143 (82%) of the 175 respondents reported no need of further services, either at the time of the interview or at the time of the victimization. Thus 32 (18%) reported need for further services; 8 were victims of assault, 5 were victims of sex offenses, 6 were victims of burglary, and 13 were victims of thefts or other offenses. Put another way, 38% of assault victims, none of the few robbery victims, 50% of the sex offense victims, 11% of the burglary victims and 15% of theft and other offenses reported perceptions of unfulfilled service needs.

The most commonly described service need was for some type of counseling; cited by 8 (5%) of the respondents including 4 (19%) of the 21 assault victims and 3 (30%) of the sex offense victims. Emergency services, such as crisis intervention, transportation or protection were desired by 4 (19%) of the assault victims while emergency building repairs were desired by 2 victims of vandalism.

Moral support or "listening" as described above had been specifically wanted by four of the victims; two were sex offense victims and two were victims of thefts or vandalism.

The one indication of need for Victim/Witness type services was a St. Paul case in which the victim was not notified of the time she was needed to appear in court. As a result she did not testify against the defendant, and she was denied Crime Victim Reparations for her injuries. (It should also be noted that no respondent interviewed received Reparations Board money; despite the fact that the survey indicated that perhaps four persons would have been eligible to be reimbursed for medical costs.)

Finally, five persons mentioned need for help in recovery of property, usually help most commonly associated with the police; while four persons desired further crime prevention advice.

Clearly, there were service needs desired by moderate proportions of

victims of personal crimes and small proportions of victims of property crimes. Generally the services described as needed by the victims of person crimes were intensive in nature while those of most (not all) victims of property crimes were not.

The possible emotional effects of the victimizations were also explored.

Some amount of "fear" was reported by 45 or 31% of the respondents, 16 of whom described the fear as "severe".

The usual objects of fear were possible repeat of the crime (20 respondents), retaliation by the offender for reporting the crime (10 respondents) and fear of being alone (10 respondents).

Other, perhaps dysfunctional, emotions generated included those of "worry" (8 or 6% of the respondents) and "upset" (50 or 34% of the respondents).

Problems specifically described by 35 (20%) of all respondents as having been engendered by the emotions described above (usually from "fear" or "upset") were "depression" (reported by 6 or 3% of the 175 respondents), "insomnia" (12 or 7%) as well as a "fear of leaving home or going about" (reported by 17 or 10% of the respondents). Other problems reported as dysfunctions were related by 9 or 5% of the respondents including one person who reported the loss of a job. (Some persons reported two problems.)

It should be noted that the problems reported above are problems for which only about one third of the people received any help at all, and some of them reported that help as inadequate. Therefore, about 30 persons (17%) of the 175 persons interviewed reported emotional problems of some distress to them for which no or inadequate treatment was received.

The estimates of the proportion of crime victims who might have advantageously liked Center services, bearing in mind the limitations of the

study design and any middle class bias in respondents, seems to converge on proportions in the range of 15-25%. Therefore, for future planning purposes a prudent estimation of potential clientele would be no more than 20% of the victims of reported crime.

A P P E N D I X

Futher Tables

TABLE 1: How Clients Came into Contact with Each Crime Victim Crisis Center

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Victim Contacted Center directly (Self-Referrals)	200	13	74	7	22	15	296	11
Friend or Relative of Victim Contacted Center	66	4	46	4	28	19	140	5
Police Contacted Center	85	5	60	6	22	14	167	6
Hospital Contacted Center	0	-	1	-	16	11	17	1
Other Agency or Official	67	4	79	8	44	30	190	7
Outreach Attempts: (VCC Attempts to Contact Potential Client)								
-Resulting in Service	596	38	685	66	14	10	1295	47
-Not Resulting in Service	552	35	99	9	2	1	653	24
TOTAL	1566	100	1044	100	148	100	2758	100

NOTE: In this and all subsequent tables, percentage sums do not necessarily total precisely 100% due to rounding error.

