DOES GEOGRAPHY MATTER? BARRIERS ENCOUNTERED BY SERVICE

PROVIDERS

by

Amanda Goodson

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice

Boise State University

May 2015

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

**DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS**

of the thesis submitted by

Amanda Goodson

Thesis Title:     Does Geography Matter? Barriers Encountered by Service Providers

Date of Final Oral Examination:     11 March 2015

The following individuals read and discussed the thesis submitted by student Amanda Goodson, and they evaluated her presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination.  They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

Lisa G. Bostaph, Ph.D.                    Chair, Supervisory Committee

Laura King, Ph.D.                         Member, Supervisory Committee

Lane Gillespie, Ph.D.                     Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the thesis was granted by Lisa G. Bostaph, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee.  The thesis was approved for the Graduate College by John R. Pelton, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my parents, Marty and Letty Goodson.  I deeply appreciate, and will never forget, all of your love and support that was given to me while I strove to accomplish my goals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this thesis is due largely in part to the guidance, support, and contributions of several individuals.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Lisa G. Bostaph, the chair of my committee. Over the past year, your mentorship has helped me in so many different ways. I would like to deeply thank you for all of your patience, support, and guidance during this journey because without it, I would not have challenged myself or strove to become the writer and the researcher that I am today. In addition, I would like to thank the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Lane Gillespie and Dr. Laura King for their insightful feedback throughout this process. I could not have done this project without them.

In addition, I would also like to thank the organization that funded the project. Without the funding to complete this project, I would not have been able to gather the data that was required for my thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank all of my friends and family who have been with me during process. I would like to thank you for being with me during my frustrations and excitement. Without your unconditional love, support, and encouragement, I would not have been able to successfully complete this thesis.

ABSTRACT


Through the professionalization of victim services, research has focused on

the barriers that victims of crime face when seeking services.  In addition, academics

have addressed the unique challenges that arise for victims in rural communities.

However, very little research has examined the barriers that arise in service provision.

Furthermore, few researchers have explored the relationship between the geographic

location of a provider and the types of barriers that are encountered. This study

attempts to address this gap in research by examining 117 surveys which were

completed by service agencies dispersed throughout a Northwestern state.

Quantitative analyses were conducted and results indicated that there is not a

statistically significant relationship between the location of a service provider and the

type of barrier encountered.  However, the qualitative data that was collected

indicated that metro agencies often encountered barriers that included low community

awareness and support, and non-metro agencies encountered diminished funding. This

study concludes by providing possible policy implications that could be implemented

to help reduce barriers in service provision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence and intimate partner violence have been shown to be a problem that needs to be continuously addressed in communities. In fact, Eastman and Bunch (2007) reported that more than 20% of all nonfatal acts of violence against women were attributable intimate partner violence. Research has also demonstrated that between 25% and 41%, or one in five women experience physical or sexual assault carried out by a spouse or partner (Logan, Stevenson, Evans, & Leukefeld, 2004). However, society has not always declared domestic violence to be a problem within communities and up until a few decades ago victims did not have services available to utilize in their quest for recovery. This is troubling because research has shown that victims of violence experience an array of negative effects, some of which include depression, anxiety, re-victimization, and economic constraints (Bennett, Riger, Schewe, Howard, & Wasco, 2004; Logan et al., 2004; Grossman et al., 2009; Grossman, Lundy, George, & Crabtree-Nelson, 2010).

Up until the 1960s, the focus of the criminal justice system was on the offender and the crime committed (Sims, Yost, & Abbott, 2005). This left out a vital component of the criminal justice system, the victims themselves. Recognizing that victims should be a priority to the system, the President's Commission on Crime was signed in 1967 (Sims et al., 2005). This report established that victims need to be brought forth and considered in the criminal justice system (Sims et al., 2005). Following the President's Commission on Crime, in 1984 the Family Violence and Prevention Services Act was enacted. According to the United States Government

Accountability Office (2007), the Family Violence and Prevention Services Act established grants for different victim service providers, which are administered from the Department of Health and Human Services. The grants can then be used by service providers to help provide shelter and other services that may be required by victims of violence (United States Government Accountability Office, 2007). In the same year that the Family Violence and Prevention Services Act was established, the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 was signed by President Reagan (United States Government Accountability Office, 2007). Under this act, the Department of Justice's Office for Victims of Crime can administer grants to victim service agencies so that appropriate services can be utilized to help aid in the recovery from crime. Finally, in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was signed by President Clinton. Similar to the previous acts, this bill allowed different federal, state, and local agencies to use grants for providing numerous services to crime victims (United States Government Accountability Office, 2007).

With the passing of new legislation, victim service agencies have been developing around the United States. While not all victim service agencies are the same, the U.S. Department of Justice (2011) defines victim service agencies as

> Publicly or privately funded organizations that provide victims with support and services to aid their physical and emotional recovery, offer protection from future victimizations, guide them through the criminal justice system process, and assist them in obtaining restitution. (p. 1)

Due to the numerous different consequences of victimization, it comes as no surprise that many victim service agencies offer multiple types of services to victims of crime.

Since the development of victim services, researchers have begun to explore multiple areas including victimization (e.g., domestic violence, stalking, sexual

assault, economic crimes), and barriers in seeking services. In addition, previous research has mainly focused on programming and services within urban America. Researchers have noted that it is important to now focus on rural America, as approximately 28% of citizens live in a community that has been classified as rural terrain (Logan, Walker, & Leukefeld, 2001). Victims in rural communities often face geographic and cultural barriers that may not be evident with victims located in urban communities, which is important because there may be specific needs of rural communities that are not being met (Websdale, 1995; Logan et al., 2001; McGrath, Johnson, & Miller, 2012). However, few academics have addressed the potential barriers that agencies encounter while providing services to different crime victims, specifically with regards to geographic location. While gathering information on barriers from survivors is critical for research, the perceptions that advocates have are equally important because they may shed light on overlooked problems that victims face.

