



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

_____ **Research Report** _____

**Access to Victim Services by
Registered Victims of Domestic
Violence and Child Victims**

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

Access to Victim Services by Registered Victims of Domestic Violence and Child Victims

Renée Gobeil

Geoffrey Barnum

&

Haythem Euch

Correctional Service of Canada

May 2012

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown.
Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for
any intended use.

Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent
pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent
document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

Acknowledgements

Christina Guest, Andrea Dow, Bethany Schock, Sylviane Lamothe, and Adrienne Coutts of the Correctional Service of Canada's Victim Services were invaluable in the conceptualization stages of this project. A sincere thank you is also extended to all the Victim Services Officers and Regional Victim Services Managers who nominated cases for analyses, despite the already-numerous demands on their time. Finally, Adrienne Coutts, again, was tremendously patient and generous in her many explanations of the data and their nuances.

Executive Summary

Key words: *Victim Services, domestic violence victim, child victim.*

In recent years, there has been increased attention to the role of victims in the criminal justice system, marked notably by significant policy and legislative changes and an increase in the services available to victims of crime, including, in Canada, the legislated opportunity to register to receive information concerning the offender who victimized them. Previous research conducted in the context of trials suggests that domestic violence and child victims may find receiving information regarding their victims particularly useful. These two types of victims represent large numbers and can suffer particularly significant impacts of their victimization, but are not easy to identify within CSC's computerized records. For this reason, the study focused on these types of victims.

In August 2010, Victims Services Officers identified 475 child victims and 426 domestic violence victims within the full population of 6,692 victims registered with CSC. Profiles – including victim registration information, demographic data, victimization information, and information access – were created for each group and contrasted with the full population.

Results demonstrated that child victims tended to be younger and were more likely to be French-speaking than the full population of victims. Nearly two-thirds were related to their offender, most commonly being the offender's daughter or ex-spouse (registered on behalf of a child or deceased person). On average, child victims had more offences of victimization on record, with sexual offences being the most common. In fact, the percentage of child victims with a sexual offence of victimization was over three times greater than the percentage thereof in the full population of victims (74% vs. 22%).

In turn, domestic violence victims were also slightly younger, more likely to be women, and more likely to be Aboriginal than the full population. Not surprisingly, domestic violence victims were most likely to be related to the offender. Nearly two-thirds of the time, the registered victim's relationship to the offender represented a current or previous romantic relationship. Relative to the full population of victims, greater percentages of victims of domestic violence had offences of victimization in the assault or threat of violence categories, the latter of which includes criminal harassment.

These profiles demonstrate that considerable differences exist among types of victims, thereby underscoring the importance of considering and acknowledging diversity within the victim population. Doing so will facilitate the provision of client-matched services.

Additionally, consideration of the full population of victims allowed for the identification of certain areas where the distribution of the population of victims was inconsistent with expectations based on the distribution of the Canadian population. Specifically, male victims, Aboriginal victims, victims from visible minorities, and victims from Quebec were all under-represented. These may be groups for whom future outreach activities could be developed.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Information Sharing with Victims	2
Prevalence of Child and Domestic Violence Victimization	4
The Current Study	4
Method	5
Procedure	5
Participants	5
Defining Victims	6
Data	7
Analytic Approach	7
Results	9
Victim Registration	9
Demographic Information	12
Victimization-Related Information	16
Information Access	19
Discussion.....	23
Conclusions.....	26
References	27

List of Tables

Table 1	<i>Types of Victim Representatives</i>	10
Table 2	<i>Distribution of Cases of Individuals Registered as Victims by Victim Registration Category</i>	10
Table 3	<i>Distribution of Family / Guardian Victim Case Registrations</i>	11
Table 4	<i>Gender of Individuals Registered as Victims</i>	12
Table 5	<i>Race of Individuals Registered as Victims</i>	13
Table 6	<i>Home Language of Individuals Registered as Victims</i>	14
Table 7	<i>Distribution of Locations of Individuals Registered as Victims, with Distribution of Canadian Population</i>	15
Table 8	<i>Mean Number of Offences of Victimization on Record</i>	18
Table 9	<i>Distribution of Offences of Victimization on Record by Type of Individual Registered as Victim</i>	19
Table 10	<i>Mean Number of Victim Notifications</i>	20
Table 11	<i>Percentage of Individuals Registered as Victims to Whom Information Disclosed</i>	22

Introduction

In recent decades, there has been an increased focus on victims as a result of the recognition that the experience of victimization can have serious consequences for those involved, and that they may benefit from involvement in or awareness of the criminal justice outcomes related to the offence against them. Victimization's impacts can be categorized in broad areas: physical, financial, and emotional/psychological (Wasserman & Ellis, 2007). These impacts are often inter-related (e.g., Blanchard, Hickling, Mitnick, Taylor, Loos, & Buckley, 1995; Miller, Cohen, & Rossman, 1993) and can exacerbate one another.

In terms of physical impacts, AuCoin and Beauchamp (2007) found that approximately one-quarter of the violent incidents of victimization self-reported in a 2004 survey resulted in an injury. Approximately one-quarter of victims who were injured sought medical attention, 20% stayed in bed, and 39% had difficulty carrying out everyday activities for the rest of the day. Though most injured victims were not affected by the injury after two weeks (AuCoin & Beauchamp, 2007), serious long-term physical impacts can include long-term health conditions, permanent disability, disfigurement, sleep disorders, and an inability to work (Wasserman & Ellis, 2007).

Victimization can also have substantial short- and long-term financial impacts for the victim, their family, and society. These include prescription drug costs, costs associated with replacement of items or property damaged during the crime, loss of wages from time missed at work, and the costs associated with mental health counselling and physical mobility tools (e.g., wheelchair and crutches) which may be required as a result of injury or disability (Wasserman & Ellis, 2007). Though exact numbers are difficult to obtain, Li (2005) conservatively estimated that the total cost of crime to Canada in 2003 was approximately \$70 billion dollars, of which about two-thirds was borne by the victim.

Though often less observable, the emotional and psychological impacts of victimization may be amongst the most profound. The majority (78%) of Canadians who self-reported victimization in 2004 experienced some sort of emotional reaction (AuCoin & Beauchamp, 2007), including shock, confusion, anger, anxiety, fear, and helplessness (Wasserman & Ellis, 2007). Victimization has also been associated with depression, inattentiveness, social

withdrawal, sleeping problems, suicidal ideation (see Hill, 2010), and the development of post-traumatic stress disorder (Resnick, Kilpatrick, Dansky, Saunders, & Best, 1993), as well as with more negative perceptions of one's neighbourhood's safety, of one's personal safety, and of the police (AuCoin & Beauchamp, 2007).

