

EXPLORATORY STUDY OF VICTIM ADVOCACY PRACTICES, STRATEGIES,
RESISTANCE AND RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CRIME VICTIM SERVICE
AGENCIES

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School

University of Missouri – Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Elizabeth Wilson, MSW, LCSW

Dr. Martha Markward, Dissertation Advisor

JULY 2009

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

EXPLORATORY STUDY OF VICTIM ADVOCACY PRACTICES, STRATEGIES,
RESISTANCE AND RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CRIME VICTIM SERVICE
AGENCIES

Presented by Elizabeth Ford Wilson,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy, and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Martha Markward

Professor Judith Davenport

Professor Larry Krueger

Professor Dong Pil Yoon

Professor John Galliher

I would like to thank my family for their support throughout my educational journeys. To my mother, thank you for the hours of listening to me as I tried to juggle being a mother, worker and student. It was comforting to know that at *anytime* I could call you and you would listen. To my father, thank you for supporting my education and encouraging me to go further. You have instilled in me a love of learning, and a love for the University of Missouri. A special thank you to my big sister Susan, whose late night IM conversations kept me going and laughing. You consistently provided me comfort, motivation and support. You are an inspiration and I thank you. Thank you to my sister Carol, who always had encouraging words and positive energy. To my dear friend and colleague, Kalea Benner, there are no words to thank you enough for your friendship and support. I could not have gone through this process without a friend like you, with whom I share so much in common. We started this journey together and I am so proud that we both have accomplished what we set out to do. Thank you for all of your encouraging words, understanding, listening, advice, and most importantly friendship. Finally, the most special thank you is for my husband Jon, and children Riley, Lindy, and Benjamin. It has been a long five years and I could never have accomplished this without your love and support. Thank you for all of your patience during times of great pressure and stress. Jon – thank you for standing by me and allowing me the time and freedom to accomplish my goals. Riley- I would like to thank you for helping around the house, and for taking care of your sister and brother when I needed to study or write. Lindy – thank you for making me laugh when I wanted to cry! I could always count on you to cheer me up and make me smile. Benjamin- to my son who has never known his mommy not to be in school, thank you being patient and lying next to me on the couch many, many nights while I

wrote. I will always treasure those times. Without the support of my entire family, this would not have been possible

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a debt of gratitude to many special people who helped me through my doctoral education. Most importantly, I would like to give a heartfelt thank you to my Chair, Professor Martha Markward for the guidance, knowledge, mentoring and friendship that she shared with me throughout my doctoral education. Professor Markward introduced me to the world of research and opened my eyes to many possibilities. She was instrumental in guiding me from a practitioner, to educator, to researcher. It was she, who helped me develop the research idea for this study and spent numerous hours with me brainstorming, strategizing and planning my project. I have the utmost respect for Dr. Markward. As an educator and my advisor, she set high standards for me and challenged me to do better than I ever thought I could. At times when I needed redirection, Professor Markward steered me in the right path and helped me regain my focus. Dr. Markward always had confidence in my abilities even when I did not. She spent countless hours on editing and revisions, and selflessly gave her time to allow me to complete my dissertation in a timely manner. Her constructive feedback was prompt and truthful. I am eternally grateful for the hours of time she spent with me, mentoring me, advising me, discussing my research, my career plans, my family, and my life. To Dr. Markward I say, *thank you*.

I would like to thank the other members of my committee for their guidance and contribution to my research. Thank you to Professor Judith Davenport, who was always supportive of my project and provided numerous editing suggestions and constructive feedback. Her expertise in rural social work community issues influenced part of my research. Her kind words were extremely encouraging. Thank you to Dr. Dong Pil Yoon for teaching me statistics and allowing me to present my study to his class to help me

prepare for my defense. Dr. Yoon always provided quick feedback or answers to statistical questions, and his explanations and patience was comforting. I would like to thank Dr. Larry Krueger for his assistance on my research. Dr. Krueger provided me with challenging questions and helpful constructive feedback to improve my study. I greatly appreciate his contribution and encouragement. Finally, thank you to Dr. John Galliher who agreed to serve as an outside member of my committee. His expertise in the criminal justice system contributed to my development of this study. Dr. Galliher allowed me to focus on my research topic while in his class, and present the victims' view of the criminal justice system. I am grateful for his patience, kindness, encouragement and willingness to help me with my education.

I would like to acknowledge the University of Missouri School of Social Work faculty and staff for encouraging me throughout my studies while I was employed there. It was through my job as a teaching faculty member that I became interested in pursuing my doctorate and conducting research. I appreciate the rich educational environment in which I worked, that encouraged me to further my education and accomplish my goals.

A special thank you goes to my current co-workers and friends at William Woods University. To George and Harriet, thank you for being such fantastic co-workers. I appreciate the support and encouragement that you gave me daily. Thank you for helping me “man the ship” when I needed to focus on completing my dissertation. Your friendship and laughter helped me through challenging times.

I am truly blessed to have had so many wonderful Professors and co-workers who have been supportive of my educational endeavors. You have all helped me in numerous ways become a better student, educator and researcher. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES vii

ABSTRACT viii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

 Purpose of the Study

 Statement of the Problem

 Significance of the Study

 Research Questions

 Assumptions

 Limitations

 Delimitations

 Theoretical Definitions

 Operational Definitions

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 9

 I. Social Work and Crime Victim Advocacy

 a) Crime Victims and Advocacy

 II. Advocacy for Crime Victims at Multiple Levels

 a) Policy Advocacy

 b) Administrative Advocacy

 c) Individual Advocacy

 III. Advocacy Strategies and Resistance

 IV. Advocacy Strategies

- a) Normative
- b) Utilitarian
- c) Conflict
- d) Resistance

V. Summary

3. METHOD OF STUDY26

- I. Pilot Study
- II. Participants
- III. Materials
- a) Validity
- b) Reliability
- IV. Design
- a) Data Collection
- b) Data Analysis

4. RESULTS34

- I. Type of Advocacy Level by Frequency of Use
- II. Type of Advocacy Strategy by Frequency of Use
- III. Frequency of Participants’ Relationship with Other Agencies
- IV. Significant Differences in Relationships with Agencies
- V. Prosecutor Office and Relationships with Agencies
- VI. Law Enforcement and Relationships with Agencies
- VII. Other Agencies and Relationships
- VIII. Resistance to Advocacy by Frequency Experienced

5. DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS42

- I. Discussion

- a) Characteristics of Advocates
- b) Types of Advocacy
- c) Advocacy Strategies
- d) Relationships
- e) Resistance in Advocacy

II, Conclusions

III. Implications

REFERENCE LIST	50
APPENDIX.....	
1. TABLES.....	56
2. ADVOCACY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	66
VITA.....	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Characteristics of Advocacy Agencies.....	54
2. Characteristics of Participants.....	55
3. Percent of Participants by Level of Advocacy and Frequency of Use	56
4. Type of Advocacy by Frequency of Use.....	57
5. Percent of Participants by Type of Advocacy Strategy and Frequency of use.....	58
6. Type of Advocacy Strategy by Frequency of Use.....	59
7. Use of Advocacy Strategy by Type of Advocacy Agency.....	60
8. Percent of Participants by Type of Advocacy Agency and Advocacy Relationship.....	61
9. Mean Ratings of Participants by Type of Advocacy Agency and Type of Advocacy.....	62
10. Percent of Participants by Resistance to Advocacy Experienced by Agency.....	63

Abstract

Social work has long been a field of advocacy, and has progressively integrated into the crime victim advocacy movement by practicing in domestic violence shelters, prosecutors' offices, law enforcement, child advocacy centers and community agencies. This study surveyed 110 victim advocates employed in these agencies to examine the practice of advocacy within the individual, administrative and policy levels, strategies of practice, agency relationships, and resistance to advocacy between agencies. Results show victim advocates practice at all advocacy levels, use all strategies of advocacy, and have mostly allied relationships. Differences in advocacy strategies and relationships were found in rural areas, where advocates are more likely to use moral reasoning and value-based advocacy, have more adversarial relationships with law enforcement and prosecutors' offices, and experience more resistance. Recommendations include implementing multidisciplinary training, development of professional advocate standards, increased communication among agencies and implications for policy and future research.

Chapter 1

Social workers are challenged to advocate for victims of crime within the context of the crime victim rights movement. This movement involved the development of the victimology field, victim compensation programs, the women's movement, the rise of crime that accompanied by parallel dissatisfaction with the criminal justice system, and, the growth of victim activism (Young and Stein, 2004). The development of victimology produced research on the effects of crime, fear of crime, treatment and support plans for those victimized, and education for service providers. More importantly, the development of victimology served as the need for advocacy in this movement.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the advocacy strategies among organizations in the criminal justice system, law enforcement, shelters, child advocacy centers and community based centers, including faith-based agencies. Sosin and Calhoun's (1979, 1983) theories on advocacy strategies served as a foundation for this study. They suggested that advocacy strategies are selected based on the relationships between agencies, and that advocates will experience resistance to such strategies. Sosian and Calhoun (1983) also noted that advocates may practice these strategies on the micro, macro and mezzo level. The objectives of this study sought to identify levels at which at which victim advocacy occurs, how advocacy strategies are utilized, the relationships between agencies and the levels of resistance to change advocates' experience.

Conceptual Framework

Advocacy is a concept proposed by a number of researchers (Davidson & Rapp, 1976; Dodd, 2004; Ezell 1994; Freddolino, Moxely & Hyduk, 2004; Gameson, 1968; Lens, 2005; Malekoff, 2000; Minkoff, 1994; Sosin, 1979, Sosin & Calhoun, 1983). Gameson (1968) proposed that advocacy strategies may be normative and based on shared values and beliefs, utilitarian, consisting of bargaining to influence others, or coercive and based on conflict and complaints to try to influence others. Davidson and Rapp (1976) introduced the concept of individual, administrative, or the policy levels of advocacy. More recently, Sosin (1979, 1983) suggested that advocacy is contingent on the relationships between the advocate and the decision maker and may result in relationships categorized as alliance, neutral, or adversarial. Within the framework that advocacy is defined by the Encarta Dictionary (2008) as giving aid to a case or cause, this study attempted to discover what advocacy strategies crime victim advocates utilize, and whether the relationships between agencies have an impact on advocacy strategies and resistance to advocacy efforts that advocates experience.

Statement of Problem

Numerous studies suggest that advocacy is a component of most groups that address the needs of crime victims (Weed, 1992; Johnson, 1997); Murphy, 2001; Carr, Logio, & Maier, 2003; Danis, 2006). Groups address the needs of domestic violence, sexual assault/rape, child maltreatment, and victims of violent crimes. The term advocate defined by the Encarta Dictionary (2008) as somebody who supports or speaks in favor of something or who acts or intercedes on behalf of another. Within the groups that serve crime victims, most appear to have the term advocate in their direct service worker role

titles, however there has not been a study that examines relationships between the various advocates working together on behalf of victims of crime. The National Office for Victims of Crime (2001) has set forth responsibilities for crime victim advocates, however, several studies show the ineffectiveness of advocacy, or lack thereof, for crime victims is due to a variety of reasons including unawareness by criminal justice personnel of victim rights' laws and local services (Kilpatrick, Beatty, & Howley, 1998) and conflict with understanding an advocate's role in the legal system (Simonson 1994).