This study provides a review of literature regarding the different services that are available for victims of crime. In addition, the literature review includes the brief research that has been conducted on the barriers that victim service providers face when serving crime victims. By using a descriptive analysis, a snap shot of victimization and available services in a rural western state can be depicted. Furthermore, by examining victimization trends and the available services for victims of crime, the different barriers that are most prominent in this western state's service agencies may potentially be revealed. Finally, this study examined how, or if, there was a relationship between the possible barriers reported by agencies and the locality of a service provider.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section begins with a review of literature on various aspects of victimization.  A comprehensive overview is given of the different types of services available for crime victims.  In addition, literature on the utilization of services as well as the barriers in service provision was explored to demonstrate the need for research in this field.

**Types of Services Provided**

There are several different types of services that victims of crime can utilize to help with the recovery process.  Research has demonstrated that services fall into many categories including medical services, health and human services, social services, and direct victim services.  Some of the most commonly used services by crime victims are victim compensation programs, victim-witness programs, advocacy, counseling, shelters, skills training, crisis hotlines, and crisis centers (Bennett, Riger, Schewe, Howard, & Wasco, 2004; Sims et al., 2005; Campbell et al., 2006).

When examining some of the most common types of services that are available for victims of crime, shelters are often listed by both victims and service providers.  Victims of violence often need to seek shelter outside of their current living situation and shelters provide a sense of security, especially for those who experience domestic abuse (Bennett et al., 2004; Grossman et al., 2010). Not only are shelters a critical service for women who have experienced violence, but shelters have also been associated with providing other services such as counseling (Bennett et al., 2004).  In fact, Grossman et al. (2010) found that 95.8% of victims who utilized

shelters also enrolled in individual counseling services provided by the shelter. Furthermore, after an evaluation of shelter services, Grossman et al. (2010) discovered that shelters help victims overcome barriers by providing education and economic resources, as well as safe housing.

Advocates have also been both an effective and useful resource for victims of crime. The role of an advocate is important because advocates provide support and answer any questions the victims might have (O'Sullivan & Carlton, 2001). In addition, an advocate will help the victim find their own voice and work with the victim to improve their quality of life (Bennett et al., 2004). Sullivan and Bybee (1999) examined the usefulness and goals of advocates and found that victims who worked with advocates over a 10-week period were more likely to utilize community resources. In addition, these victims were also more likely to obtain positive changes in life, including engaging in healthy relationships (Sullivan & Bybee, 1999). In addition, Hart (1992) argues that victim advocates are a vital resource because they can become a contact person for legal services as well as services such as safety planning and case management.

Counseling services are one of the most common services available for victims of crime (Bennett et al., 2004). Bennett et al. (2004) explained that counseling services can be utilized in a group setting as well as one-on-one with a professional. While many survivors of violence reported using individual counseling, a majority of victims also reported that group counseling was beneficial because it allowed for the opportunity to share stories with other survivors of violence (Grossman et al., 2009). Approaches to counseling can differ depending on the organization or agency that is providing the service, but the basic goal of counseling is generally the same. Counseling allows victims to not only face the incident, but also to address the

conflicts and impacts of the traumatic event in a safe environment (Bennett et al., 2004).

Victims of violence may often seek different medical services that are available within the community. While these services are often utilized by victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, other survivors have been known to access this service (Campbell et al., 2006). One of the medical groups that has become more prevalent in providing services is SANE, or sexual assault nurse examiners (Campbell et al., 2006). A major benefit of SANE units is the ability to collect forensic evidence, which may later be used to help prosecute a perpetrator. Campbell et al. (2006) surveyed 110 SANE programs across the United States and found that there was a wide array of services provided to victims. Some of the more common services included sexual assault kits, information on sexually transmitted diseases, information on pregnancy risks, and referral guides to other community based services that were available (Campbell et al., 2006).

As research has demonstrated, there are multiple services that are available for victims of crime. However, the types of available services depend on the classification of the service agency. Through the professionalization of victim services, agencies have distinguished themselves from one another (Bostaph & Jackson, 2008). Some agencies may specifically identify with being a community based agency or a victim witness agency, which is usually located in a prosecutor's office or a law enforcement department. While all of these categories of service agencies are equally important for victims of crime, each type of agency will have a different set of procedures and policies to follow, thus, influencing service provision (Bostaph & Jackson, 2008). In an attempt to better capture how agencies describe themselves, Sims et al. (2005) conducted a statewide study in Pennsylvania. Of the

surveyed agencies, 31% reported being classified as a victim-witness program, 28% were an established community based program (e.g., victim service agency), 24% were domestic abuse centers, and 4% reported being classified as a rape crisis center. While many of the service agencies reported differences across providers, all of the service providers had similar goals. A majority of the agencies (68%) reported that providing direct services was the main goal of the organization. Education was a key goal for 59% of the service providers, while 50% reported that advocacy was the direct focus of the organization (Sims et al., 2005).

## Utilization of Services

Unfortunately, research supports the notion that a majority of victim services are not being adequately utilized by victims of crime (Henning & Klesges, 2002; Logan et al., 2004; Logan, Evans, Stevenson, & Jordan, 2005; Sims et al., 2005). In 1982, Friedman and colleagues reported that only 15% of their surveyed sample of crime victims reported using services that were provided by the government. Of that 15%, only 1% reported using a local or city agency (as cited in Sims et al., 2005). Henning and Klesges (2002) surveyed 1,746 women who had experienced some form of domestic abuse by a male partner and discovered that only 14.9% of the women reported using services within their community. Furthermore, in a study conducted by Logan and colleagues (2005), 31.5% of women reported experiencing a rape related injury, yet only 35.6% of that same group reported receiving medical care. In regards to mental health services, 39% of survivors received mental health services, 21% utilized a rape crisis center, and 18% reported using religious services (Logan et al., 2004). Finally in 2011, the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that between the years of 1999 and 2009, an average of 9% of

victims of violent crime received some form of assistance from a victim service agency.