TABLE 2: Degree of Client Service

Class	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV-Crisis-oriented Service	202	13	111	11	57	39	370	13
III-Substantial Service	278	18	303	29	71	48	652	24
II-Minimal Service	534	34	531	51	18	12	1083	39
I-No Service	299	19	19	2	1	1	319	12
0-No Contact	<u>253</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>334</u>	<u>12</u>
TOTAL	1566	100	1044	100	148	100	2758	100

TABLE 3: Offense Committed Against Client

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Homicide (Client is Surviving Spouse)	2	0	0	-	0	-	2	0
Assault	224	22	179	19	21	14	424	20
Sexual Assault (Includes Rape)	37	4	28	3	20	14	85	4
Robbery	74	7	51	5	0	-	125	6
Purse Snatch	73	7	38	4	2	1	113	5
Battered Spouse	21	2	16	2	55	38	92	4
Child Abuse	1	-	2	0	26	18	29	1
Burglary/Break-In	467	46	423	45	2	1	892	42
Other Property Crimes	43	4	86	9	2	1	131	6
Other Crimes*	20	2	63	7	0	6	92	4
Client not Victim of Crime**	52	5	56	6	9	6	117	6
Witness to Crime	0	-	3	3	0	-	3	-
Total	1,014	100	945	100	146	100	2,105	100

*Includes: Terroristic Threats, Kidnapping, Extortion, Telephone Harassment, Personal Harassment, Incest

**Includes: Medical Emergencies, Suicides, Legal Needs, Social Service Needs, Crime Prevention, Missing Persons

TABLE 4: Clients Served by Residence

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Minneapolis Crime Victim Crisis Center		
City of Minneapolis		
- Target Area (Powderhorn Neighborhood)	214	21
- Remainder of 5th and 6th Precincts	612	60
- Remainder of City	122	12
Hennepin County Suburbs	25	3
Other Counties	17	2
Out of State Resident	2	-
Unknown	22	2
Total	1,014	100
St. Paul Crime Victim Crisis Center		
City of St. Paul		
- Target Area (West 7th Neighborhood)	199	21
- Remainder of B-4 (Precinct Team Area)	376	40
- Remainder of City	212	22
St. Paul Suburbs	113	12
Other Counties	25	3
Out of State Residents	1	-
Unknown	19	2
Total	945	100
Mower County Crime Victim Crisis Center		
City of Austin	702	70
Remainder of Mower County	29	20
Freeborn County	4	3
Other Counties	8	5
Out of State	2	1
Unknown	1	1
Total	146	100

TABLE 5: Client Demographics by Center

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Race</u>								
White	577	57	690	73	140	96	1407	67
Black	86	9	26	3	0	-	112	5
Native American	37	4	9	1	0	-	46	2
Other	8	1	17	2	5	3	30	1
Unknown	306	30	203	22	1	1	510	24
Total	1014	100	945	100	146	100	2105	100
<u>Sex</u>								
Female	588	58	449	48	121	83	1158	55
Male	330	33	315	33	21	15	666	32
<u>Groups</u>								
(Married Couples, Roommates, etc.)	94	9	40	4	2	1	136	6
Other (Institutions, etc.)	0	-	1	-	0	-	1	-
Unknown	2	-	140	15	2	1	144	7
Total	1014	100	945	100	146	100	2105	100
<u>Age</u>								
Less than 13 Years	9	1	35	4	16	11	60	3
13 - 20 Years	70	7	106	11	35	24	211	10
21 - 30 Years	310	31	201	21	47	32	558	27
31 - 45 Years	135	13	186	20	31	21	352	17
46 - 64 Years	76	8	125	13	13	9	214	10
65+ Years	160	16	126	13	2	1	288	14
Unknown	254	25	166	18	2	1	420	20
Total	1014	100	945	100	146	100	2105	100

TABLE 5a: Saturation Area and Clientele Racial Characteristics - Minneapolis

	Saturation Area		Clientele from Saturation Area	
	N	%	N	%
White	25,538	77	147	71
Black	6,668	20	48	23
Other	785	2	13	6
Total	32,991	100	208	100

TABLE 5b: Saturation Area and Clientele Racial Characteristics - St. Paul

	Saturation Area		Clientele from Saturation Area	
	N	%	N	%
White	15,024	99	176	95
Black	18	0.1	2	1.0
Other	154	1	8	4
Total	15,196	100	186	100