Although state laws and amendments have contributed to the collectiveness of the national crime victim movement (NVCAP 2004), little research has been conducted to understand advocacy within the larger movement. While many studies have been conducted to understand characteristics, roles, and responsibilities of crime victim advocates practicing within various organizations, there is still a gap in the literature with regard to the levels at which advocacy occurs, relationships between advocacy agencies, the strategies advocates use, and the resistance they encounter in the process of advocating for the individual(s) or groups.

Significance of the Study

According to the National Center for Victims of Crime (2004) in 2002, there were 23 million criminal victimizations in the United States. Forty-nine percent of the violent crime and 40% of the property crime were reported to police. This statistic suggested that more than half of crimes committed were not reported to the police. This phenomenon had a dramatic impact on community domestic violence shelters, as many victims who utilized shelter services did not report their crime to law enforcement. The National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards (1992) has estimated that forty-eight

million dollars were spent in 1991 for mental health care for crime victims. A report submitted by Miller, Cohen, and Wiersema (1996) to the United States Department of Justice estimated that between 10 and 20 percent of mental health care expenditures in the United States may be attributable to crime, primarily to victims treated as a result of their victimization. While estimates do not include any treatment for perpetrators of violence, they show the need to identify and understand effective advocacy strategies to ensure support, empowerment, and social justice for crime victims.

Given these data, the results of this study have implications for social work policy, practice, and research. In terms of policy, the Office for Victims of Crime and the National Association of Social Work (NASW, 2006) (Danis, 2006) published a guide for social work and victim advocacy that linked social work practice and victim advocacy on an individual, administrative, and policy level (Garkawe, 2004). Johnson (1997) highlighted the social worker role in the legal system to assist victims of crime (see also Carr, Logio, & Maier, 2003; Murphy, 2001).

A pilot study was conducted in preparation for this dissertation and suggested many areas for future research including examining relationships between domestic violence shelters and prosecutors' offices as to whether child advocacy centers are using more coercive methods of advocacy and whether victim advocates in prosecutors' offices experience more resistance within their own agencies than from other advocacy groups.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the advocacy strategies among organizations in the criminal justice system, including, law enforcement agencies, domestic violence shelters, child-advocacy centers and community-based victim service

agencies. The objectives of the study were to identify the levels at which advocacy occurs, how advocacy strategies are utilized, the relationships between the victim service agencies, and the levels of resistance that advocates have experienced as a result of their efforts. The following questions guided the study.

1. What is the frequency with which crime victim advocates practice at the individual, administrative, and policy levels, and to what extent do advocates vary in their practice by individual characteristics and environmental conditions?

2. What is the frequency with which crime victim advocates utilize normative, utilitarian, or coercive types of strategies, and to what extent do advocates vary in the strategies they use by individual characteristics and environmental conditions?

3. What is the frequency with which crime victim advocates are allies, neutral, or adversarial in relationships with other agencies, and to what extent does the type of resistance in practice vary by individual characteristics and environmental conditions?

Assumptions

For this dissertation, it was assumed that participants would answer the questions truthfully and would be practicing advocacy for crime victims in some form, employed in an agency categorized as one of the following: a child-advocacy center, domestic violence shelter, prosecutor's office, community agency, or law enforcement agency. Assumptions were made that agencies chosen in the sample would have access to the internet to complete the questionnaire utilizing Survey-Monkey, an on-line data collection website. It was assumed that the directors of these agencies would forward the request to participate in this study to the advocates employed in the agencies. Finally, assumptions were made that the participants' reflections would match their advocacy

actions, and that the participants would understand the terms on the survey and that the questions would be relevant to their experience as an advocate.

Limitations

There are numerous limitations when considering the results of this study. First, self-reporting biases were inherent in the design. Another limitation of the study was the fact that many rural areas do not have victim advocates employed in their agencies, or may not have a child advocacy center or domestic violence shelter in their county. Sending the questionnaire invitation to the agency may have limited the number of participants if the directors did not forward the invitation on to the direct advocate staff. This could have limited the responses and participants of the study. Another limitation in the design was that once the email was sent to the agency, there was no way to know if it was received, opened, and read. It was unknown if someone forwarded the email to members of the agency or other agencies in their community that were not original members of the selected sample. After the initial emails were sent to selected agencies, approximately 40 of the emails were returned with incorrect addresses. To address this problem, agencies were called, websites and lists were searched for alternative email addresses, and as a result, all but three correct email addresses were sent the survey.

Delimitations

Taking into consideration the limitations present, the researcher attempted to minimize the limitations by assuring the participants' identities were anonymous in an attempt to reduce self-reporting biases. A stratified random sample was utilized based on agency type (child advocacy centers, prosecutors' offices, shelters, and community agencies) and by location in the state to ensure a proportionate representative sample.

After excluding the pilot study participants, agencies were selected at random from the population. To increase participation, a follow-up emails were sent to agencies one week after the initial invitation email was sent asking them to participate by a specific deadline.

Theoretical Definitions

Individual advocacy: This is the act of advocating for an individual case to bring about change or a desired outcome (Sosin & Calhoun, 1983; Davidson & Rapp, 1976).

Administrative advocacy: This is the practice of advocating within an organization for a specific population or cause, such as drunken driving victims or victims of domestic violence (Sosin & Calhoun, 1983; Davidson & Rapp, 1976).

Policy advocacy: This is a process of advocating for a policy change on behalf of an issue or group of people to enhance services or gain access to services otherwise not available (Sosin & Calhoun, 1983; Davidson & Rapp, 1976).

Advocacy strategy: This encompasses approaches to persuasion and influencing decisions on behalf of another (Sosin & Calhoun, 1983).

Normative strategy: This involves the use of moral arguments and recognition of common values to influence another professional or agency on behalf of a case or cause (Sosin & Calhoun, 1983; Gameson, 1968).

Utilitarian strategy: This strategy involves the use of bargaining and negotiation to influence another professional or agency on behalf of a case, or cause (Sosin & Calhoun, 1983; Gameson, 1968).

Conflict / Complaints approach: This strategy uses conflict and complaints to influence another professional or agency on behalf of a case, or cause (Sosin & Calhoun, 1983, Gameson, 1968).

Operational Definitions

Prosecutor's office based victim assistance programs: These are comprised of at least one victim advocate who may be part-time or full-time who acts on behalf of a victim of a crime, whose case is being prosecuted through the criminal justice system.

Law enforcement, victim assistance program: These employ victim advocates who work with victims of crimes that the local law enforcement department is investigating.

Community, victim service agency: These consist of community based victim centers that offer multiple-level advocacy, as well as counseling and support for victims of crime and their families.

Domestic violence shelters: These employ victim advocates who advocate on behalf of clients, mostly women and children, who are victims of domestic violence and often sexual assault.

Child-advocacy Centers: Employ advocates who are involved in child abuse case-management and advocacy on behalf of children who are victims of a crime.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Social work and crime victim advocacy

Johnson (1997) studied the effects of victim participation in the criminal justice system, concluded that victims may benefit from the involvement of professionals, in addition to the criminal justice system, and supported that social work is pushing to expand the social worker role the criminal justice field. Danis (2003, 2006) was more specific and provided social workers with increased knowledge of the criminal justice system and presented practical tools, skills and methods of advocacy in her Office of Victims of Crime Toolkit aimed at social workers working with victims of crime.

Whether a social worker chooses to advocate on an individual, administrative, or policy level, and regardless of the advocacy strategies employed, Lens (2005) suggested that social workers needed to be able to effectively argue and represent themselves in the public arena. She suggested communication strategies for social workers to use when advocating for a cause including using empirical fact-based evidence and moral arguments (Lens, 2005).

The Office of Victims of Crime offers numerous recommendations to bridge social work and crime victim advocacy, including incorporating crime victim rights information into the social work curriculum and assignments, offering elective courses in social work on crime victimization, inviting guest speakers to present, and encouraging collaboration between social work and community organizations (Danis, 2006). This dissertation attempts to further the growing knowledge of social work and victim advocacy levels, strategies employed, and resistance experienced.

A recent study of 120 U.S. Child Advocacy Centers, revealed that over 50% of the Child Advocacy Center Directors had experience in social work practice, and 22% of directors had a masters degree in social work (Jackson, 2004). According to Jackson's study, over 95% of the agencies practiced some type of victim advocacy and over 80% of the child advocacy centers had a position of victim advocate on their team.

Crime Victims and Advocacy

The first victim compensation program was created in 1965 through California state legislation (Office for Victims of Crime, 2000). The focus of the law was to hold the offender accountable through fines to the court. Later emphasis focused on victims receiving monetary restitution for damages suffered. Creation of the Crime Victim Compensation program was a critical landmark for victim rights because it encouraged a grass roots organizational movement to become a successful, government recognized, social movement. By judicial ordering and enforcement of crime victim rights, the movement gained legitimacy within the criminal justice system (Wood, 1997).

The victim movement continued to grow in the 1970's in tandem with the other rights movements: civil rights, gay lesbian rights, and women's rights (Wood, 1997). This decade had multiple focal points for specific groups advocating for their agendas, while not quite working together to align this common interests. The 1980's however, brought critical changes when many grass roots organizations emerged, including Mothers against Drunk Driving (MADD), and bureaucratic organizations, such as Office for Victims of Crime (OVC), were funded through federal dollars earmarked for victims of crime services (Office for Victims of Crime, 2000).

During this decade, OVC created the first crime victim rights week observation and began networking and providing services to other service providers across the country. The Victims of Crime Act (1984) was the first national act that provided rights for victims of crime, including guaranteed services and rights for victims of crime under each branch of law enforcement including local law enforcement, corrections, prosecution, probation and parole, and state victim compensation boards. Smith and Huff (1992) note that a strong victim rights movement was well underway, attempting to balance the criminal justice system offender rights versus victim rights.

As a function of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, law enforcement, prosecutors' offices, jails, and prisons were mandated to provide rights for victims of crime. These included, but were not limited to, information about the crime and case status, notification of court dates, the right to be present at court dates, the right to crime victim compensation, the right to speedy recovery of personal property, the right to restitution, the right to provide a victim impact statement. Each state and local jurisdiction was responsible for implementation of victim rights (Victims of Crime Act, 1984) although mandated by federal law. Further, many states adopted constitutional amendments outlining specific automatic, or requested, victim rights and responsibilities of advocacy agencies. This created unequal access to services for victims of crime depending on the state in which they resided.

Kilpatrick, Beatty, and Howely, (1998) noted that many criminal justice personnel were still unaware of victim's rights laws and local services in the 1990's. The Victim of Crime Act of 1984 also authorized the Crime Victim Compensation fund within each state, supported through court fines, and fees collected from the perpetrator. Discretion of

the funds was left up to each state, however the federal guidelines ensure that all programs provide financial support for victims of crime for crime-related expenses including, medical bills, lost wages, mental health counseling, and funeral expenses (Office for Victims of Crime, 2000).