## Desired Qualities of Service Providers

When examining aspects of victim services, researching how victims are treated by service providers is important because it may help explain why survivors choose to seek services. Survivors of crimes, especially survivors of violent crimes, report many different characteristics that they feel service providers should incorporate into their organizations. Researchers have commonly asked crime victims to describe different factors associated with the experience of receiving services. Some of the common questions that have been posed to crime victims address the overall atmosphere of the service organization, the location of the service provider, and the overall experience with the advocates of the agency (Skogan, Davis, & Lurigio, 1990, as cited in Sims et al., 2005; Eastman & Bunch, 2007; Eastman et al., 2007; Kulkarni, Bell, & Rhodes, 2012).

Some research has examined how victims of crime have perceived service agencies. Kulkarni et al. (2012) examined the perceptions that victims held when evaluating available resources. Based on the experiences of survivors, four main qualities of care were constant throughout all of the reports. Survivors of violence reported that one of the top priorities was to be treated with compassion and understanding when seeking assistance. In addition, victims recognized that all cases of violence are different, and so the services provided should cater to individualizing care. Autonomy was also an essential component of satisfaction with the services provided. Victims reported that they wanted an advocate who would have information on different options, but would still allow the victim to make the final decision. Finally, ensuring that advocates would maintain confidentiality was critical

because of the stigma that some victims face when seeking help (Kulkarni et al., 2012).

After evaluating 240 survivors who had used victim services, Skogan, Davis, and Lurigio (1990, as cited in Sims et al., 2005) discuss four primary needs of victims. When working with victim services, survivors wanted to be able to talk with an advocate about their feelings surrounding the incident. Survivors also expressed concern about being revictimized, and they often requested information on how to avoid being further victimized by the perpetrator of the crime. This revealed the third primary need, receiving information on protection factors. Finally, to help feel more secure, survivors often reported that they wanted a heightened security on their residence, which included both repairing locks that may have been broken and installing new locks (Skogan, Davis, & Lurigio, 1990, as cited in Sims et al., 2005).

In hopes of gaining a better understanding of victims' experiences with non-profit victim service agencies, Zweig and Burt (2007) conducted a phone interview with 1,509 women from 26 different communities. After analyzing the data, Zweig and Burt (2007) discovered that, when the employees of the service agencies displayed more positive behaviors and characteristics, like empathy, compassion, and accepting, the victims were more satisfied with the services that were provided. In addition, if the victim reported a more positive experience with the employees, then the likelihood of using those services in the future increased. Victims of domestic violence also reported that the positive experiences with advocates allowed them to gain more control over their life, especially in regards to safety, child advocacy, and emotional support (Zweig & Burt, 2007).

Another theme that has been identified through research indicates that survivors believe there should be more services available. This was evident in reports

from service providers and survivors in rural communities (Eastman & Bunch, 2007; Eastman et al., 2007). Rural providers acknowledge that there is a lack of available services for victims in their areas, and the demand for available resources in rural communities was greater than that of urban communities (Eastman & Bunch, 2007). This claim is consistently discovered throughout reports on the availability of services with both service providers and survivors advocating for more services, especially when victims face isolation (Eastman et al., 2007). Although there is an abundant amount of research regarding victims' views of existing barriers, there is little research that addresses the barriers to service provision from the agency's perspective.

## Barriers to Service Provision

### Differences in Rural and Urban Communities

Little research has addressed the barriers that service providers encounter when serving victims of crime. However, there has been an abundant amount of research that addressed unique challenges and differences between rural and urban communities. Important factors, such as isolation, illiteracy, traditional gender roles, and poverty are all barriers that have been identified in rural communities that may hinder the implementation and seeking of services.

Previous research has identified illiteracy to be a prominent issue in rural communities (Rural Clearinghouse, 1993; Logan et al., 2001). According to Rural Clearinghouse (1993), while 28% of America's population is rural residents, they account for up to 42% of the illiterate. Furthermore, in a majority of states, the highest rates of illiteracy are most often discovered in rural communities (Rural Clearinghouse, 1993).

Victims who were located in a rural setting reported that the socialization of women and men differed in the community. Logan et al. (2001) reported that victims in rural Kentucky claimed that women were taught to believe that men were superior and held more authority than women in the community. In addition, McGrath et al. (2012) examined victim advocates and their perceptions of victims and their decisions not to receive services. Rural service providers were more likely to indicate that traditional sex roles were more common in small counties and were practiced by a majority of families (McGrath et al., 2012). Overall, individuals who live in rural communities may hold traditional values and beliefs, which may impact the decision for agencies to provide services and victims to seek services.

While geographic location may not be a problem for victims who lived within an urban setting, geographic isolation was a critical barrier for rural communities (Grama, 2000; Eastman et al., 2007). Eastman and colleagues (2007) argued that victims in rural locations have to travel a greater distance to receive the services that are provided by agencies. In fact, unlike their urban counterparts, it is not uncommon for victims in rural communities to have to travel distances greater than 40 miles (Eastman et al., 2007). Isolation can also influence a person's decision to report the crime to the police. Victims of crime who lived in rural settings were less likely to call the police for help or report a crime for a variety of reasons, one being the amount of time it might take a police officer to reach the location of the caller (Grama, 2000).

Research has demonstrated that employees of victim service agencies in rural and urban counties often report different barriers to service provision. Urban counties generally have a higher population, which means employees have more resources for safety (Eastman & Bunch, 2007). However, rural employees often disclose that they feel their safety may be an issue when working in smaller counties. Rural workers

also felt more vulnerable to possible assailants, which resulted in feeling less safe in the work environment. This was partly due to the isolation and geographic location of service providers (Eastman & Bunch, 2007).

A majority of service agencies require that employees receive some type of training in victim services. In a study conducted on 20 agencies that specialized in serving multi-barriered women, 95% of agencies indicated that training is mandatory, and 85% of the agencies reported that they train other community organizations (Zweig, Schlichter, & Burt, 2002). This calls into question whether or not the training that rural and urban employees receive is different and whether the training influences victims' perceptions of the services that are available. Logan et al. (2004) discovered that urban workers did not express concerns about the training that they received. Conversely, the rural employees felt that the training received was not adequate for the job at hand (Logan et al., 2004). Furthermore, rural service providers claimed that relevant training was the most difficult to obtain (Eastmen & Bunch, 2007). These findings were supported by McGrath et al. (2012), whose results indicated that 24% of rural employees received training not correlate with the prominent issues in rural counties.