TABLE 6: Primary Service Delivery by Center

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Crisis Intervention	50	5	61	7	42	29	153	7
Emergency Building Repair	54	5	9	1	1	1	64	3
Other Emergency Help	40	4	13	1	5	3	58	3
Counseling (one-half hour or more)	43	4	122	13	36	25	201	19
Referral Only	18	2	16	2	10	7	44	2
Court-Related Victim-Witness Assistance	18	2	21	2	3	2	42	2
Catharsis/Counseling (less than 30 minutes)	272	27	223	24	23	16	518	15
Crime Prevention: Information	302	30	317	34	2	1	621	30
Community Organizing	0	0	9	1	0	0	9	0
Other Information	201	20	138	15	23	16	362	17
Other Services	16	2	16	2	1	1	33	2
Total	1014	100	945	100	146	100	2105	100

TABLE 7: Case Dynamics by Center

	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Amount of <u>Lag</u> between Date of Crime and First Contact with Center (Number of Days)	Median=3.0 days Range=0 to 2368 days (N=872)	Median=2.4 days Range=0 to 1480 days (N=650)	Median=1.0 days Range=0-1204 days N=77)	Median=2.7 days Range=0-2368 days (N=1599)
Number of <u>Contacts</u> between Client and Center Staff	Median=1.3 Contacts Range=0 to 22 (N=1014)	Median=1.2 Range=0 to 32 (N=945)	Median=2.2 Range=0 to 14 (N=146)	Median=1.2 Range=0 to 32 (N=2105)
Number of <u>Hours</u> spent by Center Staff with Client in Delivery of Services	Median=0.3 hours Range=0 to 24 (N=997)	Median=0.3 hour Range=0 to 38 (N=945)	Median=2.0 hours Range=0 to 40 (N=145)	Median=0.3 hour Range=0 to 40 (N=1089)
Number of Days over which Client had Contact with Center (<u>Duration</u> of Case)	Median=0.4 days Range=0 to 131 (N=1006)	Median=0.2 day Range=0 to 154 (N=936)	Median=26.4 days Range=0 to 128 (N=146)	Median=0.4 day Range=0 to 154 (N=2088)

TABLE 8: Client Evaluation by Center

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
- 6 to -14	7	4	0	-	0	-	7	1
- 2 to - 6	1	1	3	1	0	-	4	1
Neutral (\emptyset) or no Score	9	5	8	3	0	-	17	4
1 to 6	21	13	12	4	3	8	36	8
6 to 14	128	77	251	92	36	92	415	87
Total	166	100	274	100	39	100	479	100
Mean Score:	9.43 (N=161)		11.61 (N=272)		11.15 (N=39)		10.83 (N=472)	

TABLE 9: Client Satisfaction by Type of Victimization

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Mean Satisfaction Score</u>			
	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Assault	8.78 (N=36)	11.00 (N=42)	12.40 (N=5)	10.12 (N=83)
Sexual Assault	10.67 (N=3)	10.83 (N=6)	10.56 (N=9)	10.67 (N=18)
Robbery	11.71 (N=14)	11.79 (N=24)	---	11.76 (N=38)
Purse Snatch	10.89 (N=9)	12.13 (N=16)	---	11.68 (N=25)
Battered Spouse	8.00 (N=1)	10.00 (N=5)	10.80 (N=15)	10.48 (N=21)
Child Abuse	---	---	11.33 (N=3)	11.33 (N=3)
Burglary	9.67 (N=67)	11.98 (N=123)	14.00 (N=1)	11.18 (N=191)
Other Property Crimes	8.91 (N=11)	10.11 (N=27)	9.00 (N=1)	9.74 (N=39)
Other Crimes	7.75 (N=4)	12.70 (N=10)	12.00 (N=3)	11.41 (N=17)
Not Victims of Crime	7.33 (N=15)	11.92 (N=13)	11.00 (N=1)	9.52 (N=27)
Witness to Crime	---	14.00 (N=2)	---	14.00 (N=2)
Total Mean Score	9.41 (N=160)	11.60 (N=268)	11.13 (N=38)	10.81 (N=466)