Smith and Huff (1992) suggested that the victim rights movement during the 1980s drifted away slightly from its original “rights” ideologies of the civil rights and the women’s movements. Rather, the movement began to focus on more of a conservative, law and order social frame. In the 1990s, there was a focus on offender punishment and an increase in federal funding for crime victim programs within both state and local bureaucracies, as well as not-for-profit agencies and shelters. With the increase in funding, there was an increase in the number of organizations serving victims. There was also an increase in educational programs and an emphasis on professionalizing victim advocacy.

However, there is currently a divide in the victim assistance movement regarding professionalism in the field. Historically, people who worked in the victim services field may have included survivors of crime who wanted to give back and assist others who had been a victim (Johnson, 1997). Patterning advocacy organizing from the Mothers against Drunk Driving, many shelter workers, hotline workers, and court advocates have lived through violence and crime and are able to provide a sense of support for victims that many feel a professional would not be able to understand (Young & Stein, 2004). By comparison, the educated professional brings to the process a background of theory and interventions, as well as assessment skills and formal knowledge of the court system (Johnson, 1997). Johnson (1997) further examined the role of the criminal justice system

response and suggested that several advocates in the field of social work that are attempting to expand the social worker role in the legal system to assist victims of crime. A study examining professionalization of victim advocates found that advocates within prosecutor offices were more likely to have a college education (Underwood, 2001). A key finding in this study was that approximately half of the advocates surveyed had college degrees while 20% of advocates sampled (N=175) had masters degrees.

On October 30, 2004, the most comprehensive federal victims' rights bill became law. The law affects victim rights and services by establishing the most current, powerful enforcement of victim rights mechanism, and authorizing funding to assist in implementing the law (Young & Stein, 2004). While many victim advocates celebrated the federal crime victim bill of rights, it lacked the enforcement of violations to the crime victim rights. The legislation does not delineate who is responsible for overseeing that all victims' rights are upheld (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2004).

Advocacy for Crime Victims at Multiple Levels

Noakes and Johnston (2005) suggested that there are several opportunities for advocacy in a movement. Similarly, Wood (1997) noted that many advocates work on both the micro and macro levels as advocates, supporting not only the individual client's needs, also serving as an advocates for the larger movement by participating in membership groups, attending speak-outs and rallies, honoring crime victim rights week, endorsing legislation, and other public awareness activities. Best (1997) explained that the "victim industry" is a response to victim advocates pushing for crime victim rights within the criminal justice system and agencies and introducing laws and amendments that encompass crime victim advocacy at multiple levels.

Policy Advocacy

There is no question that advocacy for crime victims occurs at the policy level, and Wood (1997) recognized key organizations that facilitated the growth of the victim rights movement. McAdam (2002) noted the importance of leadership, victim participation, and governmental involvement in advocating for victims at the policy level. McAdam also recognized the significance of engaging institutions in the development of victim rights to increase advocacy for victims and the need align with groups in the larger political arena to gain power. Young and Stein (2004) pointed to the women's movement as being a catalyst for the victim advocacy movement due to the poor treatment of battered women in the system given their lack of status, power, and influence. The women's movement gives an historical example of how domestic violence shelters gained power and recognition during the 1980s largely due to funding opportunities. This involved political engagement with the state:

“They secured the passage of funding legislation in 1981 that created the Family Violence Program and thereby structurally solidified a set of relationships between local shelters, the council, and the state. This process of politically engaging with the state opened up possibilities for political activism but at the same time creating its own set of contradictions” (Reinelt, 1995, p. 86-87).

Therefore, systems that had once ironically been adversaries, such as the police and the shelter, now relied on each other for collaboration on funding and community initiatives. The domestic violence movement gained political access to the legal system, which allowed them greater access to abused women who were going through the court system (Reinelt, 1995). The judicial system may have perceived this as a threat because

the previous feminist ways of advocating for battered women often placed blame on all institutions for the continuing violence and discrimination against women. After these collaborations, shelters shared resources with law enforcement. These resources included space, collaboration on cases, orders of protection, and community education about domestic violence. Although shelters remained resistant to shared resources, shared information on cases and witnesses, and most importantly, trust (Reinelt, 1995).

This history is similar to the victim rights movement, in that during the 1980's funding for victim services became available throughout the country. Subsequently, an ample supply of money flowed into a system that had yet to be formally created (Young & Stein, 2004). The crime victim rights act, passed in 1984, led to the increase in financial support and opportunities for advocacy programs. Once this bill passed and the money was available, the judicial, law enforcement, and political systems had to react. Lois Herrington (1987) recognized that the establishment of many advocacy groups were beginning that are still in existence today, such as Mothers against Drunk Driving, Parents of Murdered Children and the National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA) were growing rapidly and gaining validity.

Administrative Advocacy

The women's movement has been recognized as drawing more attention to the emotional crisis that individuals experience after a crime, which led to an increase in crisis intervention education and support services for victims (Young & Stein, 2004). In the same report to the Office of Victims of Crime, Young and Stein (2004) also credited the women's movement for setting the example of how to provide volunteer support services for victims due to a lack of resources. Domestic violence shelters were often

staffed by volunteers, drawing people into the movements as participants through direct work and advocacy.

Recently, the United States has seen a rise in local community groups addressing crime victim needs. These groups often form into multidisciplinary teams providing a forum to collaborate and problem solve solutions to community crime issues (U.S. Department of Justice 1998). Another recent trend that has emerged is community policing. Community policing goals are to reduce crime by using community-police partnerships to develop crime prevention strategies that are effective (U.S. Department of Justice, 1998). A 1993 research report indicated that among agencies that had implemented community policing for at least a year 99% reported improved cooperation between citizens and police, 80% reported reduced fear of crime in the community, and 62% reported fewer crimes against persons (Weisheit, 1994). An aspect of community policing included developing community neighborhood watch programs to empower communities against crime (U.S. Department Of Justice, 1998).

Campbell and Salem (1999) used concept mapping to identify problems faced by rape victims seeking community help, to include victim blaming, community education about sexual assault, medical intervention and legal reform. Their study randomly surveyed 168 victim advocates and asked how rape victims would best be served in the community. Results from the study suggested that rape victims still faced many challenges in the criminal justice and community-advocacy systems.

More recently, Murphy (2001) argued that legal advocacy for rape victims should be protected under the constitutional guarantee of “due process,” providing protection of their rights and the right to a meaningful hearing. While criminal proceedings often

violate crime victim rights, Murphy specifically suggested that prosecutors are not obligated to act as the victims attorney and the amount of advocacy a victim receives is relative to the amount of passion the prosecutor has for the case. Murphy also suggested that the lack of legal protection for victims of crime should be addressed by creating a system of free legal representation for victims of crime to advocate for their best interest (Murphy, 2001).

The need for legal advocacy for crime victims was described in the history of forensic social work and legal advocacy by Brownell and Roberts (2002) leading to the recent work in domestic violence programs. Those researchers identified federal funding as an impetus for advocacy program growth allowing social workers venues to work with victims of violent crime to address a variety of needs. Kopels and Gustavsson (1996) recommended incorporating legal issues content within social work curriculum, while Ezell (1981, 1991, and 1994) has recommended numerous ways for social workers to use administrative advocacy within agencies.

Individual Advocacy

Violent crimes cause both physical and psychological trauma in the form of injury and the threat of injury, respectively (Resnick, 1993). Violent crimes include assault, domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, homicide, drunk driving crashes, robbery, burglary, kidnapping, felonious restraint, harassment, and stalking. Violent crimes often receive the most serious penalties and victims of violent crimes were often guaranteed protection under the 1998 States' Crime Victim Bill of Rights. Victims of violent crime are eligible for certain resources that property crime victims are not eligible for such as Crime Victim Compensation funds (U.S. Department of Justice 1998). The National

Center for Victims of Crime reported in 2002 that an intimate partner (2004) perpetrated 20% of all violent crimes against women. Research shows that victims of child abuse, rape, assault, and homicide are more likely to be attacked by an acquaintance rather than a stranger (Kilpatrick, 1987). Orth (2004) found that criminal proceedings frequently cause secondary victimization in terms of victims coping with the victimization, self-esteem, faith in the future, trust in the legal system, and faith in a just world. This study also determined that strong predictors of secondary victimization were outcome satisfaction and subjective procedural justice (Orth, 2004).

Many researchers have studied the coping effects of crime victims and have found that the psychological and emotional reactions in the aftermath of crime are similar in both victims of violence as well as victims of property crime (Lurigio & Resnick 1990). Davis and Freidman (1985) noted that victims of crime experience a continuum of emotional reactions including intense feelings of anger, fear, isolation, lower self-esteem, helplessness, and depression that may be considered as emotional injuries. Kaukinen (2002) examined the support-seeking practices of victims of property and violent crime and found that victims of acquaintance perpetrators often seek assistance and support through informal networks such as friends and family rather than through the criminal justice system. The findings in this study showed that female victims were more likely than males to seek assistance from friends, family, and social service agencies dealing with crime. Kaukinen also noted that the majority of crime goes unreported to criminal justice for assistance; rather, victims were seeking support from informal networks.

In contrast, Johnson (1997) found that the legal system was perceived as helpful and may have a delayed effect on psychological symptoms of crime victims. Johnson

continues that victims can reduce feelings of inequity by improving the outcome by receiving good treatment from professionals or by lessening the assailant's outcome through direct retaliation or timely punishment. Kilpatrick, Beatty, and Howley, (1998) found that most victims who had the opportunity to participate in the criminal justice system did so by offering a victim impact statement and appeared to be more satisfied with the criminal justice system in general. Likewise, Campbell, Wasco, Ahrens, Sefl, and Barnes (2001) found that victims who were denied a chance to participate in the process had the highest levels of dissatisfactions. This study further described victims who sought help from the legal system, whose cases were declined for prosecution, as having high levels of psychological distress.

In a recent study, Orth (2004) researched whether perpetrator punishment satisfied victim's feelings of revenge. He suggested that perpetrator punishment only partially satisfies feelings of revenge among victims of violent crimes, and that the long-term feelings of revenge exist despite the severity of the punishment. Among the variables included in the study, satisfaction with compensation for damages, pain, and suffering was the best predictor of feelings of revenge. These findings indicated that advocacy for the victims of crime takes on special salience. Victim advocacy as described by the National Children's Alliance, consists of providing referrals and locating resources for individuals and families (Jackson, 2003). The National Children's Alliance lists advocacy as one of the nine core components for membership standards for Child Advocacy Centers (Jackson, 2003).

Advocacy strategies and resistance

Gameson (1968) introduced the idea that the practitioner uses different strategies of advocacy techniques based on the level of advocacy in which the worker engages. Sosin and Calhoun (1983) noted that advocacy strategies are different than techniques and encompass the approach to persuasion and influencing decisions. Based on the type of relationship between the advocate and the decision maker, the advocacy techniques would be normative or value based, utilitarian, or logic based and coercive based (Gameson, 1968). Sosin and Calhoun (1983) suggested that advocacy can occur at any of the levels and require the social worker to utilize a two-step process to decide which level of advocacy strategy to utilize. They recommended that social workers consider the context of the relationship whether it is an ally, neutral or adversarial and match the advocacy effort with the context. Again, the social worker can practice at the individual, administrative, and policy advocacy levels using these strategies. Levels of advocacy intervention have yet to be tested to see if they are also utilized within the crime victim advocacy field, specifically, in domestic violence shelters, prosecutors' offices, child advocacy centers, and community victim assistance agencies.