<u>Funding</u>

When surveying agencies about the barriers that are faced when trying to serve victims of crime, Ullman and Townsend (2007) reported that 64% of service providers disclosed that funding was a major issue, which was linked to the inability to pay employees adequate compensation. Not being able to pay advocates a high enough wage led to high rates of turnover (Ullman & Townsend, 2007). Macy, Giattina, Parish, & Crosby (2010) had similar findings, which indicated that the lack of adequate funding was consistently reported by service agencies. Sims et al. (2005)

determined that when funding was an issue, most agencies also reported being understaffed. Between low wages and understaffing, service providers discussed concerns with the possibility of offering a lower quality of care (Sims et al., 2005; Ullman & Townsend, 2007). In addition, low funding meant that service agencies were competing for qualified professionals (Macy et al., 2010, Ullman & Townsend, 2007).

Sustainability

While victimization has been acknowledged as a problem within society, service providers still face many challenges. One of the main challenges that agencies face is a lack of recognition by the general public (Macy et al., 2010). Even though research demonstrates that domestic violence and intimate partner violence is prevalent within society, some advocates feel that communities are in denial. In fact, after conducting a study on the perceptions of service providers regarding the barriers that are faced, 36% of advocates reported that there is a lack of support from the community (Ullman & Townsend, 2007). Having support from other community agencies as well as community members enhances the resources of the service provider and thus allows for a more effective relationship with the victim (Macy et al., 2010).

Unanticipated Challenges

In the beginning of establishing victim services, providers expected to face many challenges within communities (Zweig et al., 2002; Macy et al., 2010). However, there have been several unanticipated barriers that have risen over the years. Macy and colleagues (2010) surveyed domestic violence service providers in hopes of bringing to light these unexpected challenges. Every service provider

reported that one of the most prominent barriers revolved around the lack of policy attention given to victims at all levels of government. Agencies felt that a lack of government attention made it more difficult to apply for funding and serve victims of crime (Macy et al., 2010).

Researchers have slowly started to examine what situations may prevent victims from seeking services. Known barriers in seeking services have been identified, as well as the stark differences between rural and urban communities. However, little research has addressed the barriers that arise when advocating and providing services for survivors. This study addressed this gap through examining the relationship between geographic location and barriers encountered by service providers.

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

## Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study examined several different research questions. The questions included: What barriers do service providers face when trying to deliver services to victims of crime? Do the barriers differ between agencies located in metro and non-metro counties? Do service providers located in non-metro counties encounter a higher number of barriers than service providers located in metro counties? There are two different hypotheses in this study:

$H_1$      The geographic location of an agency influences the type of barrier encountered.

$H_2$      Agencies located in metro counties encounter fewer barriers than agencies located in non-metro counties.

## Conceptualization of Variables

States may have different definitions to encompass what qualifies as a crime victim. However, the state[1] in question has created a specific definition that applies to all persons within the state. According to the state's code § 19-5306(5)(a), a *victim* is, "an individual who suffers direct or threatened physical, financial, or emotional harm

---

[1] The state name has been removed in order to maintain anonymity and is available upon request.

as the result of a commission of a crime or juvenile offense" (Office of the Attorney General, 2004, p. 5).

There are many different types of service providers that victims of crime may approach for help.  For the purpose of this study, the different categories that may be used to describe a *service provider* included direct victim service providers, victim witness coordinator/victim assistant, law enforcement, prosecutor's office, medical service providers, mental health services, human/health services, social services, faith-based services, and other services.  According to 42 USCS § 13925 under the Violence Against Women Act (1994), the term *victim service provider* or *victim services* refers to:

> A non-profit, nongovernmental organization that assists domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victims, including rape crisis centers, domestic violence shelters, faith-based organizations, and other organizations, with a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. (p. 7234)

In addition to *victim service provider*, the Violence Against Women Act also provided definitions to key terms, which may be used consistently in victim services. Under code 42 USCS § 13925, *victim witness coordinator* or *victim assistant* refers to an individual who provides services to crime victims under the supervision of a prosecutor, a court, or a law enforcement agency. *Law enforcement agencies* will be defined as a public agency that engages in police functioning and the *prosecutor's office* is a "public agency with direct responsibility for prosecuting criminal offenders" (42 USCS § 13925, p. 7233).  *Medical providers* encompass organizations that provide health services to patients and may be preventive, curative, rehabilitative, or promotional in nature (Clawson, Small, Go, & Myles, 2003). Examples of medical providers include private doctors, clinics, hospitals, and community health care

centers. *Mental health providers* may include psychiatrists, psychologists, licensed professional counselors, licensed clinical social workers, and counselors. Professionals in the mental health field may provide treatments that include individual and group counseling which focuses on the emotional and mental well being of a victim (Logan et al., 2004). *Social service providers* are government agencies that provide services to help the victim, such as education, housing, and emergency funding (Clawson et al., 2003). *Faith based service providers* refer to organizations and agencies that are affiliated with a specific religion, and may offer certain services to victims of crime (Clawson et al., 2003). *Other providers* include organizations that do not belong to a previously mentioned category. Organizations that may fall into this category include food banks and clothing stores. It is important to note that, while specific definitions were provided in this paper, they were not provided to the agencies taking the survey. Participants of the study were able to classify their organizations into what they believed to be most appropriate.