TABLE 9a: Client Satisfaction by Type of Victimization

	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Crimes Against Persons	9.81 (N=63)	11.33 (N=93)	11.03 (N=32)	10.77 (N=188)
Crimes Against Property	9.48 (N=82)	11.69 (N=159)	11.80 (N=5)	10.96 (N=246)
Other	7.33 (N=15)	12.31 (N=16)	11.00 (N=1)	9.94 (N=32)

TABLE 10: Client Satisfaction by Type of Service

	<u>Mean Satisfaction Score</u>			
<u>Primary Service Delivered</u>	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Crisis Intervention	11.88 (N=17)	11.67 (N=24)	11.06 (N=17)	11.55 (N=58)
Building Repair	11.56 (N=27)	12.33 (N=3)	14.00 (N=1)	11.71 (N=31)
Other Emergency Service	6.11 (N=9)	12.00 (N=1)	---	6.70 (N=10)
Counseling	8.47 (N=15)	11.17 (N=53)	11.29 (N=14)	10.70 (N=82)
Referral Only	10.33 (N=3)	11.67 (N=3)	8.00 (N=1)	10.57 (N=7)
Court-Related Victim/Witness	5.50 (N=2)	13.13 (N=8)	---	11.60 (N=10)
Listening/Catharsis	7.33 (N=15)	12.05 (N=58)	9.00 (N=2)	11.03 (N=75)
Crime Prevention Information	9.54 (N=37)	11.65 (N=84)	---	11.01 (N=121)
Other Services	8.69 (N=35)	10.91 (N=34)	12.33 (N=3)	9.89 (N=72)

TABLE 10a: Client Satisfaction by Degree of Client Service

	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Class IV	10.08 (N=62)	11.66 (N=38)	11.11 (N=19)	10.75 (N=119)
Class III	9.33 (N=57)	11.44 (N=122)	11.16 (N=19)	10.81 (N=198)
Class II	8.26 (N=39)	11.78 (N=112)	12.00 (N=1)	10.88 (N=152)

TABLE 11: Client Opinion about Center Performance*

<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Minneapolis</u>	<u>St. Paul</u>	<u>Mower</u>	<u>Total</u>
Understanding	2.80 (N=157)	2.89 (N=270)	2.97 (N=39)	2.86 (N=466)
Helpfulness	2.35 (N=153)	2.52 (N=247)	2.82 (N=38)	2.49 (N=438)
Promptness	2.68 (N=98)	2.91 (N=67)	2.85 (N=39)	2.79 (N=204)
Timeliness	1.83 (N=86)	2.06 (N=66)	1.65 (N=34)	1.88 (N=186)
Satisfaction with Referrals	1.65 (N=40)	2.31 (N=51)	2.53 (N=15)	2.09 (N=106)

*0 - very poor, 3 = very good

Recommendations

Probability that Client Would Recommend Victim Crisis Center -

Yes	139 (87%)	256 (93%)	39 (100%)	434 (91%)
No	6 (3%)	5 (2%)	0 -	11 (2%)
No Answer	21 (10%)	13 (5%)	0 -	34 (7%)
Total	166 (100%)	274 (100%)	39 (100%)	479 (100%)

TABLE 12: Sample Subjects Interviewed

	Minneapolis		St. Paul		Mower		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Telephone Interviews Completed	63	31	45	49	30	29	138	35
Mailed Questionnaires Returned	8	4	6	7	23	22	37	9
Refusals	15	7	11	12	1	1	27	7
No Response - Unable to Contact	55	27	19	21	30	29	104	26
Moved - Unable to Contact	60	29	10	11	19	18	89	22
Dead	3	1	1	1	0	-	4	1
Total	204	100	92	100	103	100	399	100