Sosin (1979) also introduced the concept of resistance to advocacy from both the internal organization and external organizations. Resistance is experienced when an organization produces obstacles to change, thus, not allowing, or limiting the change in services that are mandated. It is not known how often or to what extent advocates in advocacy positions experience resistance. Peterson and Underwood (2000) conducted a victim service needs assessment and found that "an element of distrust" existed between crime victim service providers based on the lack of understanding of agency roles and responsibilities for the victim. Results showed that these issues strained agency

relationships, as agencies were leery of other agency involvement in their cases. Sudderth (2003, 2006) studied relationships between domestic violence shelters and law enforcement in rural areas and found that these agencies formed working relationships, yet these agencies distrusted one another and lacked knowledge of the agency roles. While these results supported the existence of resistance among advocacy agencies, this concept has yet to be studied with all types of victim service providers.

Advocacy strategies

Lens (2005) highlighted the importance of social workers being able to effectively argue and represent themselves in the public arena. She suggested communication strategies for social workers to use when advocating for a cause, including using empirical fact-based evidence. Advocacy strategies including normative, utilitarian, and conflict strategies warrant attention in the literature.

Normative

Best (1997) supported Sosin's suggestion that advocacy strategies are often based on value-based arguments. Best proposed seven ideological notions that the victimization movement has initiated and argued that advocates use the "good versus evil" and "just versus un-justice" moral argument as a reason to advocate for victims of crime. Oliver and Johnston (2005) noted that moral arguments and societal ideologies were used as a means of advocating for victims. For example, victims and relatives of drunk driving used "friends don't let friends drive drunk" (Noakes, 2005).

Utilitarian

The victim movement, and victim advocates specifically, frame victimization as widespread, consequential, and unquestionable (Best, 1997). According

to Best, victims of specific crimes (domestic violence and child abuse) should not be doubted as to the truthfulness of their statements because the criminal justice system is so difficult for victims to participate in one would not lie or engage in the process for no reason. Best also pointed out that, historically, advocates have used multiple accounts of tragic victimization accounts as proof that something happened to the victim and that the account must be true, such as in the case of satanic abuse.

Conflict

Best (1997) posited that historical relationships between agencies are often in conflict with goals and power. Brownell and Roberts (2002) contended that relationships between agencies often are in competition for resources and may experience conflict between the agencies. Murphy (2001) described conflict between competing goals of prosecutors and advocates working on behalf of a case during prosecution. He proposed creating a free advocacy system for victims within the criminal justice system as a method of satisfying victims' needs. Throughout the feminist literature (Reinalt, 1995; Young & Stein, 2004) there have been discussions about shelters in conflict with law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Calhoun and Sosin (1983) suggested that the method of advocacy strategy that an advocate utilized was based on the relationship between the agencies. Thus, one could conclude, based on the literature of tense relationships between criminal justice agencies, shelters and prosecutors, that conflict would sometimes be used as a strategy of advocacy.

Resistance

Sosin (1979) introduced the concept of resistance to advocacy from both the internal organization and external organizations. Resistance occurs when an

organization produces obstacles to change, thus not allowing, or limiting the change in services that are mandated. After reviewing the literature on crime victim right groups, policies, and amendments, Acker (1991) found that the concept of equal rights for victims of crime in the criminal justice system threatens the vary core of the constitutional rights of the offenders. The victim rights movement posed a threat to the offender rights, thus describing resistance on the policy and administrative levels (Acker, 1991). Minkoff (1994) pointed out that, historically, the members in advocacy organizations have experienced competition for resources as the legitimacy of advocacy organizations grew in the 1950s.

At times, feminist movements have been criticized for giving up some of their goals (Ferree, & Martin, 1995). It has been suggested that many feminist organizations have had to weigh the needs of their clientele, along with the demands of businesses, corporations, and the funding agencies to balance their goals (Ferree and Martin, 1995). This is evident in both the shelter movements, and the advocacy movements, especially prosecutor-based advocate programs. As victim rights were beginning to be established, more and more advocates were housed in the prosecutors' offices, along side attorneys, police, detectives, defense attorneys, and support staff. An advocate's job is to advocate for the best interest of the victim, which can sometimes lead to disagreements with the prosecutors on cases that were dropped or pled to lesser charges (Simonson, 1994). It is sometimes practice to have state prosecutor's offices utilize the advocate to have them try to "frame" the plea so that the victim would accept the plea offer as reasonable, which, again, places the advocate in an ethical dilemma (Simonson, 1994). Advocates may have to make a choice in how far they are willing to "push the envelope" and advocate for

victim issues. It is unknown whether advocates make a greater impact by staying within the organization and making small change over time, rather than if they held strong to their advocacy goals and were not flexible.

This professional isolation of advocates, in a prosecutor's office creates a difficult situation in which sometimes advocates feel that they have to "bend" and give in to the goals or policies of the prosecutor's office rather than the advocacy position they hold. Advocates face dilemmas that are caused because of their positions as advocates, primarily because they are housed in government institutions and receive government salaries. If an advocate felt it was in the best interest of a woman and child to send them to another state in hiding, yet the court system had subpoenaed them for court, the advocate could not act on advocacy intentions.

Summary

The literature is rich with content as to how the victim rights movement was successful and developed over the past forty years. However, based on the review of social work, criminal justice, and social movement literature, there appear to be unanswered questions as to the types, levels, and strategies of advocacy. It is unknown the extent to which advocates use these strategies to help crime victims gain access to services, uphold crime victim rights and cope emotionally and financially. This information seems needed to address the needs of crime victims in light of the economic, social, and psychological costs of crime to society. This author used Sosin and Calhoun's concepts to conduct an exploratory study to examine the levels of advocacy, strategies, relationships, and resistance that crime victim advocates experience within the criminal justice system. The purpose of this study was to examine the advocacy strategies among

organizations in the criminal justice system, law enforcement, shelters, child advocacy centers, and community-based centers. This author used Sosin and Calhoun's (1983) theory that advocacy strategies are selected based on the relationships between agencies, that advocates will experience resistance to such strategies, and advocates will practice these techniques on the micro, macro, and mezzo levels. The objectives of this study sought to identify the levels at which advocacy occurs, advocacy strategies are utilized, relationships between agencies, and the levels of resistance to change advocates experience. Chapter 3 focuses on the methods and procedures that examined these phenomena.

Chapter 3: Method of Study

Chapter one of this dissertation introduced the need to examine individual, administrative or policy levels of advocacy, strategies used by victim advocates in various agencies, and relationships between victim service agencies. Chapter Two presented the literature related to crime victim advocacy within the criminal justice system, the social work response to crime victims, advocacy strategies, levels of advocacy practice, and presented the existing knowledge on these topics. This chapter describes the pilot study, methods and procedures used to gather data for this dissertation and analysis; and methods to draw conclusions.

Based on the extensive review of the literature, an exploratory study was designed to learn more about advocacy practices among crime victim advocacy agencies in Missouri. The study used an exploratory design in an attempt to gather descriptive data to examine the use of individual, administrative, or policy advocacy strategies used by victim advocates in various agencies, relationships between advocacy agencies, and resistance to their advocacy efforts.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted using a 32 item questionnaire that had been IRB approved. The questionnaire was developed based on Sosin's (1983) theories on levels of advocacy practice, relationships between agencies determining advocacy strategies, and levels of resistance experienced by advocates. Four experts in the field of victim rights and victim advocacy reviewed the questionnaire to ensure content validity. Such experts included the Director of the Missouri Office for Victims of Crime, a board member for the National Organization for Victim Assistance, the Director of the Crime Victim

Services Unit for the Missouri Department of Public Safety, and a victim advocate director of over twenty years. Questionnaires were personally delivered to a stratified sample of 21 various victim service offices and administered by the researcher. Variables included participant characteristics, gender, race, age, demographics, length of service, type of agency, education, whether s/he was a victim of a crime, formal education, what agency facilitated their training, and levels of advocacy within organizations. Levels of resistance and examination of the advocate's participation within the crime victim rights movement were also assessed through the questionnaire.

There were many limitations to this study as the N was low with 21 respondents. The sample was obtained using a convenience method, thus making the sample less representative of the population. Independent t- tests were conducted to test for relationships, strategies and levels of practice, and resistance experienced. Mean scores of advocates employed in a domestic violence shelter were compared to advocates based in a prosecutor's office. Results showed that being a crime victim did affect the level of advocacy that advocates used, specifically coercive techniques. It appears that advocates who had not crime victims, used coercive techniques more often than advocates who were. Advocates appeared to use more coercive techniques, including threats, and complaints against law enforcement agencies and prosecutor's offices when advocating on behalf of a client than with other agencies.

For this study, several changes were made to the instrument, data collection and methodology based on information I received after completing the pilot study. The questionnaire was reduced from 33 to 22 questions to reduce the amount of time needed to complete the questionnaire. The survey was placed online to facilitate collection and

analysis. During the pilot study, the terms normative, utilitarian and coercive were used to ask participants how often they used the strategies and feedback received from the participants was that the terms were confusing, and vague. Therefore, for this study, Gameson (1968) and Sosin's (1983) definitions of normative, utilitarian, and coercive, were used rather than the terms to ask participants the frequency that they use these strategies in an attempt to simplify the instrument. Questions were also added to this survey regarding educational level and effectiveness of the strategy. Agencies that participated in the pilot study were eliminated from the sample of advocates.

Participants

Participants in this study were 110 crime victim advocates employed in either a domestic violence shelter, law enforcement prosecuting attorney's office, child advocacy center, or community agency in a Midwestern state. A proportionate stratified random sample was used to obtain representation from more than one employee, particularly an administrator and a direct service provider, to ensure a more thorough representation of advocacy practices in the agencies, from each of 228 selected agencies listed with the state's crime victims services unit. Agencies on this list were also compared to the individual agencies listed online. A complete list of agencies were sorted by type of agency into the five categories and by location in the state to ensure a representative geographic sample.

Using Isaac and Michael's (1997) list of necessary sample size based on an infinite population size, a sample of 144 agencies were needed to ensure that the sample proportion would be within $\pm .05$ of the population proportion with a 95% level of confidence. A proportionate sample was randomly drawn once agencies were categorized

by type of agency and location. Attempts were made to obtain data from at least two victim advocates per agency from fourteen child advocacy centers; ten law enforcement agencies; twenty-five domestic violence shelters; forty-eight prosecuting attorney's offices; and from forty-seven community agency centers for a total of 144 agencies sampled.

Materials

A 22-item questionnaire was developed to gather data about advocacy practices, strategies, relationships, effectiveness, and resistance experienced from crime victim advocates. Content for the questionnaire was based on a review of advocacy literature, as well as social work and criminal justice literature. Items 1-11 addressed gender; victimization; type of crime if victimized; agency role (administrative or direct service); level of education; length of employment with the agency; and length of employment (1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years 11-15 years and longer than 15 years).