*Services* refer to helping an individual or providing something to an individual, such as counseling, housing, clothing, emergency funds, and shelter, which may improve a victim's psychological, physical, or emotional well-being (Clawson et al., 2003). *Barrier(s)* refer to any restriction or object that may prevent an agency from providing services to victims of crimes (Logan et al., 2004). *Underserved* and *vulnerable populations* are groups of people who may face more barriers when seeking services. It is important to note that there is a distinction between *underserved* and *vulnerable populations* because a group of people can be classified as *underserved* but not be classified as *vulnerable* and vice versa. However, these populations are often classified together because of the similarities in lack of

access to services and are often indicated as populations that are in need of greater attention (Logan et al., 2004).

For the purpose of this study, the geographic location of an agency was based on individual county populations.  The county populations were categorized with the 2013 Rural-Urban Continuum Codes provided by the United States Department of Agriculture.  According to the United States Department of Agriculture (2013), *Metro counties* have three different subcategories which include:

- "Counties in metro areas of 1 million people or more" (n.p.)

- "Counties in metro areas of 250, 000 to 1 million population" (n.p.)

- "Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population" (n.p.).

*Non-metro counties* was the second category provided by the United States Department of Agriculture (2013), which included six different subcategories. The six different subcategories that were used to define *non-metro counties* are:

- "Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area." (n.p.)

- "Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area." (n.p.)

- "Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area." (n.p.)

- "Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area." (n.p.)

- "Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metro area." (n.p.)

- "Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area." (n.p.)

To achieve the most variance within cells, the three subcategories for *metro* counties were collapsed into one category and the six *non-metro* subcategories were collapsed into a second category.

### Non-Experimental Cross Sectional Study Design and Data Collection

Non-experimental cross sectional study designs allow a researcher to observe and examine a single instance in time, which is then compared to events that occurred at the same time. The results from the data are compared to what would be expected had the event not occurred (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). A non-experimental cross-sectional study design was used for this study. For the purpose of this study, the primary source of data collection came from a survey that service agencies completed throughout a western state. The different variables examined were measured through specific questions that address each topic. Surveys are an excellent source for data collection because they allow for a large target population to be reached (Babbie, 2013). Babbie (2013) argued that surveys provide the researcher an opportunity to collect comprehensive information within a specific area of interest. Critical information, such as the type of service provider, the location of the organization, and the different barriers that are present in victim services was gathered.

### Sampling

The target population for this study consisted of agencies that may come into contact with victims of crime. A sampling frame was compiled using a variety of sources including the state in question's Council on Domestic Violence and Victim Assistance's website, Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence website, local, state, and federal government agency websites, crime victim service provider resource manuals, and other Internet searches. A total of 417 email addresses and 10 physical addresses comprised the sampling frame and, once it was constructed, a census was conducted by sending a survey to each email list and physical address. Of the 417 email addresses within the sampling frame, 45 email addresses were returned as undeliverable and five respondents requested to be removed from the email list

because the organizations did not track if they served victims of crime. In addition, agencies were given the ability to forward the survey to other organizations across the state. By giving agencies the ability to forward the survey to other organizations, the total size of the sampling frame is unknown; however a minimum of 377 surveys were sent. Once the initial survey was dispersed, reminder emails were sent to agencies. In the end, one paper survey was returned and 116 online surveys were either partially or fully completed. The returned 117 surveys were examined for the purpose of this study. The best response rate for this study is 31%; however if more participants received the survey then the response rate would be lower. It is important to note that while a 31% response rate may seem low, research has revealed that online surveys usually have a response rate that is less than 25% (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009). This means that while the response rate is still low when compared to paper surveys, it is higher than normal with regards to online surveys. The validity and reliability issues with the response rate will be discussed in detail within the limitations section.

**Dependent Variables and Levels of Measurement**

The focus of this study revolved around the different barriers that service agencies encountered when trying to provide adequate services to victims of crime. Three different survey questions were used to measure this dependent variable. The type of barrier that providers encounter was measured at the nominal level through one question that asked the agency to check all of the barriers they experienced and, therefore, was not mutually exclusive. In addition, two different open-ended questions were provided in the survey, which allowed the service providers to elaborate on their responses (see Appendix 1, Questions 20, 21, and 22). The qualitative responses were used to provide context to the qualitative results.

The number of barriers encountered by service agencies was measured at the ratio level through one question and asked the agency to check all of the answers that apply, thus, while being exhaustive, was not mutually exclusive (see Appendix 1, Questions 20, 21, and 22). A variable was then created in SPSS to total the number of barriers each agency reported experiencing when providing services to crime victims.

## Independent Variables and Levels of Measurement

The independent variable within this study included the geographic location of the service provider. This survey measured whether an agency is located in either a metro or non-metro county and was identified through two different questions in the survey. The first variable was quantified through a question that indicated the county in which the service provider resided and was measured at the nominal level. The variable was then quantified according to county level geographic location information provided by the United States Department of Agriculture, which was measured at the ordinal level. Additional information, such as the city or town that the agency was located in, was analyzed through qualitative analysis (see Appendix I, Questions 3 and 4).

## Descriptive Statistics and Levels of Measurement

The type of service provider who completed this survey, the type of crime victim served, any victim that would classify as an underserved or vulnerable population, and the desired services were all variables examined within this study. Each variable was measured at the nominal level through five separate questions that addressed either the type of service provider, the type of crime victim served, underserved or vulnerable populations, and desired service provision. The questions asked the agency to check all of the answers that applied, thus, while being

exhaustive, it was not a mutually exclusive measurement (see Appendix 1, Questions, 1, 7, 11, 17, and 45).

Before gaining an understanding of the types of services that are available for victims of crime, the agency must be an organization that provides services to crime victims. This variable was measured at the nominal level using two separate "yes/no/don't know" responses. The first measure of the variable addressed whether an agency served a victim of crime. If an organization indicated that crime victims were served then the next part of the measure focused on provision of direct services (see Appendix 1, Questions 6 and 15).