TABLE 13: Personal Demographics of Victims Interviewed

	<u>Minneapolis</u>		<u>St. Paul</u>		<u>Mower</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Race (of Respondents)</u>								
White	59	83	48	94	52	98	159	91
Black	8	11	0	-	0	-	8	5
Indian	1	1	0	-	0	-	1	-
Unknown	3	5	3	6	1	2	7	4
Total	71	100	51	100	53	100	175	100
<u>Sex (of Respondents)</u>								
Male	45	63	26	51	29	55	100	57
Female	26	37	25	49	24	45	75	43
Total	71	100	51	100	53	100	175	100
<u>Age (of Respondents)</u>								
9 - 13	3	4	0	-	4	8	7	4
14 - 20	3	4	2	4	9	17	14	8
21 - 44	39	55	27	53	22	42	88	50
45 - 64	14	20	14	27	9	17	37	21
65+	8	11	7	14	8	15	23	13
Unknown	4	3	1	2	1	2	6	3
Total	71	100	51	100	53	100	175	100
<u>Type of Victimization</u>								
Assaults, Threats	8	11	3	6	10	19	21	12
Robbery	3	4	2	4	1	2	6	3
Sex Offense	2	3	5	10	3	6	10	6
Burglary	29	41	21	41	4	8	54	31
Theft, Damage	27	38	18	35	33	62	78	45
Other	2	3	2	4	2	4	6	3
Total	71	100	51	100	53	100	175	100

TABLE 14: Types of Victimizations (all sources) by Victim Services Received

	Assaults, Threats		Robbery		Sex Offenses		Burglary		Thefts		Other		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Services Received	9	43	3	50	0	-	21	39	42	54	2	33	77	44
Crisis Intervention	1	5	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	0	-	2	1
Emergency Repairs	0	-	0	-	1	10	0	-	1	1	0	-	2	1
Other Emergency (including transportation)	6	29	1	16	1	10	0	-	1	1	1	16	10	6
Clean Up Premises	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	4	2	3	1	16	5	3
Recovery of Property	0	-	1	16	0	-	3	6	12	15	2	33	18	10
Help with Insurance or Reparation Forms	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	2	3	4	1	16	5	3
Counseling/Therapy	2	10	0	-	3	30	1	2	1	1	0	-	7	4
Listening/ Moral Support	2	10	0	-	1	10	2	4	1	1	0	-	6	3
Crime Prevention	7	33	3	50	5	50	25	46	21	27	0	-	61	35
Other	0	-	1	16	1	10	6	11	2	3	0	-	10	6
Total	21	100	6	100	10	100	54	100	78	100	6	100	175	100

NOTE: Column percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

TABLE 15: Sources of Victim Services before Crime Victim Crisis Centers

<u>Sources Received From</u>	<u>Minneapolis</u>		<u>St. Paul</u>		<u>Mower</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Police	48	68	32	63	27	51	107	61
Relatives or Friends	3	4	6	12	0	-	9	5
Church	1	1	0	-	0	-	1	1
Social Service	2	3	2	4	1	2	5	3
Other	2	3	0	-	2	4	4	2
No Services Received	30	42	20	39	27	51	77	44
Total	71	100	51	100	53	100	175	100

NOTE: Column percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

TABLE 16: Perception of Service Needs by Type of Victimization

	Assaults, Threats		Robbery		Sex Offenses		Burglary		Thefts		Other		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Further Services Desired	13	62	6	100	5	50	48	89	67	86	4	67	143	82
Emergency Repairs	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	16	2	1
Emergency Services (including transportation, protection)	4	19	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	2
Clean Up Premises	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	2	0	-	0	-	1	1
Recovery of Property	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	2	3	4	1	16	5	3
Help with Insurance/ Forms	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	0	-	1	1
Counseling	4	19	0	-	3	30	1	2	0	-	0	-	8	5
Moral Support/ Listening	0	-	0	-	2	20	0	-	2	3	0	-	4	2
Notification of Time of Court Appearance	1	5	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1
Crime Prevention	3	14	0	-	0	-	1	2	0	-	0	-	4	2
Total	21	100	6	100	10	100	54	100	78	100	6	100	175	100

NOTE: Column percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

TABLE 17: Emotional Reactions to Crime by Type of Victimization

	Assaults, Threats		Robbery		Sex Offenses		Burglary		Thefts		Other		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fear	9	43	1	16	6	60	22	41	6	8	1	16	45	31
Worry	1	5	1	16	0	-	5	9	1	1	0	-	8	6
Upset	6	29	3	50	1	10	18	33	21	27	1	16	50	34
Anger	8	38	1	16	2	20	17	31	38	49	3	50	69	47
Other	0	-	0	-	3	30	1	2	2	3	0	-	6	4
No Reported Reaction	3	14	1	16	1	10	5	9	17	22	2	33	29	17
Total	21	100	6	100	10	100	54	100	78	100	6	100	175	100