Item 12 and sub-items addressed Sosin's (1983) levels of individual, administrative, and policy advocacy and asked participants about how often they have practiced advocacy on behalf of individuals, groups, or on behalf of policy changes (0= not at all; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often). Item 14 with sub-items addressed Sosin's (1983) normative, utilitarian, and coercive advocacy strategies and asked participants how often they use moral arguments/common values, bargaining or negotiation and coercive strategies such as complaints (0 = never; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often). Item 15 with sub-items, addressed the frequency with which advocates used these strategies to influence child advocacy centers, domestic violence shelters, law enforcement agencies, prosecuting attorney's office, and community

agencies (0 = never; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often). In item 16 with sub-items, participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of only those advocacy strategies they have used (3 = very effective-I achieved my advocacy goal; 2 = somewhat effective-we reached a compromise; 1 = not effective-was not able to influence).

Items 21 with sub-items examined the relationship between agencies (ally, neutral, adversarial) and resistance to advocacy (Sosin, 1979). Each participant was asked to rate the relationship with other agencies, including child advocacy centers, domestic violence shelters, law enforcement agencies, prosecuting attorney's office, and community agencies (1 = ally; 2 = often an ally; 3 = neutral; 4 = often adversarial; 5 = adversarial). Last, items 22, with sub-items, asked participants how often they experienced resistance from prosecutors offices, law enforcement, community agencies, domestic violence shelters, and child advocacy programs (0 = never; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometime; 3 = often).

Validity. With respect to face validity of advocacy constructs, four experts in the field of victim services reviewed the questionnaire and agreed to the accuracy of the content. Issac and Michael (1997) pointed out that face validity is important to have to win confidence in the participants who are asked to complete the instrument in that it is useful information for them to have. A review of literature showed no studies that examined advocacy constructs, so the results of this study was compared to those in the pilot study. Within the context that validity is the "ability of the instrument to adequately test the real meaning of the concept under consideration" (Yegidis & Weinbach, 2002, p.206), the comparison of results will help determine the content and construct validity of advocacy constructs measured.

External validity may also be limited for several reasons. For example, external validity is compromised when email surveys are used because it is not known whether the participants understood the questions asked on the survey and/or whether the participants spent an adequate amount of time thinking of the responses (Yegidis & Weinbach, 2002). External validity might be affected by the date and time that email requests for participation were sent. For example, the Monday that the emails were sent to participants was a state holiday, and because many prosecutor advocates did not receive the invitation to participate until Tuesday following a three day weekend, they may have minimized the survey invitation compared to other email messages they perceived to be more important.

Reliability. Reliability is related to the concept of consistency, specifically the likelihood that the same results will be found under different circumstances (Yegidis and Weinbach 2002). Although the sample was too small in the pilot study to examine reliability, the Cronbach's alpha across aspects of advocacy was .930 based on the 21 items that questioned advocacy practices, strategies, and relationships in this study. Reliability tests were conducted on each subsection of the survey and all were within the .850 range or above. This demonstrated high internal consistency between the construct of advocacy and the components that comprised the construct of advocacy (Yegidis and Weinbach 2002).

Design

The University of Missouri Campus Review Board (IRB) approved the online survey, consent page, application, and research proposal. Independent variables in the study were demographic information (age, gender and years of employment); type of

organization the advocate was employed in; education level, rural or urban location, victimization, and advocacy role. Dependent variables included (a) type of advocacy strategies practiced; (b) levels of advocacy that a victim advocate practiced, (c) type of relationship between agencies, (d) resistance perceived from other agencies, and (e) level of change as a result of advocacy strategy.

Data Collection. Once the sample was selected, data collection involved searching the agency website to obtain both advocate and directors' email addresses. If the agency did not have a website, the researcher called the agency to obtain the contact information for the director and an advocate who works with crime victims. When it was not possible to find more than one email per agency or the agency used only one email address for the entire staff, the researcher sent an email to the agency requesting the director forward the email to staff members.

Participants were then sent an email message and invited to complete the questionnaire. The email described the consent process, as well as the IRB required information, and contained a link to the Survey Monkey online survey website where participants who chose to complete the questionnaire could do so in an estimated 10 minutes' time. The responses were anonymous, and data collection via Survey Monkey resulted in 110 completed surveys. A follow up email message was sent to the list of agencies approximately one week after the first email message was sent to serve as a reminder of participation. Survey Monkey stored the results online using a format that was compatible with Microsoft Excel worksheet and SPSS, a statistical software package used to analyze the data.

Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics, including means, frequencies, and correlations, were presented to describe the sample and aspects of advocacy. Ten categorical independent variables included age, ethnicity, type of agency, years employed in the agency, years of advocacy practice, education, role within the agency, location, whether the participant was a crime victim, and type of crime. Dependent variables included ordinal variables use of individual, administrative, policy advocacy; use of normative strategies, use of utilitarian strategies, and use of coercive strategies. Perceived relationships and resistance variables were presented. Bi-variate analyses were conducted using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and associations were examined using Chi square analyses.

Information gathered from this study will provide insight into the effectiveness of advocacy strategies used between agencies in the criminal justice system and prove valuable for the education of social work students who also utilize such strategies. Information describing resistance will be helpful in understanding the unanticipated consequences of advocacy and will prove useful in the education of social workers and criminal justice advocates.

Chapter 4: Results

Chapter one discussed the need to examine individual, administrative, or policy levels of advocacy, strategies used by victim advocates in various agencies, and relationships between crime victim service agencies. Chapter two focused on the literature related to crime victim advocacy within the criminal justice system, the social work response to crime victims, advocacy strategies, and levels of advocacy practice, as well as created a framework to examine how agency relationships affect strategies used by advocates to form the context for this study. Chapter three described the pilot study, methods, and procedures used to gather data for this dissertation and analysis methods to draw conclusions. This chapter describes the sample and significant findings. Prior to presenting possible answers to the research questions that guided the study, the characteristics of the participants and agencies in which they work are presented. Those data are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Chi-square analyses identified associations between the characteristics of participants and agencies in which they were employed. In using 10 categorical variables to conduct analysis of associations, the results showed that age was associated with years of employment in the agency and location (rural, urban), crime victim, advocacy goals, location, and education. Specifically, results showed that participants under the age of 27 were more likely than others to have worked in the agency less than 3 years $X^2 = 56.82(25) p = .000$. In fact, nearly 50% of participants who had worked in agencies between one and three years are under the age of 27. Interestingly, approximately 46% of participants who were employed with their agency less than one year are between 36 and 44 years of age. Similarly, the results showed that age and location were significantly

associated $X^2 = 11.53 (5) p = .04$. Sixty-one percent of participants between the age of 20-27 lived in urban areas and all of the participants over the age of 60 lived in rural areas (N=5).

The results showed that being a crime victim was significantly associated with advocacy goals $X^2 = 13.1 (3) p = .004$ and education level $X^2 = 6.87 (2) p = .03$. Sixty-three percent of participants who had been victims of a crime used joint goal planning with their clients compared to 30% of participants who had not been victims and used joint goal planning. In addition, 21% of participants who had been victims allowed the client to determine the advocacy goals, compared to 55% of participants who were not victims. Interestingly, 80% of participants who were victims of crime did not have a degree compared to 74% of participants who were victims of crime do have a degree. Further, 57% of those who were victims of crime had a graduate degree. In addition, educational level was significantly associated with location $X^2 = 9.15 (2) p = .010$. Surprisingly, participants who lived in rural areas were more likely to have a graduate degree (N = 20) than participants who lived in urban areas (N = 12). However, participants who did not have a degree (N = 31) were more likely to live in a rural area than an urban area (N = 26).

Type of Advocacy by Frequency of Use

Participants were asked how often they advocated on behalf of individuals, groups, or causes, or for policy changes (0 = not at all; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often). A key finding was that participants used individual advocacy most often. The data in Table 3 shows the percentage of participants by type of advocacy and frequency of use.

There were significant differences in participants' use of individual, administrative, and policy advocacy. Data were screened for normality, outliers, and missing data. Results of Levene's tests showed that variance was equal, met the assumptions of equality, and participants were randomly selected, thus meeting assumptions for using analysis of variance tests and t-tests. The results in Table 4 show there was a significant difference in participant mean ratings and that participants practice individual advocacy significantly more often than either administrative or policy advocacy.

Only the significant findings will be presented, although multiple one-way analysis of variance tests (ANOVAs), and t-tests were performed using mean scores for individual, administrative, and policy advocacy by nine categorical variables to test for differences in advocacy practices. The results of the independent t-test showed a significant difference in the frequency with which participants used individual advocacy by role within the agency $t(107) = 2.585, p = .011$. Independent t-tests showed that participants who provided direct service use individual advocacy ($M = 2.84, SD = .39$) more often than administrators ($M = 2.58, SD = .58$).

Participants also differed in the used of administrative advocacy by type of agency $F(3, 102) = 4.88, p = .003$. The results of post analysis Bonferroni tests showed that participants employed in domestic violence shelters used administrative advocacy significantly more frequently ($M=3.38, SD =.88$) than community agencies ($M = 2.42, SD = 1.29$). Lastly, participants differed in the use of policy advocacy by role within the agency $t(107) = 3.208, p = .002$. T-test results showed that administrators used policy advocacy more often ($M = 2.54, SD = .73$) than direct service providers ($M = 1.67, SD = 1.13$).

Type of Advocacy Strategy by Frequency of Use

Participants were asked about the frequency with which they used normative (discussion of moral arguments or values), utilitarian (bargaining/negotiating) or coercive (as filing complaints) strategies in advocating for crime victims (0 = not at all; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often). The results in Table 5 show the percentage of participants by use of advocacy strategy.

ANOVAs were used to further explore advocacy strategies participants used. The data were first screened for normality, outliers, and missing data and results of Levene's tests showed that variance was equal, data met the assumptions of equality, and participants were randomly selected, thus meeting assumptions for using analysis of variance tests. Numerous ANOVAs and t-tests were performed using mean scores for normative, utilitarian, and coercive strategies by the same nine categorical variables to identify differences in advocacy practices. Results showed that while the majority of participants used the advocacy strategies, they did not use them often. Mean score comparisons showed that participants used the utilitarian strategy significantly more often than coercive strategy. The results in Table 6 showed the frequency with participants' use the three advocacy strategies.

ANOVAs and t-tests were conducted to determine differences in the use of the normative strategy. The results showed a significant difference in the use of the normative advocacy strategy by location $t(95) = -2.232, p = .028$. Specifically, participants from rural areas used normative strategies more often ($M = 1.45, SD .95$) than participants from urban areas ($M = 1.03, SD = .78$). By comparison, ANOVA results showed a significant difference in mean scores in the use of the utilitarian advocacy

strategy by type of agency $F(3, 102) 3.12, p = .029$. Post comparison Bonferroni tests show a significant difference in mean scores from participants employed in prosecutors' offices. Specifically, participants employed in prosecutors' offices used the utilitarian strategy ($M = 1.70, SD = .82$) more than participants in community agencies ($M = 1.03, SD = .77$). There were no significant differences in participants' use of the coercive advocacy.