**Validity and Reliability**

For the purpose of this study, there are factors that need to be addressed that specifically relate to reliability, face-validity, and content validity. Unfortunately some of the common methods that are used in survey research to check for reliability, like the split-half method and the test-retest method were not appropriate for this study. However, the reliability of the survey can be addressed in a couple of different ways. First, the survey was created using information from previously established measures through various needs assessment surveys. The needs assessments that were used as a guide when creating this survey include: Needs Assessment Survey for Alaska State Victim Assistance Academy (Rosay, 2009), California Violence Against Women Needs Assessment Program (Warnken, 2012), Kansas Victim Services Needs Assessment (Peterson & Underwood, 2000), and the Minnesota Victims Services Needs Assessment (Butler, Swenson, Krugerud, Plante, & Clausen, 2001). In addition to using previous measures when creating the questions, this survey also holds reliability for the different variables that were analyzed. With the exception of vulnerable populations, each variable has at least two different questions that are

directed toward that specific variable. This ensures that the provided answers are consistently producing the same information.

The survey was sent to organizations with the intention of having the executive director complete it. The goal was for the survey to be completed by executive directors or managers who would have the needed information for the survey, but if an executive director was not identified, then the survey was sent to the general email. The purpose of sending the survey to an executive director or manager of an agency was to ensure that the most accurate data would be provided and the data provided would be consistent across all service providers

For the purpose of this study, the survey that was used holds face validity. The questions that are being used to gather the data were written in a way that allowed for the necessary information to be obtained. Content validity has also been addressed through the construction of the questions and response options. The questions are clear and concise, asking for specific information from the respondent. Response options also include an "other" or "n/a" category, which allowed the survey respondents to provide information that may be relevant, but was not an option provided by the researcher. In addition, providing "other" or "n/a" categories was the most exhaustive approach in gaining as much information as possible. Finally, to help ensure the overall validity of the measure itself, three different academic professors reviewed the survey for potential threats to reliability and validity. The reviewers of the survey hold extensive knowledge on this subject matter. While several factors address the measurement validity of the survey, there are some problems with the external validity which will be discussed in the limitations.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations that need to be addressed in regards to this study. The first limitations that will be discussed are in reference to the inherent problems with the research design. Survey research is an excellent way to gather a large quantity of important information; however there are many drawbacks to this design (Babbie, 2013). Babbie (2013) discusses how the use of surveys in a study can be relatively inflexible, especially if the questions within the survey do not apply to the participant. Furthermore, surveys may not collect the in-depth information that a researcher wants to obtain. A non-experimental cross sectional study design also has built in limitations. One of the major limitations to this design is a lack of control or comparison group, which impacts the internal validity of a study. Without a control or comparison group, it is often difficult to assess causality. In addition, there is not a pretest built into one-shot case studies. The finding of the study may be the result of spuriousness, consequently making it difficult to eliminate alternative explanations (Babbie, 2013). Because this study is a descriptive study and not an explanatory study, there is little to no internal validity built into the design.

Another limitation to the study addresses the accuracy of agencies reporting exact numbers. The survey asks the participants to report the number of crime victims that have been served over a five (5) year time period. While the participants should be reporting the exact number of crime victims served, there is not a way to monitor if this is being done. If the survey participants are not providing accurate numbers, then the internal validity of the study could be threatened.

While a variety of sources were used to compile an email list of service providers, a major limitation to this study relates to the sampling frame that was created. The survey was sent to a minimum of 377 email addresses and physical

addresses. In addition, participants who received the survey through email were able to forward it to additional service providers who may or may not have already been included in the original sampling frame. Unfortunately, it is nearly impossible to determine the exact number of emails within the sampling frame, which affects the 31% calculated response rate of the study and the generalizability of the results.

While 117 surveys were partially filled out or completed and returned only 106 of the agencies were able to report on the barriers that were encountered, which is a small sample size. Having a small sample size inadvertently means that the cell size of the number of valid cases is low. Small cell counts could lead to false negative results in statistical analyses. In other words, because of the small sample size, there may be a statistically significant relationship between the geographic location of a service provider and the types and numbers of barrier encountered, but it was not revealed.

Finally, another limitation to this study was the amount of missing data with regards to ratio variables. Originally, it was intended to examine the annual number of crime victims that each agency has served between 2008 and 2014. However, a majority of this data was either incomplete or missing. Since this information was not provided or was lacking, appropriate statistical analyses were not conducted on the data.

## Statistical Analyses

After the data was collected, a series of descriptive and statistical analyses were performed. The data were analyzed through a computer software program known as the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics and frequencies were used to examine certain characteristics and the

frequencies of those characteristics within the sample (i.e., metro/non-metro locality, types of service providers who completed the survey, types of crime victims, underserved/vulnerable populations, and types of direct services provided).

To test the different hypotheses of this study, a number of statistical analyses were conducted. The best statistical analysis to use to test the different hypotheses would have been a logistical regression statistic because it would have allowed for predictive statements with dichotomous dependent variables (Salkind, 2011). However, between the limited sample size, low response rate, and missing data, the statistic would not hold enough power within the results. Due to these limitations, a chi-square statistic and an independent sample t-test were used to test the hypotheses.

Two separate chi-squares analyses were conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the different categorical variables within the study. The first chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the geographic location of an agency, based on metro and non-metro categories, and the type of barriers encountered while providing services (Hypothesis 1). A second chi-square test was utilized to determine the relationship between the geographic location of an agency based on judicial district, and the type of barriers encountered while providing services to crime victims (Hypothesis 1). The following formula was used for the chi-square statistical analyses (Salkind, 2011):

$$\chi^2 = \Sigma \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Where:

$\chi^2$ is the chi-square value

$\Sigma$ is the summation sign

O is the observed frequency

E is the expected frequency

Hypothesis 2 regarded a categorical variable as well as a continuous variable. Unlike the previous variables, the most appropriate statistic to use to test Hypothesis 2 was an independent sample t-test. An independent sample t-test was used to examine the variance between the means of two independent groups within the sample. This statistic examined the relationship between the geographic location of a service agency and the number of barriers that were encountered while serving victims of crime.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics were reported for the characteristics of the sample

including service provision, indicated barriers, and the geographic classification of

each agency.  In addition, results from chi-square analysis on the relationship between

geographic location and the types of barriers encountered as well as an independent

samples t-test on the relationship between geographic location and the number of

barriers encountered are provided.