NOTE: Column percentages total greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

TABLE 18: Police Use of Crime Victim Crisis Centers

Frequency of Direct Referrals	Minneapolis				St. Paul		Mower County			
	Fifth		Sixth		B-4		Police		Sheriff	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Almost Daily	0	-	0	-	1	3	0	-	0	-
Twice Weekly	0	-	0	-	2	5	3	16	0	-
Weekly	3	11	2	5	4	11	7	37	0	-
Monthly	16	57	13	33	16	42	5	26	5	50
Never	9	32	25	63	14	37	4	21	4	40
Does not apply or unknown	0	-	0	-	1	3	0	-	1	10
TOTAL	28	100	40	100	38	100	19	100	10	100

Frequency of Indirect (Brochure) Referrals

Almost Daily	1	4	1	3	5	13	0	-	0	-
Twice Weekly	1	4	0	-	3	8	4	21	0	-
Weekly	7	25	6	15	6	16	5	26	0	-
Monthly	13	46	14	35	17	45	7	37	5	50
Never	6	21	19	48	7	18	3	16	4	40
Does not apply or unknown	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	10
TOTAL	28	100	40	100	38	100	19	100	10	100

TABLE 19: Types of Victimitizations Perceived as Appropriate for Crime Victim Crisis Center Referrals

Past Referrals for:	Minneapolis				St. Paul		Mower County			
	Fifth		Sixth		B-4		Police		Sheriff	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Assault	13	46	6	15	17	45	15	79	3	30
Robbery	8	29	5	13	10	26	1	5	0	-
Purse Snatching	11	39	7	18	8	21	4	21	0	-
Rape-Sexual Assault	13	46	8	20	19	50	17	89	4	40
Burglary	22	79	18	45	24	63	3	16	0	-
Thefts	5	18	5	13	12	32	2	11	0	-
Other	5	18	3	8	6	16	1	5	0	-
None or no mention	6	21	22	55	4	11	4	21	6	60
<u>Projected Future Referrals for:</u>										
Assault	19	68	16	40	28	74	15	79	8	80
Robbery	17	61	14	35	22	58	8	42	2	20
Purse Snatching	19	68	18	45	19	50	7	37	2	20
Rape-Sexual Assault	20	71	19	48	31	82	18	95	9	90
Burglary	23	82	25	63	25	66	3	16	1	10
Thefts	15	54	16	40	18	47	4	21	1	10
Others	2	7	7	18	7	21	5	26	1	10
None or no mention	3	11	17	43	1	3	1	5	1	10

Column proportions total more than 100% because of multiple responses.

Minneapolis				St. Paul		Mower				Total	
5th		6th		B-4		Police		Sheriff		Total	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%

TABLE 20: Perception of Crime Victim Crisis Center Helpfulness to Police Work

More Efficient	13	46	8	20	20	53	13	68	4	40	58	43
No Change	13	46	24	60	17	45	5	26	5	50	64	47
Less Efficient	1	4	1	3	0	-	1	5	0	-	3	2
No Answer	1	4	7	18	1	3	0	-	1	10	10	7
Total	28	100	40	100	38	100	19	100	10	100	135	100

TABLE 21: Quality of Crime Victim Crisis Center Work

Excellent	4	14	4	10	14	37	8	42	0	-	30	22
Good	20	71	18	45	18	47	9	47	8	80	73	54
Poor	0	-	3	8	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	2
Very Poor	1	4	5	13	0	-	0	-	0	-	6	4
No Answer	3	11	10	25	6	16	2	11	2	20	23	17
Total	28	100	40	100	38	100	19	100	10	100	135	100

TABLE 22: Should the Crime Victim Crisis Centers Continue to Operate?

Yes	18	64	18	45	30	79	18	95	7	70	91	67
No	2	7	14	35	0	-	0	-	0	-	16	12
No Opinion	8	29	8	20	8	21	1	-	3	30	28	21
Total	28	100	40	100	38	100	19	100	10	100	135	100

END