Frequency of Participants' Relationship with Other Agencies

The frequency of participants' relationships with other agencies ranged on a continuum from ally to neutral and adversarial (1 = ally; 2 = often ally; 3 = neutral; 4 = sometimes adversarial, 5 = adversarial). Participants in prosecutors' offices, community victim programs, domestic violence shelters, and child advocacy centers were asked about their relationships with other agencies. The results in Table 8 showed the percentage of participants by relationship with victim service agencies.

Significant Differences in Relationships with Agencies

While the majority of the participants ranked their relationships with victim service agencies as "ally," analysis of variance tests showed that there were significant differences in advocacy relationships. These data were screened for normality, outliers, and missing data. Results of Levene's tests showed that variance was equal, data met the assumptions of equality, and participants were randomly selected, thus meeting assumptions for using analysis of variance tests and independent t-tests. The results in Table 9 showed the mean ratings of participants in five agencies on the extent to which relationships are adversarial.

Prosecutor Office and Relationships with Agencies.

The results of ANOVA showed that advocates in prosecutors' offices differ significantly in relationships with other agencies by type of agency $F(3, 102) 3.78 p = .013$, and length of time advocates were employed in agency $F(5, 103) 2.57 p = .031$. Post comparison Bonferroni tests were conducted to determine the extent to which prosecutors' offices differed in relationships with advocates in other agencies. Prosecutors' offices had a more adversarial relationship with community agencies ($M = 1.97, SD = .81$) $p = .038$ than with domestic violence shelters ($M = 1.88, SD = .74$) or child advocacy centers ($M=1.38, SD = .52$). Advocates in prosecutors' offices had a more adversarial relationship with participants who worked in an agency less than 1 year ($M = 2.27, SD = .65$) than with participants who had worked in the agency longer than 15 years ($M = 1.20, SD .447$). Lastly, results of an independent t-tests showed a significant difference in relationships by location $t(108) = -2.084, p = .040$. Prosecutors' offices have a more adversarial relationship with advocates in rural areas ($M = 1.87, SD = .78$) than advocates in urban locations ($M = 1.58, SD = .59$).

Law Enforcement and Relationships with Agencies.

Results of independent t-test showed a significant difference in relationships with law enforcement agencies by location $t(108) = -2.19, p = .031$. Similarly, participants in law enforcement agencies have more adversarial relationships with advocates in rural locations ($M = 2.0, SD = .87$) than with advocates in urban locations ($M = 1.68, SD = .59$).

Other Agencies and Relationships.

Results of independent t-tests showed that there were significant differences in relationships between participants in community agencies, domestic violence shelters, and child advocacy centers. Participants in community agencies differed in relationships with advocates by role in the agency $t(108) = 2.12, p = .036$. Participants had a more adversarial relationship with advocates who had an administrative role ($M = 1.54, SD = .72$) than with direct service providers ($M = 1.24, SD = .57$). Similar to the findings regarding community agencies, participants in domestic violence shelters differ in their relationships with other advocates by role in the agency $t(108) = 2.00, p = .048$. Participants in domestic violence shelters had a more adversarial relationship with those in a direct service role ($M = 1.48, SD = .731$) than those in an administrative role ($M = 1.17, SD = .381$), although scores rate the relationship within the alliance range.

Resistance to Advocacy by Frequency Experienced

Participants were asked the frequency that they experienced resistance from law enforcement agencies, prosecuting attorneys' offices, domestic violence shelters, community agencies, child advocacy centers, and within their own agency (0 = never, 1 = rarely, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often). Those results are shown in Table 10.

Insert Table 10 Here

Based on the adversarial relationships of law enforcement and prosecutors' offices with other advocates, independent t-tests were used to examine the resistance these participants experienced in relationships with those in other agencies. Consistent with previous findings regarding relationships, significant findings were found between location and resistance from law enforcement $t(108) = -2.20, p = .031$, and prosecutors

offices $t(108) = -2.65, p = .009$. Results showed that advocates in rural areas experienced more resistance from law enforcement ($M = 1.93, SD = .75$) than in urban areas ($M = 1.58, SD = .84$). Likewise, advocates in rural areas experienced more resistance from prosecutors' offices ($M = 1.37, SD = .94$) than in urban areas ($M = .95, SD = .71$).

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications

This study examined advocacy practices, strategies, and relationships among organizations within the criminal justice system, including law enforcement, shelters, child advocacy centers, and community-based centers. These results are unique in that a similar study has not previously conducted. As such, the results provide insight into advocacy relationships that exists between advocacy agencies and the criminal justice system. The study expands the knowledge base on what is known about types of advocacy, advocacy strategies, and advocacy relationships that typify on behalf of crime victims. A better understanding of the advocacy that occurs at the individual, group, and policy levels of practice is now possible within the context of the advocacy conceptual framework (Sosin, 1983).

Discussion

In interpreting the results of the study, a major limitation of the study is that it relied on participant self-reporting wherein biases may be inherent in the design. Yet another limitation of the study was that the study participants, and in turn, responses could be limited if agency directors did not read or forward the invitation questionnaire to the advocate staff or forward to other agencies who were not original members of the selected sample.

Despite these limitations, the study has numerous strengths to consider, including the proportionate stratified random sample design that will allow the results to be generalized to other populations of advocates. While anonymity allowed for a sizeable number of responses, the most significant strength is the innovativeness of a study that addressed, for the first time, the topic of advocacy. It is unique in that information gained

from this study will highlight the characteristics of crime victim advocates in prosecutors' offices, law enforcement agencies, community advocacy agencies, domestic violence shelters, and child advocacy centers. Currently, little is known about the frequency of advocacy practices, strategies or resistance experienced by crime victim advocates, or the extent to which advocates in the criminal justice system use these strategies and levels of practice. With these strengths in mind, the characteristics of advocates will be discussed.

Characteristics of Advocates

Data from this study showed that most crime victim advocates have a college degree, with almost a third possessing a master's degree. This result is consistent with literature that emphasizes professionalization in the victim rights field, yet it is inconsistent with results in previous past studies that show advocates are less educated (Underwood, 2001). The result that showed the higher level of education is prevalent across all types of crime victim service agencies is in contrast to previous results that showed advocates in prosecutors' offices are more likely to have advocates who are college graduates (Underwood, 2001). The results in previous studies and those in this study show the growing trend toward professionalization and the increasing value of a professional degree to the agencies (Johnson, 1997; Danis 2003, 2006).

The result in this study that shows the majority of advocates who do *not* have a degree are victims of crime indicates that those advocates may have become crime victim advocates as a result of their victimization and the need to help others. This result is similar to those in previous research that show advocates for crime victims believe that a person who has been a crime victim can best understand how the victims feel (Johnson, 1997; Young & Stein, 2004).

Victim advocates have been a victim of a crime at the same rate of the general-public. Consistent with federal crime rates, approximately 30% of victim advocates in this study had been a victim of domestic violence, in particular. It is noteworthy that the percentage of advocates who were victims of crimes is similar to federal crimes statistics on burglary, sexual assault, and child abuse rates in the general population further demonstrating generalizability of these results. When looking at the responses of advocates who have been crime victims, they did not differ from those who were not crime victims in advocacy strategies or relationships.

The advocates in this study were almost exclusively female and Caucasian, though there were a few African American and Latino advocates. These results are consistent with those in another study of advocate gender characteristics (Underwood, 2001) and may be explained in the high number of advocates in domestic violence shelters who responded and who worked in this traditionally female field. This brings into question the extent to which the lack of diversity among advocates has a negative impact on clients.

Types of Advocacy

In general, crime victim advocates in fact, do advocate on behalf of individuals, groups/ causes, and for policy changes (Sosin, 1983). The results in this study showed that all advocates work on behalf of individuals or cases within all types of agencies. These direct service providers used individual advocacy more often than administrative advocates is consistent with the literature on advocacy activities used in agencies. Those activities include safety planning in domestic violence shelters, notification performed by prosecutors offices, support for child abuse victims within child advocacy centers, and

general supportive services in community agencies (Danis, 2006; Underwood, 2001).

These activities are the responsibility of direct service providers who work on behalf of individuals and families as opposed to administrative duties, such as supervising staff, funding and paperwork.

In this study, advocates in domestic violence shelters used administrative advocacy more frequently than did all other agencies. This is consistent in the literature that describes the history of the domestic violence and victim rights movement.

Advocates in shelters have long advocated for a cause or group of people to gain access to services (Young and Stein, 2004). In contrast, prosecuting attorneys' offices do not frequently advocate for a group or cause, primarily because they advocate on an *individual* basis for many different types of crime victims and are politically influenced relative to perceptions of fairness. The results indicate that advocates who are in administrative roles practice policy advocacy in an effort to change laws, policies, or access services more than direct service providers.

Advocacy Strategies

The result in this study that showed advocates in rural areas use a normative strategy (or values and morals to persuade or influence others) is consistent with the traditional, more relaxed and informal environment in rural areas where many share common values a sense of identity (Brueggeman, 2001). Individuals in rural communities often have dual roles and relationships that may influence their approach to advocacy (Brueggeman, 2001). In contrast, such relationships and community common values may be absent in urban communities, which results in advocates less likely to experience personal or dual relationships.

The data showed that advocates from all agencies, and especially prosecutors' offices, use utilitarian strategies. One explanation of advocates in prosecutors' offices and law enforcement agencies using this strategy may be that these advocates must rely on logical, and not value, interpretations of the law, though this explanation goes beyond the scope of this study. Another explanation of all agencies using utilitarian advocacy strategies is that it allows for diversity and compromise between agency goals and relationships, but this explanation also goes beyond the scope of the study. There were no significant findings regarding the use of coercive strategies, which brings into question under what circumstances advocates use coercive strategies on behalf of clients. Sosin (1983) suggested that coercive strategies are more likely to be used when there is an adversarial relationship between agencies.

Relationships

With regard to relationships, the results in this study indicated that advocates in rural prosecutors' offices have more adversarial relationships with community-based agencies. One explanation of this might be that the only victim service agencies that exist in rural areas are community-based agencies that provide services to victims of all types of crime rather than the more specialized agencies such as a shelter or child advocacy center. Further, it is possible that an advocate in a rural area provides services to a wide variety of crime victims and may have little opportunity to build relationships with the prosecuting attorneys' offices in the same way that other specialized advocates are able to do. Yet another explanation may be that it is impossible for advocates to form a positive relationship in rural areas where prosecutors are often hired on a part-time basis. These explanations are not validated in this study with part-time prosecutors.

Resistance in Advocacy

The result that shows advocates in rural areas experience higher resistance from both prosecutors' offices and law enforcement agencies is consistent with results in one study of relationships between agencies, including domestic violence groups and law enforcement, in rural areas (Suderth, 2006). In that study, advocates in both prosecutors' offices and law enforcement were more likely than other advocates to resist advocacy from other victim service agencies. Sosin (1983) recommended that social workers consider the context of the relationship and select a level of advocacy and an advocacy strategy that corresponds with the relationship. The data in this study indicate that the majority of advocacy relationships are positive alliances, few are neutral, and even fewer are adversarial. Likewise, the data indicate that many agencies use normative, most use utilitarian, and few use coercive strategies.