It is notable that the two types of victims of interest in the current study – that is, victims of domestic violence and child victims – may suffer disproportionately from some of these impacts. In a self-report survey, victims of family violence reported being more confused and upset than did those victimized by a stranger (AuCoin & Beauchamp, 2007), suggesting that the emotional and psychological impacts of victimization may be particularly relevant for victims of domestic violence and children victimized by family members. Moreover, with respect to child victims, it is known that younger victims tend to experience greater impacts of victimization than do their older counterparts (e.g., AuCoin, 2005; Brzowowski, Taylor-Butts, & Johnson, 2006).

Information Sharing with Victims

In managing the impacts of victimization, victims in Canada can draw upon multiple services that are provided through various public and privately-funded bodies. There have been significant policy and legislative changes regarding victims (CSC, 2010a) which have resulted in an increase in the victim services available (Wemmers, 2009). These services include counselling, emergency shelter, and financial assistance (Sauvé, 2009). Moreover, the victim has opportunities to share the impacts of the victimization experience with the Court at sentencing (Criminal Code, 2011) and with the Parole Board of Canada when discretionary release decisions are made (PBC, 2010). Finally, legislation allows victims of federally-sentenced offenders to register to receive information and notifications concerning the offender who victimized them (CCRA, 1992).

The parameters of information sharing with victims are spelled out in sections 2, 23, 26, and 142 of the CCRA (1992). In brief, section 23 outlines the information that may be collected by CSC concerning the offender. Sections 26 and 142 outline the specific information that may be disclosed to victims by both CSC (section 26) and the Parole Board of Canada (section 142); together with section 2, these sections also detail who is legislatively recognized as a victim.¹

¹ Bill C-10 (*Safe Streets and Communities Act*), which expanded the legislative definition of a victim and the information to which victims are entitled to request access, was passed in the House of Commons in March 2012. The contents of this report reflect the definition and information access in place prior to this legislative change.

Individuals who meet the criteria may register with the National Victim Services Program, launched by CSC in 2007 to facilitate information sharing and outreach activities, to receive notifications concerning the status of an offender under federal jurisdiction (CSC, 2010b). Notifications can include such information as the length of the sentence, the offender's eligibility and review dates for release, and in some cases, the location of the penitentiary where the offender is incarcerated, the destination to which an offender is released, and the conditions associated with release.

To date, no research has been conducted on the direct impacts of sharing offender information with victims. That said, in an audit of the American Department of Justice Victim Notification System, the American equivalent of National Victim Service Program, the vast majority of registered victims considered receiving information on the status of their offender very important and valuable (U.S. Department of Justice, 2008). Similarly, in 2009, most of the victims registered with the National Victim Services Program reported satisfaction with the relevance, timeliness, and clarity of the information provided, as well as with the notification process (Evaluation Branch, 2010).

The importance ascribed to information sharing by victims is unsurprising given the body of research on victim assistance during the trial process, where very little information has traditionally been shared with victims (e.g., Davis, Kunreuther, & Connick, 1984; Erez & Roberts, 2007). Herman (2003) reviewed research on victims' feelings of security during the trial process and determined that in cases when the victim and offender knew one another intimately, many victims were fearful for their safety as defendants were usually released on bail. Victims felt safer and more satisfied with the trial process when information concerning the process and progress of a trial was provided to them (e.g., Kilpatrick, Beatty, & Howley, 1998).

It is reasonable to suppose that victims may also benefit from receiving information after an offender's conviction. This may be especially true for victims of domestic violence and child victims, for whom the combination of the offender's intimate knowledge about them and their lack of information concerning the status of the offender could lead to fear relating to personal safety. Lacking information on the status of an offender, these victims may fear a surprise encounter with him or her; therefore, receiving information on the status of their offender may lead to increases in victims' feelings of safety and reductions in their feelings of anxiety and of stress. A similar argument has been formulated by Herman and Wasserman (2001).

Prevalence of Child and Domestic Violence Victimization

The number of victims registered with CSC and the Parole Board of Canada² has grown from 1200 in 1995 to nearly 6000 in 2009 (Evaluation Branch, 2010). Unfortunately, victims of domestic violence and child victims are difficult to identify within CSC's computerized victim databases and therefore their relative representation among this number is unclear.

Though it is thought a large number of domestic violence victims never contact police (e.g., Felson & Paré, 2005), estimates based on a comprehensive 2004 survey indicate that about 7% of the Canadian population is a victim of domestic violence each year (Taylor-Butts, 2009). It is therefore not surprising that in a representative snapshot of those who used victim services in Canada, just under half (47%) were victims of domestic violence (Sauvé, 2009). As such, though exact numbers are unclear, it is evident that the prevalence of domestic violence victimization is quite significant.

With respect to child victimization, Trainor (2001) found that in 1999, 86% of sexual assaults and 73% of physical assaults against youth between the ages of 15 and 17 were not reported to police. Crimes against younger children are likely also under-reported. This suggests that the 2007 figure of approximately 53,000 child victims of physical and sexual assaults reported to police (Nemr, 2009) is likely a gross under-estimation of true child victimization rates.

The Current Study

Given the high prevalence of victims of domestic violence and of child victims, the fact that they may be significant users of victim services, and the important manner in which information sharing may be helpful in managing certain impacts associated with victimization, a better understanding of these types of victims is clearly necessary. It is within this context that the present study was initiated. The purpose of the study is to increase CSC's knowledge of victims of domestic violence and of child victims registered with the National Victim Services Program by providing a profile of these groups. To allow for contrasts, the study also includes an examination of the full population of victims registered with the National Victim Services Program.

² Individuals who register as victims with either CSC or the Parole Board of Canada have access to information held by either body given that the two bodies both process offender information.

Method

Procedure

In collaboration with Victim Services, memoranda were sent to each of the four to six Victim Services Officers in each of CSC's five geographic regions in August 2010 requesting that they identify from within their caseload a list of 15 cases of domestic violence and 15 cases with a child victim (i.e., either cases where the now-adult registered victim was victimized as a child or where a family member or guardian was registered on behalf of a child). For each, the Victim Services Officers provided sufficient information to allow for identification of the case within the larger database of information on registered victims maintained by CSC.

A temporary database was then created for analyses. The individuals identified in the Victim Service Officers' lists were flagged therein as being victims of domestic violence and/or child victims, which allowed comparisons between each of these groups and the population of victims as a whole.