**Descriptive Statistics**

<u>Sample Characteristics</u>

As illustrated in Table 1.0, 25.6% of the participants of the survey classified

themselves as direct victim service providers, 16.2% were classified as law

enforcement, 12.8% were members of a prosecutor's office, 2.6% were medical

providers, 5.1% were mental health services, 7.7% were social services, 2.6% were

faith-based, and 29.1% of the participants classified themselves as an agency outside

of the provided options.  Agencies that classified themselves as "other" included court

and legal assistance offices, funding agencies, information centers, and community

awareness agencies.   It is important to note that the percentages will exceed more

than 100% because agencies were able to select more than one classification.

Agencies were able to indicate if their primary function differed from their agency

classification.  With regards to the primary function of the agency, 23.1% selected

direct service provision; the remaining functions were law enforcement (16.2%),

prosecutorial work (12.8%), medical services (1.7%), health and human services

(2.6%), mental health services (10.3%), social services (11.1%), faith-based services

(1.7% ) and other primary functions (20.5%).   Finally, 80.3% of the agencies

disclosed that they had served crime victims.

**Table 1.0      Type of Agency**

| Variable | N | Valid Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Type of Agency** | | |
| Direct Victim Service Provider | 30 | 25.6% |
| Law Enforcement | 19 | 16.2% |
| Mental Health Services | 16 | 13.7% |
| Prosecutor's Office | 15 | 12.8% |
| Social Services/Welfare | 9 | 7.7% |
| Health/Human Services | 6 | 5.1% |
| Medical Provider | 3 | 2.6% |
| Faith-Based Services | 3 | 2.6% |
| Other | 34 | 29.1% |
| **Primary Function of Agency** | | |
| Direct Victim Service Provider | 27 | 23.1% |
| Law Enforcement | 19 | 16.2% |
| Prosecutor's Office | 15 | 12.8% |
| Social Services/Welfare | 13 | 11.1% |
| Mental Health Services | 12 | 10.3% |
| Health/Human Services | 3 | 2.6% |
| Medical Provider | 2 | 1.7% |
| Faith-Based Services | 2 | 1.7% |
| Other | 24 | 20.5% |

Service Provision

With regards to serving crime victims, 80.3% of the agencies indicated that

they had served crime victims between 2008 and 2014, 5.1% did not serve victims of

crime, and 14.5% did not track this information (see Table 1.1).  In addition, 69% of

the agencies offered direct services to victims of crime, 26.8% did not provide direct

services to crime victims, and 4.2% of the sample did not know if direct services were

offered to crime victims. While many of the agencies provided a variety of direct

services to victims of crime, some of the most commonly reported available services

were referrals to a community service agency including legal assistance (36.8%),

crisis intervention (28.2%), assistance with filing restraining orders and protection

orders (28.2%), accompanying the victim to court or other legal proceedings (27.4%),

assisting with the application process for victim compensation (26.5%), and helping

the victim understand the criminal justice system (25.6%).

**Table 1.1        Service Provision**

| Variable | N | Valid Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Crime Victims Served** | | |
| No | 9 | 5.1% |
| Yes | 94 | 80.3% |
| Our Agency Doesn't Track this Information | 17 | 14.5% |
| **Direct Service Provision** | | |
| No | 19 | 26.8% |
| Yes | 49 | 69.0% |
| Don't Know | 3 | 4.2% |
| **Direct Services Currently Provided** | | |
| Referral to Community Service Including Legal Assistance | 43 | 36.8% |
| Assistance Filing Protection/Restraining Order | 33 | 28.2% |
| Crisis Intervention | 33 | 28.2% |
| Accompaniment to Court or Other Legal Proceedings | 32 | 27.4% |
| Assistance Applying for Victim Compensation | 31 | 26.5% |
| Orientation to the Criminal Justice System | 30 | 25.6% |
| Hotlines | 25 | 21.4% |
| Transportation | 24 | 20.5% |
| Emergency Services | 22 | 18.8% |
| Accompaniment to Hospital | 22 | 18.8% |
| Assistance Obtaining Restitution | 21 | 17.9% |
| Individual Counseling | 21 | 17.9% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bilingual Services | 21 | 17.9% |
| Group Counseling | 18 | 15.4% |
| Shelter | 17 | 14.5% |
| Child Care | 9 | 7.7% |
| Medical Care/Services | 8 | 6.8% |
| Other | 10 | 8.5% |

<u>Characteristics of Crime Victims Served</u>

Similar to previous research findings, the vast majority of agencies served victims of domestic violence (75.2%). As indicated in Table 1.3, adult sexual assault and abuse victims were reported as the second highest (59.8%) category of victim served, followed by victims of stalking (55.6%) and child sexual assault victims (40.2%). Of the agencies who served victims of crime, 35.0% worked with economic and property crime victims, 30.8% served victims of DUI, 29.1% worked with survivors of homicide victims, and 15.4% served a crime victim outside of the provided response options. Table 1.2 demonstrates that a high percentage of agencies serve victims from vulnerable populations. The highest percentage of agencies reported serving victims 13-17 years old (45.3%), Non-English speaking victims (45.3%), mentally disabled victims (44.4%), victims over 65 years of age (43.6%), Hispanic/Latino victims (43.6%), and physically disabled victims (41.9%).