Conclusions

Based on the discussion of results in this study, several conclusions can be drawn that seem plausible. First, it appears that advocates are highly educated females, on average, and seem professionalized. Second, the lack of education among advocates seems linked to grassroots advocacy movements in terms of victims advocating for victims, such as in domestic violence shelters. Third, although being a victim of crime seems to have little impact on advocacy, little is known about the impact of so little ethnic diversity among advocates. Fourth, the level of advocacy and advocacy strategy used appear to vary by agency type, especially in rural areas. Lastly, advocates in rural areas seem to have an adversarial relationship with advocates in agencies that use utilitarian advocacy strategies (logical reasoning). This is especially in prosecutors'

offices and law enforcement agencies, and as a result, advocates appear to experience more resistance from those agencies.

Implications

Results of this study have implications for several policy recommendations regarding increasing communication and building relationships between agencies. It seems beneficial for states to include policy and funding for multidisciplinary collaborative community teams to meet regularly about cases going through the criminal justice system. These teams could provide a venue for dialogue between agencies that might improve relationships and facilitate communication between agencies working on behalf of victims of crime. In addition, victim advocacy guidelines should be established that provide a basic level competency for all advocates working in all agencies. These should be accompanied by education and training to teach the minimum standards. In turn, community policies could be created to address formal lines of communication regarding roles, responsibilities, and limits of sharing information between cases, which might improve relationships and eliminate resistance between agencies.

Practice seems warranted that focuses on increased training for victim service providers and administrators. Within the context that relationships were shown to be more adversarial in rural areas, earlier and more training for prosecutors' offices and new advocates seems needed in order for advocates to better understand the role of the prosecutor and facilitate communication. Cross-training and multidisciplinary team meetings should be implemented in rural areas to facilitate communication and networking. Providing education on advocacy strategies might be beneficial to all advocates, regardless of agency type. This could include information on the differences

between normative, utilitarian, and coercive strategies. This type of training might be invaluable to advocates in rural areas who struggle with resistance from advocates in prosecutors and law enforcement agencies who tend to use logic and rule based arguments to influence on behalf of their clients. Acknowledging the differences in strategies agencies use could shed light on the adversarial relationships. Training for administrators on administrative and policy advocacy as well as training for direct practice advocates on case management seems beneficial.

Future research is needed to determine the effectiveness of advocacy strategies and under what circumstances each advocacy strategy is most effective. This is especially the case for coercive strategy that involves the use of conflict or complaints. Additional research seems needed to examine why and how individuals become advocates, such as a result of being a victim versus advanced education. Future research is needed to examine the extent to which the lack of ethnic diversity among advocates impacts clients. Further research also seems needed to determine the extent to which relationships are negatively affected by the advocacy strategies rural advocates use when interacting with advocates in prosecutors' offices and law enforcement agencies. Finally, future research seems warranted to examine the extent to which ally relationships are prevalent among advocates in prosecutors' offices, law enforcement, and other victim service agencies in urban areas. A closer look is needed to understand what makes these relationships positive and supportive alliances rather than adversarial.

References

- Acker, J. (1991). Social sciences and the criminal law: Victims of crime plight vs. rights. *Criminal Law Bulletin*, 28(1), 64-77.
- Andrews, K., & Edwards, B. (2004). Advocacy organizations in the US political process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 479-506.
- Best, J. (1997). Victimization and the victim industry. *Society*, 34(4), 9-19.
- Brownell & Roberts (2002). Century of social work in criminal justice and correctional settings. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 35(2), 1-17.
- Brueggeman, W. G. (2001). *The practice of macro social work*, Chicago: Neilson Hall.
- Campbell, R., & Salem, D. (1999). Concept mapping as a feminist research method, examining community response to rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23(1), 65-89.
- Campbell, R., Wasco, S.M., Ahrens, C.E., Sefl, T., & Barnes, H.E. (2001). Preventing the second rape: Rape survivor's experiences with community service providers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 1239-1259.
- Carr, P., Logio, K., & Maier, S. (2004). "Keep me informed: What matters for victims as they navigate the juvenile criminal justice system in Philadelphia." *International Review of Victimology*, 10, 117-137.
- Danis, F. (2003). The criminalization of domestic violence: What social workers need to know. *Social Work*, 48(2), 237-246.
- Danis, F. (2006). The victim assistance field and the profession of social work. Office of Victims of Crime. Retrieved from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/assist/NASW_Kit/welcome.html

- Davidson, W. S. & Rapp, C. A., (1976). A multiple strategy model of child advocacy: Implications for the juvenile justice system. *Social Work, 21*, 225-232.
- Dodd, S., & Jansson, B. (2004). Expanding the boundaries of ethics education: Preparing social workers for ethical advocacy in an organizational setting. *Journal of Social Work Education, 40(3)*, 455-465.
- Ezell, M. (1981). Advocates on advocacy: An exploratory study. *Social Work Research and Abstracts, 17(2)*, 5-12.
- Ezell, M. (1991). Administrators as advocates. *Administration in Social Work, 15(4)*, 1-18.
- Ezell M. (1994). Advocacy practices of social workers. *Families in Society, 75(1)*, 36-46.
- Schmitt, F., & Martin, P. (1999). Unobtrusive mobilization by an institutionalized rape crisis center "all we do comes from victims." *Gender & Society, 13(3)*, 364-384.
- Freddolino, P., Moxley, D., & Hyduk, C. (2004). A differential model of advocacy in social work practice. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Sciences, 85(1)*, 119-128.
- Ferree, M. & Martin, P. (1995) *Doing the work of the movement; Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 3-26.
- Gameson, W. A., (1968). *Power and Discontent*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Herman, L. (2003). The mental health of crime victims: Impact of legal intervention. *International Society of Traumatic Stress, 16(2)*, 159-166.
- Herrington, L. (1987). Victim rights and criminal justice reform. *Annals of the American academy, 494*, 139-144.

- Issac, S., & Michael, W. (1997). *Handbook in research and evaluation for education and the behavioral Sciences*.
- Jackson, S. (2003). A USA national survey of program services provided by child advocacy centers. Institute of Law, Psychiatry and Public Policy. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 411-421.
- Johnson, K. (1997). Professional help and crime victims. *Social Service Review*. March, 89-109.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Beatty, D., & Howey, S.S., (1998). The rights of crime victims – Does legal protection make a difference? Washington, D.C. National Institute of Justice Research in Brief.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., & Otto, R. K. (1987). Constitutionally guaranteed participation in criminal proceedings for victims: Potential effects on psychological functioning. *Wayne State Law Review*, 34(1), 7-28.
- Kaukinen, C. (2002). The help-seeking decisions of violent crime victims, an examination of the direct and conditional effects of gender and the victim-offender relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(4), 432-456.
- Kopels, S., & Gustavsson, N. (1996). Infusing legal issues into the social work curriculum. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 32(1), 115-125.
- Lens, V. (2005). Advocacy and Argumentation in the Public Arena: A Guide for Social Workers. *Social Work*, 50(3), 231-238.
- Lurigio, A. J., & Resnick, P. (1990). Healing the psychological wounds of criminal victimization: Predicting post crime distress and recovery. In A. J. Lurigiol, W.G.

- Skogan, & R.C. Davis (Eds.), *Victims of Crime: Problems, policies, and programs* (pp.50-67). Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- McAdam, D. (2002). *Political process and the development of the black insurgency*. Chicago press.
- Miller, T.,Cohen, M., & Wiersema, B. (1995). *Victim costs and consequences: A new look. Research Report*. Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, February.
- Minkoff, D. (1994). From service provision to institutional advocacy: The shifting legitimacy of organizational forms. The University of North Carolina Press, *Social Forces*, 72(4), 943-969.
- Murphy, W. (2001). The victim advocacy and research group: Serving a growing need to provide rape victims with personal legal representation to protect privacy rights and to fight gender bias in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homelessness*, 11(1), 123-138.
- National Center for Victims of Crime, (2004). Key Findings. Retrieved from <http://nvc.org/news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/crim/cvras2329.pdf>
- Noakes, J. A., & Johnson, H. (2005). Frames of protest, a roadmap to perspective. *Frames of Protest*. Rowman & Littlefield: 1-33
- Office for Victims of Crime (2000). *National victim assistance academy text* OVC press.
- Oliver, P. E., & Johnston, H. (2005). What a good idea! Ideologies and frames in social movement research. *Frames of Protest* (pp. 185-204). River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Orth, U. (2004). Does perpetrator punishment satisfy victims' feelings of revenge? *Journal of Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 62-70.

- Peterson, D., & Underwood, T. (2000). Victim services needs assessment: A study of victim services in the community. Joint Center on Violence and Victim Studies. Retrieved from www.washburn.edu/ce/jcvvs/research/needs_assessment/
- Reinelt, C. (1995). Moving onto the terrain of the state: The battered women's movement and the politics of engagement. *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement* (pp.84-104). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Resick, P. A. (1993). The psychological impact of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8(2), 223-255.
- Simonson, L. (1994). The victim's rights movement: A critical view from a practicing sociologist. *Sociological Imagination*, 31(4), 181-196.
- Smith, B., & Huff, C. (1992). From victim to political activist: an empirical examination of a statewide victims' rights movement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20(3), 201-215.
- Sosin, M. (1979). Social work advocacy and the implementation of legal mandates. *Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work*. 265-274.
- Sosin, M., & Calhoun, S. (1983). Advocacy: A Conceptualization for social work practice. *National Association of Social Workers*, Jan-Feb, 12-17.
- Sudderth, L. K. (2003). An uphill climb: The challenges of collaboration in response to family violence in a rural area. *The Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 8(4), 17-39.
- Sudderth, L. K. (2006). An uneasy alliance: Law enforcement and victim advocates in a rural area. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(4), 329-353.

- Underwood, T. (2001). The Professionalization of victim assistance: An exploratory study of attitudinal dimensions and factors. Joint Center of Violence and Victim Studies. Retrieved from www.washburn.edu/ce/jcvvs/research/professionalization/
- Victim of Crime Act 1984. Retrieved from <http://fl1.findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/crim/cvras2329.pdf>
- Weed, F. (1997). The framing of political advocacy and service responses in the crime victim rights movement. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 24(3), 43-61.
- Weisheit, R. A., Falcone, D. N., & Wells, L. E. (1994). *Rural crime and rural policing*. (Research in Action). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 150223.
- Weisheit, R. A., & Wells, L. E. (1998). Future issues in rural crime. *The Compiler*, 17(4), 8-10.
- Weisz, A. (1999). Legal advocacy for domestic violence survivors: The power of an informative relationship. *Families in Society*, 80(2), 138-147.
- Wood, F. (1997). The framing of political advocacy and service responses in the crime victim rights movement. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 24(3), 43-61.
- Yegidis, B. & Weinbach, R. (2002). *Research Methods for Social Workers*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston MA: 206.
- Young, M., Stein, J. (2004). *History of the crime victim rights movement in the United States; A component of the office for victim of crime oral history project*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/ncvrw/2005/pg4c.html>

Appendix

Table 1

Characteristics of Advocacy Agencies

Characteristic	N	No.
Agency type	110	
Prosecutor office		23
Domestic violence		42
Community based		33
Child advocacy		8
Location	110	
Rural		40
Urban		70
Job role	110	
Administrative		24
Direct service		86
Work at agency	109	
≤3 years		54
4-10 years		33
>10 years		23

Note. Thirty-five percent of participants had worked in the victim services field for less than three years. Twenty-five percent had worked in the field for more than ten years.