Participants

The Victim Services Officers identified a total of 442 victims of domestic violence and 491 child victims.³ Given that not all lists were received simultaneously and that some time elapsed from the time the lists were submitted until the data were fully ready for analyses, the statuses of both the victims and the offenders were verified. A number were identified as having become inactive in this time period – which means, for victims, that the individual no longer wished to be advised of offender information, and, for offenders, typically that they had reached the end of their sentence. Further, certain cases were identified as duplicates – that is, submitted by more than one Victim Services Officer. Inactive and duplicate cases were eliminated, which left a total of 426 cases of victims of domestic violence and 475 child victim cases. These victim categories were not mutually exclusive, and 24 cases fell into both categories.

Within the database corresponding to the larger population of victims, all cases where

³ Given that the request outlined in the memorandum was for 'cases', there was some confusion about the unit of identification and some Victim Services Officers identified 15 victims while some identified 15 offenders with registered victims (for some offenders, more than one person is registered as a victim). This resulted in some variation in the number of individuals in each of the two lists.

both the victim and the offender were flagged as active were retained for analyses. The total number of victim cases – that is, those flagged as being in one of the specific categories as well as those not so flagged – was 6692.

This database, however, included some repetition in that victims who were registered to more than one offender appeared repeatedly (once per offender). As such, a second database was also created wherein each victim appeared only once. In total, this database included 6192 unique victims, 417 of whom were identified as victims of domestic violence and 457 of whom were identified as child victims. Twenty-four individuals fell into both categories.

It is important to acknowledge that the cases identified by the Victims Services Officers as being child victims or domestic violence victims comprise only a portion of all victims of these types within the larger population of victims. None of the data collected and maintained electronically on victims allowed for an exhaustive identification of all victims of these types.

Defining Victims

The CCRA (1992) identifies three types of victims eligible for registration to receive information notifications relating to federally-sentenced offenders in Canada. The global term *individuals registered as victims* was used to reflect that these individuals could fall into any of the following three categories:

1. An *actual victim* is one who was directly harmed by an offender who was convicted of that crime. For example, an individual who was assaulted by an offender who was then convicted of that assault would be eligible to register as an actual victim.
2. A *family/guardian victim* is one who is registered on behalf of an individual who meets the criteria described in the first category but is deceased, incapacitated, or under the age of 18. The registered individual must also be the spouse, partner, relative, dependent, lawful custodian of or responsible for the care of the individual who directly experienced the crime.⁴ For example, the mother of a 14 year old who was sexually assaulted by an offender who was then convicted of that sexual assault would be eligible to register as a family/guardian victim.

⁴ As a result of amendments to the CCRA resulting from the passing of Bill C-10 (*Safe Streets and Communities Act*) in March 2012, this category has been expanded. When the actual victim is deceased or incapacitated, individuals who have custody of or responsibility for the actual victim's dependent(s) are also eligible to register as a victim. These victims are not reflected in this study as they were not legislatively recognized at the time of data collection.

3. A *victim recognized under section 26(3) or 142(3) of the CCRA* is one who registered a complaint against an offender for an act that caused him or her harm, but the offender was not convicted in connection to that complaint (but was convicted of another offence). For example, an individual who complained to the police of criminal harassment at the hands of someone who was ultimately convicted of an unrelated assault, but not of the criminal harassment, would be eligible to register as a victim recognized under section 26(3) or 142(3) of the CCRA, even though the offender was not convicted of the criminal harassment that led to the victim's complaint.

Data

For each case, profile data from CSC's automated databases were retained for analyses. The data included victim registration information (e.g., the type of victim – actual, family/guardian, and those recognized under sections 26(3) and 142(3) of the CCRA), demographic data (e.g., date of birth, gender, race), victimization information (e.g., offence[s] of victimization on record, relationship to offender[s]) and information access (e.g., information communicated to victim).⁵

There were numerous individuals registered as victims for whom some data were not available. This is partly due to the nature of the information, which is voluntarily given and not required as part of the registration and notification process. In addition, the collection of certain data was only begun in September 2009 – as a result, individuals who registered as victims prior to this date were unlikely to have been asked to provide much of the demographic data. In all cases, analyses were conducted using what data were available.

Analytic Approach

Most of the analyses in this study were descriptive in nature in that they describe the demographic, victimization-related, or other characteristics of the two specific subgroups of victims of interest. Based on the analysis of interest, either the database of *cases* of individuals registered as victims or of *unique* individuals registered as victims was used. In order to provide context for the descriptions of the two specific subgroups of individuals registered as victims, a similar profile of the population of all individuals registered as victims was also provided.

⁵ Again, only the types of information which were legislatively permitted to be shared with victims at the time of the study were included. Additional information that can now be disclosed as a result of Bill C-10 (*Safe Streets and Communities Act*) is not reflected in the study.

Statistical tests (two-tailed z-tests of sample and population proportions and two-tailed z-tests of sample and population means) were used to examine the extent to which the data from the samples differ from those of the larger population. In assessing statistical significance in these tests, Bonferroni corrections were applied for each variable analysed.

Results

Victim Registration

Of the 6692 cases of individuals registered as victims,⁶ about two thirds were registered through CSC, with the remaining being registered through the Parole Board of Canada. This was true for the two groups of interest (cases of individuals registered as child victims: 66%; cases of individuals registered as domestic violence victims: 67%) as well as for the full population of cases (64%), with no statistically reliable group differences between each of the two groups of interest and the full population.

In most cases, victim registration did not include registration of a victim representative (that is, an individual or agency authorized to make information requests or receive offender information on the victim's behalf). That said, the cases of individuals registered as domestic violence victims were more likely than the full population of cases to include at least one victim representative (13% vs. 9%, $z = -3.05$, $p < .001$ ⁷). In turn, the percentage of cases of individuals registered as child victims including a victim representative (10%) did not differ statistically from that of the full population.

As can be seen in Table 1, the distribution of types of victim representatives differed by victim case type. Relative to the full population of cases of individuals registered as victims, a non-significantly greater percentage of those corresponding to child victims were family members (47% vs. 33%), and of those corresponding to victims of domestic violence were agents (67% vs. 55%).

⁶ Descriptions and analyses in this section utilized cases of individuals registered as victims (and not unique individuals registered as victims) as the unit of analysis because individuals can register more than once, potentially in different categories (individuals must register to each offender separately).

⁷ For ease of interpretation, when multiple tests are used in examining one variable, the equivalent level of significance prior to application of the Bonferroni correction is reported. For example, for this series of analyses, two z-tests were conducted; as such, tests reported here as reaching the $p < .001$, two tailed, threshold were actually assessed at $p < .00025$ (.0005 [due to two tails]/2).

Table 1

Types of Victim Representatives

Victim Representative Category	Victim Case Type		
	Child (<i>n</i> = 51)	Domestic Violence (<i>n</i> = 57)	All Victims (<i>N</i> = 611)
Agent	41%	67%	55%
Family Member	47%	23%	33%
Other	12%	11%	12%

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. *Other* includes lawyer, friend, clergy, Elder, business relation, community support, and ‘other’.

More than half of the full population of cases of individuals were registered as family or guardians of victims (see Table 2). For the cases of individuals registered as child victims and as domestic violence victims, however, this was not the case – both were significantly more likely to be registered as actual victims ($z = 9.03, p < .001$ and $z = 4.50, p < .001$, respectively) and less likely to be registered as family or guardians of victims ($z = -7.03, p < .001$ and $z = -4.41, p < .001$, respectively). Child victim cases were also significantly less likely to be registered under sections 26(3) or 142(3) of the CCRA than were those in the larger population of cases of individuals registered as victims, $z = -2.80, p < .05$.

Table 2

Distribution of Cases of Individuals Registered as Victims by Victim Registration Category

Victim Registration Category	Victim Type		
	Child (<i>n</i> = 475)	Domestic Violence (<i>n</i> = 426)	All Victims (<i>N</i> = 6692)
Actual	58%	49%	38%
Family / Guardian	39%	44%	55%
Recognized Under 26(3) -142(3)	3%	7 %	6%

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Follow-up examinations were conducted for the cases of individuals registered as the family member or guardian of a victim – in these cases, registrations can be on behalf of a

deceased person, on behalf of an incapacitated person, or on behalf of a person under the age of 18. Moreover, individuals registered as family/guardian victim can be registered on behalf of more than one person.

Table 3 shows the distribution of the cases of individuals registered as family/guardian victims. For cases from both the full population of individuals registered as victims and of those registered as domestic violence victims, the very large majority of family/guardian victim registrations were on behalf of a deceased individual. However, as would be expected, for cases of individuals registered as child victims, more than half of registrations were on behalf of a person under 18.

Table 3
Distribution of Family / Guardian Victim Case Registrations

Victim Registration Sub-Category	Victim Type		
	Child (<i>n</i> = 150) ^a	Domestic Violence (<i>n</i> = 156) ^b	All Victims (<i>N</i> = 2642) ^c
Deceased	41%	97%	95%
Person Under 18	57%	3 %	4%
Incapacitated	1%	-	1%

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Percentages represent family / guardian registrations on behalf of at least one person falling in the sub-category. ^aVictim registration sub-category was unavailable for 35 cases of individuals registered as child victims. ^bVictim registration sub-category was unavailable for 19 cases of individuals registered as domestic violence victims. ^cVictim registration sub-category was unavailable for 712 cases of individuals registered as victims.

For a number of family/guardian cases registered on behalf of a deceased person, information was available on the relationship of the individual registered as a victim to the deceased person. For the full population, the registered victim was most frequently the deceased’s sister (20%), mother (18%), brother (10%), or daughter (9%). Turning to child victim cases, the registered victim was most frequently the deceased’s mother (26%), aunt (17%), sister (12%), or father (11%). Finally, for the domestic violence victim cases, the registered victim’s relationship to the deceased was most frequently that of sister (23%), daughter (16%), mother (13%), father (9%), brother (9%), or aunt (7%). In general, it appears that women more frequently registered as family/guardian victims on behalf of a deceased relative than did men. In particular, sisters and mothers seemed to be among the most common

registered victims for all three types of cases of individuals registered as victims.

Demographic Information

For the 2251 of the 6192 unique individuals registered as victims⁸ for whom age information was available, the average age as of January 2011 was of 49 years ($SD = 15$). Individuals registered as victims of domestic violence tended to be slightly younger ($M = 46$ years; $SD = 14$; $n = 169$), and individuals registered as child victims tended to be younger still ($M = 44$ years; $SD = 13$; $n = 181$). Both of these differences were significant, $z = -2.48$, $p < .05$ and $z = -4.68$, $p < .001$, respectively.

Table 4 presents the distribution of individuals registered as victims of by gender. For both the full population and the two groups of interest, individuals registered as victims were much more likely to be women. This was especially true for those registered as victims of domestic violence; this group included a significantly greater percentage of women than did the full population of individuals registered as victims, $z = 4.67$, $p < .001$. This pattern of high representation of women is consistent with findings related to the relationship of victims registered as family/guardian to deceased individuals.

Table 4
Gender of Individuals Registered as Victims

Gender	Victim Type		
	Child ($n = 255$) ^a	Domestic Violence ($n = 248$) ^b	All Victims ($N = 2642$) ^c
Women	76%	87%	74%
Men	23%	13%	26%

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding. ^aGender was unavailable or unknown for 203 individuals registered as child victims.

^bGender was unavailable or unknown for 169 individuals registered as domestic violence victims. ^cGender was unavailable or unknown for 3537 individuals registered as victims.

⁸ Demographic analyses were conducted at the level of unique individuals registered as victims, rather than of cases. Only those individuals for whom demographic data were available were included in analyses.

Though data on racial background was available for only about one-sixth of the individuals registered as victims, race was also explored. As can be seen in Table 5, for both the full population of individuals registered as victims and for the two groups of interest, individuals registered as victims were predominantly White, followed distantly by Aboriginal. The distributions of race in the two groups of interest were not statistically compared to that of the full population given that the high proportion of missing race data prevented doing so with confidence.

Table 5
Race of Individuals Registered as Victims

Race	Victim Type		
	Child (<i>n</i> = 96) ^a	Domestic Violence (<i>n</i> = 87) ^b	All Victims (<i>N</i> = 1037) ^c
White	83%	76%	87%
Aboriginal	8%	10%	5%
Black	3%	-	2%
Other	5%	14%	6%

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding. ^aRace was unavailable or unknown for 362 individuals registered as child victims. ^bRace was unavailable or unknown for 330 domestic violence victims. ^cRace was unavailable or unknown for 5155 individuals registered as victims.

An analysis of the individuals registered as victims’ home languages demonstrated that English was the home language for about three-quarters of those for whom these data were available (see Table 6). Almost a quarter of individuals reported using French as their primary home language. Over a dozen other home languages were also reported, though none had endorsement rates attaining 1%; that said, Hindi and Punjabi were the two most frequently endorsed home languages after French and English. Again, high proportions of missing data precluded comparisons of the distributions of the two groups of interest to the full population of individuals registered as victims.

Table 6
Home Language of Individuals Registered as Victims

Home Language	Victim Type		
	Child (<i>n</i> = 123)	Domestic Violence (<i>n</i> = 132)	All Victims (<i>N</i> = 1319)
English	62%	70%	76%
French	37%	27%	22%
Other	1%	2%	2%

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding. ^aHome language was unavailable or unknown for 335 individuals registered as child victims. ^bHome language was unavailable or unknown for 284 individuals registered as domestic violence victims. ^cHome language was unavailable or unknown for 4873 individuals registered as victims.