Table 2
 Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	N	No.
Age	110	
20-35 years of age		45
More than 35 years of age		65
Gender	110	
Male		4
Female		105
Ethnicity		
White	109	98
Non-white		11
Education	110	
No college		31
Undergraduate degree		46
Graduate		32
Victimized	108	
Yes		70
No		38

Note. Victimized (38% burglary; 26% sexual assault; 19% domestic violence; 7% child abuse). Percentages of victims were consistent across agency types.

Table 3

Percent of Participants by Level of Advocacy and Frequency of Use (N = 110)

Frequency	Percent of Participants and Type of Advocacy			
	Not at all	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Individual (N = 109)	0%	22%	17%	80%
Administrative (N = 101)	4%	10%	15%	72%
Policy (N = 109)	17%	20%	26%	37%

Table 4

Type of Advocacy by Frequency of Use

Type of advocacy	Mean	Standard Deviation
Individual	2.79	0.45
Administrative	2.54	.82
Policy	1.84	1.11

Note. Frequency (0 = not at all; 1 = rarely; 2= sometimes; 3 = often). There is a significant difference in mean ratings on frequency of advocacy by type. Post hoc comparison show the significant difference between individual and administrative $p = .004$; individual and policy advocacy; administrative and policy advocacy. $p \leq .001$

Table 5

Percent of Participants by Type of Advocacy Strategy and Frequency of Use

Percent of Participants and Use of Advocacy Strategy				
Frequency	Not at all	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Normative (N = 97)	24%	30%	39%	7%
Utilitarian (N = 110)	16%	40%	31%	13%
Coercive (N = 109)	32%	49%	5%	0%

Table 6

Type of Advocacy Strategy by Frequency of Use

Type of advocacy strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation
Normative	1.30	0.91
Utilitarian	1.40	0.91
Coercive	0.91	0.80

Note. Frequency (0 = never; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often).

There is a significant difference in mean ratings on the frequency with which participants use normative, utilitarian, and coercive advocacy strategies. Post hoc pair wise comparisons show the significant differences between: (a) utilitarian and coercive $p \leq .001$ (b) normative and coercive, $p=.001$

Table 7

Use of Advocacy Strategy by Type of Advocacy Agency

Strategy	Advocacy			
	Agency _a	Agency _b	Agency _c	Agency _d
Normative				
Mean	1.45	1.27	1.23	1.63
SD	1.05	.83	.92	.74
Utilitarian				
Mean	1.70	1.03	1.48	1.63
SD	.83	.77	.94	1.06
Coercive				
Mean	.83	.91	.95	1.00
SD	.92	.84	.84	1.07

Note. Frequency (0 = never; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often). Agency (a = prosecutor's office; b = community agency; c = domestic violence shelter; d = child advocacy center). There is a significant difference in mean ratings of advocate in prosecutor's office and law enforcement offices on the use of the utilitarian advocacy strategy.
p<.05.

Table 8

Percent of Participants by Type of Advocacy Agency and Advocacy Relationship

Type of Advocacy Relationship	Type of Advocacy Agency				
	Agency _a	Agency _b	Agency _c	Agency _d	Agency _e
Ally	88%	90%	96%	95%	92%
Neutral	9%	4%	3%	3%	7%
Adversarial	3%	6%	1%	2%	1%

Note. Agency (a = prosecutors office; b = law enforcement; c = community agency; d = domestic violence shelter; e = child advocacy center).

Table 9

Mean Ratings of Participants by Type of Advocacy Agency and Type of Advocacy

Relationship

Relationships with Agency

Relationship	Mean	Standard Deviation
Prosecutors Office	1.76	.72
Law Enforcement	1.88	.76
Community Agency	1.31	.62
Domestic Violence Shelter	1.41	.68
Child Advocacy Center	1.41	.67

Note. Relationship (5 = adversarial, 4 = sometimes adversarial, 3 = neutral, 2 = often ally, 1 = ally) There is a significant difference in mean ratings of relationships with agency. Post hoc pair wise comparisons show significant difference in mean ratings of advocates in prosecutor' offices and law enforcement offices on the extent to which relationships are adversarial.

$p \leq .001$

Table 10

Percent of Participants by Resistance to Advocacy Experienced by Agency (N = 110)

Resistance from Agency	Percent of Participants that experience			
	Resistance			
	Not at all	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Prosecutor	21%	45%	27%	7%
Law enforcement	7%	20%	60%	13%
Community agency	28%	56%	14%	3%
Domestic violence shelter	34%	54%	8%	3%
Child advocacy center	39%	48%	10%	2%

1. Consent to participate

You are being invited to participate in a dissertation research project conducted by Elizabeth Wilson from the Graduate School of Social Work at the University of Missouri. This project is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Martha Markward PhD.

Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may also refuse to answer any question.

This project is an attempt to measure advocacy practices, strategies, resistance and effectiveness among crime victim advocates in the state of Missouri.

Your agency will be one of approximately 120 victim assistance agencies asked to participate in this project. Your participation consists of voluntarily answering the survey questions accessible at (insert URL when available). It should take you about 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Your participation in the project is anonymous. Please do not identify yourself in any of your responses to the survey.

There are no foreseeable physical risks associated with your participation; however, some people are uncomfortable discussing prior victimization. Accordingly, you may experience some minor discomfort in answering some of the questions.

While you will not directly benefit from participation, your participation may help the investigator better understand how victim advocacy is related to social work practice.

Participation in this project is voluntary and the only alternative to this project is non-participation.

The results of this study may be published in professional and/or scientific journals. It may also be used for educational purposes or for professional presentations. However, no individual participant will be identified.

If you have any questions, you may contact Elizabeth Wilson at 573-268-2183. You may also contact Martha Markward, faculty sponsor, at (573) 884-6159.

ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (573) 882-9585.

2. Personal demographics

The following questions will help provide information about you.

1. What is your age?

- 20-27 years
- 28-35 years
- 36-44 years
- 45-52 year
- 53-60 years
- 60+ years

2. What is your race or ethnic background?

- Caucasian/white
- African American
- Hispanic/ Latino
- Native American
- Asian

Other (please specify)

3. What is your gender?

- male
- female

4. How many years of education do you have?

- completed high school
- completed some college
- completed bachelors degree
- completed masters degree
- completed PhD

5. Have you ever been a victim of a crime?

- yes
- no

6. If you have been a victim of a crime, please specify the type of crime below. You may select as many as you need. If you have not been a victim of a crime, please proceed to the next question.

- Domestic violence
- Child abuse
- Burglary
- DWI
- Sexual assault
- Fraud
- Homicide of family member

Other (please specify)

3. Agency demographics

The following questions will provide information about the agency you work for.

7. What is the Judicial Circuit in which you work?

Judicial Circuit

Please select your circuit

8. How would you describe the type of agency in which you work?

- Prosecutor's Office based program
- Community victim service program
- Domestic violence shelter
- Child Advocacy Center

9. How long have you been employed with this agency?

- less than one year
- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-10 years
- 10-15 years
- 15+ years

10. How long have you been employed in the victim service field?

- less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-10 years
- 10-15 years
- 15+ years

11. What best describes your role in the agency?

- Administration
- Direct Service Provider

4. Types of advocacy

The following questions will provide information on the types of advocacy you participate in.

12. In the last six months, to what extent have you practiced the following types of advocacy?

	Not at all	rarely	sometimes	often
I have advocated for an individual, person, family or case	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have advocated for a specific group (i.e. drunk driving victims, victims of domestic violence, etc.) within an agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have advocated for a policy change or awareness on behalf of an issue or group of people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. When working with a client, who decides what goals that you advocate for?

Client

Joint planning between you and client

You as the advocate

Your agency

5. Advocacy Strategies

The following questions will provide information about the types of advocacy strategies you use when advocating on behalf of a client or cause.

14. There are many strategies that are often used to influence others in the advocacy process. In the last six months, how often have you used the following strategies when advocating on behalf of clients?

	never	rarely	sometimes	often
I use moral arguments and recognition of common values to influence individuals or agencies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use bargaining and negotiation to influence individuals or agencies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use conflict and complaints to influence another person group or agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. To what extent have you used discussions of morals and common values to influence the following agencies?

	never	rarely	sometimes	often
Prosecutor's Office based program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Law enforcement department	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community victim service program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Domestic violence shelter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Child advocacy center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Within my own agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. How effective was this advocacy strategy (moral arguments and discussing common values) in influencing the following agencies?

	Very effective - I achieved my advocacy goal	somewhat effective - we reached a compromise	not effective - was not able to influence
Prosecutor's Office Victim Assistance Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Law enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community agency program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Domestic violence program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Child advocacy center	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
within my own agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. To what extent have you used bargaining or negotiation to influence the following agencies?

	never	rarely	sometimes	often
Prosecutor's Office based program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Law enforcement department	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Independent victim service program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Domestic violence shelter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Child Advocacy Center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Within my own agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. How effective was this type of advocacy strategy (use of bargaining and negotiation) in influencing the following agencies?

	Very effective - I achieved my advocacy goal	somewhat effective - we reached a compromise	not effective - I was not able to influence the agency
Prosecutor's office victim program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Law enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community agency program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Domestic violence program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Child advocacy center	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
within my own agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. To what extent have you used conflict or complaints to influence the following agencies?

	never	rarely	sometimes	often
Prosecutor's based program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Law enforcement office	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Victim Services Program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Domestic Violence Shelter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Child Advocacy Center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Within my own agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

20. How effective was the advocacy strategy of using conflict and complaints against the following agencies?

	Very effective - I reached my advocacy goal	somewhat effective - we reached a compromise	not effective- I was not able to influence the agency
Prosecutor's office victim program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Law enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community agency program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Domestic violence program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Child advocacy center	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
within my own agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Agency Relationships

The following question will provide information about relationships between agencies in your community.

21. Please describe your relationship with the following agencies in your county:

	Ally	Often ally	Neutral	Often adversarial	Adversary
Prosecutor's Office	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Law enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Victim Program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Domestic Violence Shelter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Child Advocacy Center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

22. Sometimes, advocates experience resistance from other professionals or organizations when advocating for a client or cause. To what extent have you experienced resistance from these agencies?

	never	rarely	sometimes	often
Prosecutor's Office	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Victim Advocate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Law enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Victim Program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Domestic Violence Shelter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Child Advocacy Center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Within my own agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

VITA

Elizabeth Ford Wilson currently resides in Columbia Missouri. She earned a bachelor's degree in Educational and Counseling Psychology in 1992, masters in Social Work in 1995, and a doctorate of philosophy in Social Work in 2009, all from the University of Missouri. She is a licensed clinical social worker. She is currently the Social Work Program Director at William Woods University in Fulton Missouri since 2007. She was previously a full-time clinical faculty with the School of Social Work at the University of Missouri from 2001-2007. Prior to working in academia, she was a Crime Victim Specialist with the Boone County Prosecutors' Office in Columbia. She is married and has three children.