The final demographic analyses were focused on geographic location. It should be noted that this examination focused on the *current* location of individuals registered as victims as opposed to the location where the offence occurred or where they resided at the time of registration. Moreover, to prevent the identification of any registered victims, location was reported only at a relatively high level – that is, at the provincial/territorial level.

As can be seen in Table 7, individuals registered as victims were most frequently located in Ontario (34% of the full population) or British Columbia (20%), followed by Quebec (12%) or Alberta (10%). Though certain differences were apparent in contrasting the two groups of interest with the full population of individuals registered as victims, these did not seem to follow a discernible pattern. Perhaps more interesting was contrasting the distribution of the individuals registered as victims’ location with the distribution of the Canadian population.

Table 7

Distribution of Locations of Individuals Registered as Victims, with Distribution of Canadian Population

Race	Victim Type			Canadian Population (2010)
	Child (n = 447) ^a	Domestic Violence (n = 403) ^b	All Victims (N = 6021) ^c	
British Columbia	18%	19%	20%	13%
Alberta	8%	10%	10%	11%
Saskatchewan	4%	4%	4%	3%
Manitoba	2%	3%	4%	4%
Ontario	40%	37%	34%	34%
Quebec	13%	11%	12%	23%
New Brunswick	9%	7%	6%	2%
Nova Scotia	5%	4%	5%	3%
Prince Edward Island	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Newfoundland and Labrador	-	2%	3%	1%
Yukon Territory	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%
Northwest Territories	-	<1%	<1%	<1%
Nunavut	-	-	<1%	<1%
United States	<1%	-	1%	N/A

Note. 'All victims' is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Canadian population data drawn from Statistics Canada (2010b). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding. ^aLocation was unavailable for 11 individuals registered as child victims. ^bLocation was unavailable for 14 individuals registered as domestic violence victims. ^cLocation was unavailable for 171 individuals registered as victims.

The right-most column of Table 7 shows the distribution of the Canadian population amongst provinces and territories (Statistics Canada, 2010b).⁹ Though there is variability in the prevalence of different types of crime across the country, a certain parallelism could nonetheless be expected between the geographic distributions of individuals registered as victims and of the Canadian population. That said, in comparing the victim data to the national population data, the

⁹ The distribution of the Canadian population was included rather than the distribution of crime given that the latter masks regional differences in *type* of crime and associated likelihood of victim registration. Population was also preferred given more recent numbers were available. Readers who wish to contrast the percentage of crime within region are referred to Evaluation Branch (2010).

percentage of individuals registered as victims located in Quebec was notably lower and the percentages in the Atlantic provinces and British Columbia notably higher than the Canadian population distribution would suggest.

Victimization-Related Information

Analyses then turned to the victimization-related data. First, it was noted that though most individuals registered to only one offender, some were registered to up to seven. On average, individuals in the full population of victims were registered to 1.08 offenders ($SD = 0.36$; range = 1-7; $N = 6192$). The average for those registered as child victims was slightly lower, at 1.04 ($SD = 0.24$; range = 1-4; $n = 458$), $z = -2.38$, $p < .05$, and that for individuals registered as victims of domestic violence even lower, at 1.02 ($SD = 0.15$; range = 1-2; $n = 417$), $z = -3.40$, $p < .01$.

The victim-offender relationship was then considered, where such information was available. Given that individuals registered to multiple offenders could have different relationships with each, these analyses were conducted by examining the cases of individuals registered as individuals rather than unique individuals. A considerably different pattern emerged for the two groups of interest than for the full population of cases, with, not surprisingly, many more of the cases in the two groups of interest having individuals registered as victims that were related to the offender. While only 33% of the full population of cases for whom these data were available ($N = 2428$) were related to the offender, this percentage increased dramatically to 63% of child victim cases for whom the data were available ($n = 234$) and 75% of domestic violence victim cases for whom the data were available ($n = 227$). Contrasts of the percentages of both the cases of individuals registered as child victim cases and as domestic violence victims with the percentages of the full population of cases demonstrated that the differences were statistically reliable, $z = 9.68$, $p < .001$ and $z = 13.53$, $p < .001$, respectively.

For the full population of cases, by far the most frequently reported relationship for the registered individual to have to the offender is that of ex-spouse (25%), followed by daughter (9%), ex-girlfriend (7%), sister-in-law (5%), and brother-in-law (5%). This order is generally consistent with that found for the domestic violence victim cases, with the most common category again being ex-spouse (33%), followed by ex-girlfriend (11%), sister-in-law (9%),

common-law spouse (5%) and wife (5%). As would be expected, for this group, nearly two-thirds of the victim cases (60%) corresponded to a category representing a current or previous romantic relationship (i.e., common-law spouse; ex-girlfriend, -boyfriend, or -spouse; girlfriend; or wife – the group included no victims registered as boyfriend or husband to the offender). Finally, the pattern for child victim cases was, not surprisingly, somewhat different, with the most common category being daughter (18%), followed by ex-spouse (14%).¹⁰

The next area of examination was of the number of offences of victimization on record. This analysis was conducted both at the level of cases of individuals registered as victims (which, in effect, results in a count of the number of offences of victimization on record per offender per victim) and for unique individuals registered as victims (which cumulates all the offences of victimization for each registered individual, regardless of the number of offenders represented). In interpreting these results, it is important to be aware that multiple offences of victimization can result from the same incident, both when an individual offender is convicted of multiple crimes stemming from one incident and when two or more offenders are each convicted for their participation in the same offence(s).

Table 8 presents the results of these analyses. Both the cases of individuals registered as child victims and of those registered as domestic violence victims had significantly more offences of victimization on record than did the full population of cases, $z = 5.57, p < .001$ and $z = 2.70, p < .05$, respectively. Second, considering the results of analyses at the level of unique individuals, the average number of offences of victimization for the full population of individuals registered as victims was 1.44, which did not differ statistically from that for those registered as domestic violence victims; the average number of offences of victimization for the individuals registered as child victims, however, remained significantly greater than that of the full population, $z = 4.01, p < .001$. These patterns are consistent with the finding, reported above, that those in the full population of cases of individuals registered as victims were more likely to be registered to multiple offenders.

¹⁰ Readers are reminded that the cases of individuals registered as child victims are any where the *actual* victim is a child, regardless of whether or not the individual registered as a victim is the now-adult child in question – in other words, a parent registered as a family/guardian victim on behalf of his or her child is considered an individual registered as a child victim in the context of this examination, which explains how ex-spouses can fall into this category.

Table 8

Mean Number of Offences of Victimization on Record

Victim Type	<i>n</i> ^a	Offences of Victimization on Record		
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	Range
Cases of Individuals Registered as Victims				
Child	470	1.60	1.30	1-12
Domestic Violence	418	1.47	1.18	1-11
All Victims	6453	1.33	1.05	1-17
Unique Individuals Registered as Victims				
Child	453	1.67	1.36	1-12
Domestic Violence	409	1.50	1.20	1-11
All Victims	5955	1.44	1.22	1-17

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. ^aOffence of victimization data were unavailable for 5 child victim (representing 4 unique individuals), 8 cases of individuals registered as domestic violence (8 unique individuals), and 239 cases of individuals registered as victim (237 unique individuals) from the full population of victims.

Follow-up analyses were conducted to examine the types of offences of victimization on record. Though these analyses were performed both at the level of cases and of unique individuals, only those at the level of unique individuals are reported here for reasons of concision. The differences between the results at the two levels of analysis were consistently very small, with only 5 of 29 differences in frequency between the corresponding pairs exceeding 0.5 percentage points’ difference. None exceeded 1.5 percentage points’ difference.

Table 9 presents the percentage of unique individuals registered as victims with each category of offence of victimization on record. Strikingly, the percentage of individuals registered as child victims with at least one sexual offence of victimization was more than three times greater than is the case for the full population (74% vs. 22%, $z = 27.00$, $p < .001$). In turn, greater percentages of individuals registered as victims of domestic violence had assault offences of victimization or threat of violence offences of victimization, a category that includes utter threats against a person and criminal harassment, than did the full population of victims (31% vs. 14%, $z = 10.08$, $p < .001$ and 15% vs. 10%, $z = 3.50$, $p < .01$, respectively). It was also notable that, relative to the full population, smaller percentages of individuals registered both as child victims and as domestic violence had offence causing death as their offence of victimization

(23% and 46% vs. 54%, $z = -13.10$, $p < .001$ and $z = -3.33$, $p < .01$ respectively).

Table 9

Distribution of Offences of Victimization on Record by Type of Individual Registered as Victim

Offence Category	Victim Type		
	Child ($n = 453$) ^a	Domestic Violence ($n = 409$) ^b	All Victims ($N = 5955$) ^c
Offence Causing Death	23%	46%	54%
Attempt Offence Causing Death	2%	8%	3%
Sexual Offence	74%	13%	22%
Deprivation of Freedom	3%	7%	4%
Assault	11%	31%	14%
Threat of Violence	3%	15%	10%
Property Offence	1%	5%	7%
Driving Offence	<1%	-	2%
Other Offence	2%	6%	5%

Note. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Percentages sum to more than 100 because individuals registered as victims can have more than one offence of victimization on record.

^aOffence of victimization data were unavailable for 4 individuals registered as child victims. ^bOffence of victimization data were unavailable for 8 individuals registered as domestic violence victims. ^cOffence of victimization data were unavailable for 237 individuals registered as victims from the full population.

Information Access

The average number of notifications – that is, of times that individuals registered as victims were contacted in order that information might be shared – was examined both at the level of cases and at the level of unique individuals.¹¹ As was the case in the analyses reported previously, results of analyses on cases of individuals registered as victims represent the number of notifications per offender to whom registered per victim, while those of unique individuals registered as victims cumulate across all offenders to whom the individual is registered.

As can be seen in Table 10, there was a very wide range in the number of notifications made, both when considering cases and unique individuals. In all cases, two-thirds or more of the notifications were made by CSC. Also notable was that individuals registered as victims of

¹¹ More than one piece of information can be conveyed during a notification; results of analyses on the average number of items of information disclosed are presented separately.

domestic violence received more notifications than did those in the full population, both when cases ($z = 4.62, p < .001$) and when unique individuals ($z = 2.86, p < .01$) were considered.

Table 10
Mean Number of Victim Notifications

Victim Type	Victim Notifications ^a					
	Notifications Made by CSC		Notifications Made by PBC		All Notifications	
	M (SD)	Range	M (SD)	Range	M (SD)	Range
Cases of Individuals Registered as Victims						
Child	16 (21)	0-194	6(6)	0-144	22 (25)	1-235
Domestic Violence	21 (25)	0-200	8 (8)	0-43	28 (29)	1-220
All Victims	16 (22)	0-334	7 (7)	0-65	23 (26)	1-353
Unique Individuals Registered as Victims						
Child	17 (22)	0-194	6 (6)	0-44	23 (26)	1-235
Domestic Violence	21 (26)	0-200	8 (7)	0-43	29 (31)	1-220
All Victims	17 (23)	0-334	7 (7)	0-65	25 (28)	1-353

Note. ^a Victims registered with either CSC or the PBC have access to information from both bodies; however, each provides notifications corresponding to the information they hold. ‘All victims’ is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. CSC = Correctional Service of Canada. PBC = Parole Board of Canada.

The final series of analyses focused on the number and specific types of items of information conveyed during a notification. Again, these analyses were performed both at the level of cases and of unique individuals, but given very small differences in results, are reported only at the level of unique individuals. Patterns with respect to the total number of items of information conveyed were consistent with those related to number of notifications, with individuals registered as victims of domestic violence being conveyed significantly more items of information than those in the full population of individuals registered as victims ($M = 62$ vs. $M = 53, z = 3.11, p < .01$). Again in keeping with results for notifications, the number of items of information conveyed to individuals registered as child victims ($M = 52$) was not significantly different than that conveyed to the full population of individuals.

Varying percentages of individuals registered as victims were disclosed specific types of information. This is related both to the information requested at registration and the offenders’

case details and progress. For instance, long term supervision information was conveyed to a relatively small percentage of individuals registered as victims, but this is not surprising as most offenders do not receive a long term supervision order and therefore would have no relevant information in this domain.

As can be seen in Table 11, information regarding institutional location was conveyed to almost all individuals registered as victims. Individuals were also frequently conveyed information regarding eligibility dates, offence, sentence status/length, escorted temporary absence, and full parole. Generally speaking, the percentages of individuals registered as victims in each of the two groups of interest that were disclosed information in specific areas seemed to approximate the percentages of the full population. That said, it appears that greater percentages of those registered as victims of domestic violence were conveyed information regarding whether the offender was or was not in custody, while greater percentages of those registered as child victims were conveyed information regarding the offender's name and information in the public domain. Greater percentages of both of these groups were disclosed information regarding escorted temporary absences, statutory release, and warrant expiry.

Analyses also demonstrated that individuals registered as victims were conveyed many distinct items of information related to certain areas, but fewer in other areas. On average, for individuals who were conveyed information regarding escorted temporary absences, 32 items of information in this category were conveyed. In order, this was followed by information regarding unescorted temporary absences ($M = 14$ items), trip permits ($M = 14$ items), long term supervision ($M = 12$ items), and day parole ($M = 8$ items). These patterns were consistent across the two groups of interest and the full population of individuals registered as victims.

Table 11

Percentage of Individuals Registered as Victims to Whom Information Disclosed

Information Category	Victim Type		
	Child (<i>n</i> = 475)	Domestic Violence (<i>n</i> = 426)	All Victims (<i>N</i> = 6692)
Offender Name	52%	48%	46%
Offender Age	21%	24%	22%
Offence	64%	67%	65%
Institutional Location	90%	94%	90%
Province, if Exchange of Service Agreement	3%	5%	3%
Sentence Status/Length	65%	67%	65%
Information in Public Domain	34%	29%	24%
Court	37%	37%	34%
Appeal	<1%	1%	1%
Sentence Reduction	2%	2%	2%
In Custody	32%	44%	38%
Not in Custody	7%	19%	11%
Eligibility Dates	71%	74%	71%
Escorted Temporary Absence	68%	70%	61%
Unescorted Temporary Absence	12%	14%	16%
Work Release	6%	7%	7%
Day Parole	40%	43%	41%
Full Parole	64%	58%	60%
Post Suspension	7%	17%	13%
Trip Permit	25%	31%	27%
Statutory Release	56%	51%	44%
Detention	5%	7%	5%
Warrant Expiry Date	44%	42%	35%
Long Term Supervision	3%	5%	2%

Note. 'All victims' is a total category and includes the child and domestic violence victims. Categories of information disclosed to less than one percent of victims (death, deportation, Section 810, decision no release) are not included.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to create a profile of child victims and domestic violence victims identified by Victim Services Officers, and to contrast this profile with that of the full population of victims to make out differences and similarities. Overall, the two groups of interest differed from the full population in all four areas examined: registration, demographics, victimization-related information, and information access.

Before reviewing results, however, it is important to acknowledge once again that demographic data were missing for a considerable number of victims. This is explainable both by the fact that demographic information only began to be collected in September 2009 and by the fact that the provision of this information is voluntary. Given that it is impossible to know if and how the victims for whom data were missing differ from those for whom data were available, caution is necessary in interpreting the results of analyses focused on victims' demographic characteristics.

That said, analyses suggested that individuals registered as child victims were more likely to be registered as actual victims, to be younger, and to be French-speaking than the full population of victims. Nearly two-thirds were related to their offender, most commonly being the offender's daughter or ex-spouse.¹² On average, child victims had more offences of victimization on record, with the most common offence of victimization being a sexual offence. In fact, the percentage of child victims with a sexual offence of victimization was over three times greater than the percentage thereof in the full population of victims. Child victims tended to receive similar numbers of information notifications with similar content as the full population of victims, though slightly higher percentages received basic information such as the offender's name and information in the public domain.

In turn, individuals registered as domestic violence victims were also more likely than the full population of victims to be registered as actual victims and to have registered a victim representative. They were also slightly younger, more likely to be women, and more likely to be Aboriginal or of a visible minority. Not surprisingly, on average, domestic violence victims were registered to the lowest number of offenders and were most likely to be related to the

¹² The ex-spouse registrations can be explained by registration on behalf of deceased or incapacitated children or children under the age of 18.

offender. Nearly two-thirds of the time, the registered victim's relationship to the offender represented a current or previous romantic relationship (i.e., common law spouse; ex-boyfriend, -girlfriend, or -spouse; girlfriend; or, spouse). Relative to the full population of victims, greater percentages of victims of domestic violence had offences of victimization in the assault or threat of violence categories, the latter of which includes criminal harassment. Finally, domestic violence victims tended to receive a higher number of victim notifications and to be conveyed more information, both overall and specifically with respect to whether the offender was or was not in custody.

Completion of these profiles serves several purposes. First, the profiles allow for a better understanding of the victims registered with CSC and the Parole Board of Canada, thereby facilitating outreach services, communication, and the provision of client-matched services generally (Hill, 2010). For instance, knowing that child victims are more likely to be French-speaking or that victims of domestic violence are more likely to be of an ethnocultural category other than White or Black may be useful in planning the publication and distribution of specific information materials created for these groups of victims. This is especially pertinent given the recent evaluation of the National Victim Services Program resulted in the conclusion that 'outreach methods and communication measures to facilitate information sharing need to be enhanced in order to reach a growing diverse population' (Evaluation Branch, 2010, p. 3).

Second, the victim sub-group profiles might also be helpful in terms of workload resourcing for Victim Service Officers. The relative differences in numbers and types of victim notifications associated with the groups of interest may translate into different time and resource needs in dealing with victims of various types.

Third, the profiles serve to confirm the existence of very distinct sub-groups of victims within the pool of registered victims. While the information included on the full population of victims is revealing and useful in its own right, the profiles demonstrate that the population of victims is not homogeneous and underscore the importance of considering groups within this population. This is further highlighted by the fact that the examination of the two subgroups of interest in the present report was only possible when the victims falling within each subgroup were identified by the Victim Service Officers. It would have been impossible, using the automated data maintained by CSC or the Parole Board of Canada, to accurately identify the victims comprising these sub-groups. Similarly, it is impossible, using the available data, to

extrapolate from the sub-groups identified by the Victim Services Officers the total numbers of child victims and victims of domestic violence within the full population of victims – or, for that matter, to project numbers to the full population of offenders. Moreover, the inability to identify all victims in each of the two sub-groups of interest introduces the possibility that the victims identified by the Victim Services Officers differ in some way from child and domestic violence victims within the full population of victims, thereby introducing error into the profile. The extent to which this occurred is not known.

Nonetheless, the present study underscores both the importance of considering specific sub-groups of victims and a significant challenge to doing so with the presently-available data. While Victim Services significantly expanded the data collected on victims in September 2009, further data collection refinements according to victim sub-groups might be possible.

Until such time as richer data on sub-groups of victims become available, it is also possible to draw conclusions by focusing on the full population of victims. Though the inclusion of this group in the present study was intended primarily to allow for identification of ways in which victims of domestic violence and child victims differed from other victims, consideration of results from the full population can be informative in its own right.

Specifically, examining the demographic characteristics of this population suggests that the distribution of registered victims is not consistent with expectations, which may, in turn, identify opportunities for greater outreach. Most obvious was the under-representation of men amongst registered victims. Though men are somewhat more likely to be victims of crime than are women (Perrault & Brennan, 2010), women use victim services more frequently (Sauvé, 2009), perhaps because women report more emotional impacts of crime (AuCoin & Beauchamp, 2007; Pimlott-Kubiak & Cortina, 2003) and emotional support is among the types of assistance most provided by victim service agencies (Sauvé, 2009). Nonetheless, certain male victims may find registration as a victim and the information sharing associated with it to be helpful, and this may be an area where outreach efforts could be focused.

In addition, victims tended to be under-represented in Quebec and over-represented in British Columbia and the Atlantic provinces, relative to the Canadian population (Statistics Canada, 2010b). The over-representation of victims in British Columbia may be at least partially explained by the over-representation of life- and indeterminately-sentenced offenders – as a proxy for more serious offences and therefore a higher likelihood of having a registered victims

– in the Pacific region (Young, Broom, & Ruddell, in press) and of higher rates of victim services outreach activities in British Columbia (Evaluation Branch, 2010). That said, Quebec's under-representation is less easily explained, and, as such, this may be another area worthy of exploration of outreach efforts.

Finally, the distribution of ethnocultural categories within the victim population did not match either that of the Canadian population or what could be expected based on what is known about victimization in different ethnic groups. Specifically, as of the 2006 Canadian census, 16% of the Canadian population was of a visible minority (excluding Aboriginal; Statistics Canada, 2009), but only 8% of registered victims were of an ethnicity other than White or Aboriginal. Moreover, while the proportion of Aboriginal victims within the sample, 5%, is consistent with what would be expected from the census (4%; Statistics Canada, 2010a), this is a group that may have been expected to be over-represented among victims given that greater percentages of Aboriginal people than of their non-Aboriginal counterparts are victims of violent crimes (Brzozowski et al., 2006). Again, attention to these details may serve to identify groups of victims who may benefit from learning about the National Victim Services Program.

Conclusions

Overall, this examination of victims of domestic violence and child victims allowed for the identification of the manner in which each differed from the full population of victims. Perhaps more importantly, the results demonstrate that differences do exist among types of victims and thereby underscore the importance of considering and acknowledging diversity within the victim population. Doing so will facilitate outreach, communication, and provision of victim services. Improvements and expansions in victim-related data collection may be required in order to meet this goal.

References

- AuCoin, K. (2005). Children and youth as victims of violent crime. *Juristat*, 25(1). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- AuCoin, K., & Beauchamp, D. (2007). Impacts and consequences of victimization, GSS 2004. *Juristat*, 27(1). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Blanchard, E. B., Hickling, E. J., Mitnick, N., Taylor, A. E., Loos, W. R., & Buckley, T. C. (1995). The impact of severity of physical injury and perception of life threat in the development of post-traumatic stress disorder in motor vehicle accident victims. *Behavioral Research Therapy*, 33, 529-534.
- Brzozowski, J., Taylor-Butts, A., & Johnson, S. (2006). Victimization and offending among the Aboriginal population in Canada. *Juristat*, 26(3). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act. (1992). <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2010a). *History of victim services*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/victims-victimes/hvs-hsv-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2010b). *The role of victims of crime in the correctional process*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/victims-victimes/rvcp-rvpc-eng.shtml>
- Criminal Code*, R.S., 2011, c. 34, s. 722. <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/>
- Davis, R. C., Kunreuther, F., & Connick, E. (1984). Expanding the victim's role in the criminal court dispositional process: The results of an experiment. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 75, 491-505.
- Erez, E., & Roberts, J. (2007). Victim participation in the criminal justice system. In R. Davis, A. Lurigio, & S. Herman (Eds.), *Victims of Crime* (3rd ed., pp. 277-288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Evaluation Branch (2010). *Evaluation report: National victim services program* (File #394-2-64). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Felson, R. B., & Paré, P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 597-610.
- Herman, S. (2003). The mental health of crime victims: Impact of legal intervention. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 16, 159-166.
- Herman, S., & Wasserman, C. (2001). A role for victims in offender reentry. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47, 428-445.

- Hill, J. K. (2010). *Working with victims of crime: A manual applying research to clinical practice* (2nd ed.). Ottawa, ON: Department of Justice Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/pcvi-cpcv/pub/res-rech/pdf/hill.pdf>
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Beatty, D., & Howley, S. S. (1998). The rights of crime victims-Does legal protection make a difference? *Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/pubs-sum/173839.htm>
- Li, K. (2005). Costs of crime in Canada – An update. *Just Research*, 12, 56-57. Ottawa, ON: Department of Justice Canada.
- Miller, T. R., Cohen, M. A., & Rossman, S. B. (1993). Victim costs of violent crime and resulting injuries. *Health Affairs*, 12(4), 186-197.
- Nemr, R. (2009). Fact sheet – Police-reported family violence against children and youth. In Statistics Canada, *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile* (Catalogue No. 85-224-X; pp. 32-41). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Parole Board of Canada. (2010). *NPB Policy Manual*. Ottawa, ON : Parole Board of Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.pbc-clcc.gc.ca/infocntr/policym/PolicyManual.pdf>
- Perreault, S., & Brennan, S. (2010). Criminal victimization in Canada, 2009. *Juristat*, 30(4). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Pimlott-Kubiak, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2003). Gender, victimization, and outcomes: Reconceptualizing risk. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 528-539.
- Resnick, H. S., Kilpatrick, D. G., Dansky, B. S., Saunders, B. E., & Best, C. L. (1993). Prevalence of civilian trauma and posttraumatic stress disorder in a representative national sample of women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 984-991.
- Sauvé, J. (2009). Victim services in Canada, 2007/2008. *Juristat*, 29(4). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2010a). *Aboriginal identity population by age groups, median age, and sex*. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/hlt/97-558/pages/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo=PR&Code=01&Table=1&Data=Dist&Sex=1&Age=1&StartRec=1&Sort=2&Display=Page>.
- Statistics Canada. (2010b). *Population by year, by province and territory*. Retrieved from <http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/101/cst01/demo02a-eng.htm>.
- Taylor-Butts, A. (2009). Fact sheet – Police-reported spousal violence in Canada. In Statistics Canada, *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile* (Catalogue No. 85-224-X; pp. 24-31). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.

- Trainor, C. (2001). *Victims' use of justice and social service* (Cat. No. 85-553-XIE). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection-R/Statcan/85-553-XIE/0019985-553-XIE.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General Audit Division. (2008). *The Department of Justice's victim notification system* (Rep. 08-04). Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/oig/reports/EOUSA/a0804/final.pdf>
- Wasserman, E., & Ellis, C. A. (2007). Impact of crime on victims. In A. Liew (Eds.), *Participant text: National victim assistance academy*. Retrieved from http://www.ccvv.state.vt.us/joomla/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=12
- Wemmers, J. (2009). Where do they belong? Giving victims a place in the criminal justice process. *Criminal Law Forum*, 20, 395-416.
- Young, M.M., Broom, I., & Ruddell, R. (in press). *Offenders serving life and indeterminate sentences: Snapshot (2009) and changing profile (1998 to 2008)* (Report R-231). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.