**Table 1.2     Crime Victims**

| Variable<br>Type of Crime Victim | N | Valid Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Domestic Violence | 88 | 75.2% |
| Adult Sexual Assault | 70 | 59.8% |
| Stalking | 65 | 55.6% |
| Child Sexual Assault/Abuse | 47 | 40.2% |
| Economic/Property Crime | 41 | 35.0% |
| DUI | 36 | 30.8% |

| | N | Valid Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Survivors of Homicide Victims | 34 | 29.1% |
| Other | 18 | 15.4% |
| **Crime Victims Served From Underserved/Vulnerable Populations** | | |
| 13-17 Years Old | 53 | 45.3% |
| Non-English Speaking | 53 | 45.3% |
| Mentally Disabled | 52 | 44.4% |
| Over 65 Years Old | 51 | 43.6% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 51 | 43.6% |
| Physically Disabled | 49 | 41.9% |
| College Students | 45 | 38.5% |
| LGBTQ | 45 | 38.5% |
| Under 12 Years Old | 42 | 35.9% |
| Native American | 38 | 32.5% |
| Migrant Workers | 31 | 26.7% |
| Other | 9 | 7.7% |
| N/A | 3 | 2.6% |

Barriers and Desired Service Provision

Agencies disclosed that there were barriers to service provision. As illustrated in Table 1.3, agencies reported experiencing an average of 1.65 barriers with the most common barrier being a lack or shortage of employees within the organization (25.6%). Rural outreach and non-English speaking victims were both the second most common barrier (23.9%), followed closely with community awareness about the available services for victims of crime (23.1%).

**Table 1.3     Barriers to Service Provision**

| Variable | N | Valid Percent | Mean | Median | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Barriers to Service Provision** | | | | | |
| Lack or Shortage of Employees | 30 | 25.6% | | | |
| Rural Outreach | 28 | 23.9% | | | |
| Non-English Speaking Victims | 28 | 23.9% | | | |
| Community Awareness of | 27 | 23.1% | | | |

Services

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lack or Shortage of Volunteers | 17 | 14.5% | | | |
| Employee/Volunteer Training | 17 | 14.5% | | | |
| Referrals from Other Service Providers | 12 | 10.3% | | | |
| Referrals from Law Enforcement | 9 | 7.7% | | | |
| Community Support | 8 | 6.8% | | | |
| Board Capacity/Functionality | 8 | 6.8% | | | |
| None of the Above | 9 | 7.7% | | | |
| **Number of Barriers Encountered** | | | | | |
| | | | 1.65 | 1.00 | 2.34 |
| 0 | 54 | 46.2% | | | |
| 1 | 22 | 18.8% | | | |
| 2 | 12 | 10.3% | | | |
| 3 | 9 | 7.7% | | | |
| 4 | 6 | 5.1% | | | |
| 5 | 6 | 5.1% | | | |
| 6 | 1 | 0.9% | | | |
| 7 | 1 | 0.9% | | | |
| 8 | 3 | 2.6% | | | |
| 9 | 1 | 0.9% | | | |
| 10 | 2 | 1.7% | | | |

Desired Service Provision.

Agencies also indicated that a shortage in resources prevented them from offering specific types of services for victims. For example, as illustrated in Table 1.4, 12.0% of the agencies would like to offer individual counseling services, and 10.3% of agencies would like to offer group counseling and bilingual services, but are unable to do so because they do not have the necessary resources. Finally, 25.7% of agencies had to deny services to victims of crime.

**Table 1.4 Desired Service Provision**

| Variable | N | Valid Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Desired Services but Unable to Provide Due to Lack of Resources[2]** | | |
| Individual Counseling | 14 | 12.0% |
| Group Counseling | 12 | 10.3% |
| Bilingual Services | 12 | 10.3% |
| Emergency Services | 11 | 9.4% |
| Referral to Community Service including Legal Services | 11 | 9.4% |
| Shelter | 11 | 9.4% |
| Child Care | 11 | 9.4% |
| Transportation | 11 | 9.4% |
| Medical Care/Services | 10 | 8.5% |
| Orientation to the Criminal Justice System | 9 | 7.7% |
| Crisis Intervention | 8 | 6.8% |
| Assistance Obtaining Restitution | 6 | 5.1% |
| Accompaniment to Hospital | 4 | 3.4% |
| Assistance Applying for Victim Compensation | 4 | 3.4% |
| Assistance Filing Protection/Restraining Order | 4 | 3.4% |
| Accompaniment to Court or Other Legal Proceedings | 4 | 3.4% |
| Hotlines | 4 | 3.4% |
| Other | 9 | 7.7% |
| **Desired Services but Unable to Provide Due to Lack of Resources[3]** | | |
| Crisis Intervention | 5 | 26.3% |
| Bilingual Services | 5 | 26.3% |
| Transportation | 4 | 21.1% |
| Accompaniment to Court or Other Legal Proceedings | 4 | 21.1% |
| Emergency Services | 3 | 15.8% |
| Group Counseling | 3 | 15.8% |
| Accompaniment to Hospital | 3 | 15.8% |
| Referral to Community Services including Legal Assistance | 3 | 15.8% |

[2] Agencies currently providing direct services

[3] Agencies not providing direct services

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Shelter | 3 | 15.8% |
| Orientation to the Criminal Justice System | 3 | 15.8% |
| Assistance Applying for Victim Compensation | 2 | 10.5% |
| Assistance Filing Protection/Restraining Order | 2 | 10.5% |
| Individual Counseling | 2 | 10.5% |
| Hotlines | 2 | 10.5% |
| Child Care | 2 | 10.5% |
| Medical Care/Services | 2 | 10.5% |
| Assistance Obtaining Restitution | 0 | 0.0% |
| Other | 1 | 5.3% |
| **Denial of Services** | | |
| No | 42 | 60.0% |
| Yes | 18 | 25.7% |
| Don't Know | 10 | 14.3% |

Geographic Location of Agency.

As expected, the majority of service providers were classified as being located in a metro county. As illustrated in Table 1.5, 63.8% of the agencies were located in a metro county compared to 36.2% of agencies that were located in a non-metro county. In addition, 24.1% of the agencies located in a non-metro county were located in a town with a population of less than 20,000 persons.

**Table 1.5     Geographic Location of the Agencies**

| Variable | N | Valid Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Metro or Non-Metro[4]** | | |
| Metro: 250,000-1,000,000 | 47 | 40.5% |
| Metro: <250,000 | 27 | 23.3% |
| Non-Metro: >20,000 | 14 | 12.1% |
| Non-Metro: ≤20,000 | 28 | 24.1% |
| **Metro or Non-Metro Dichotomous** | | |
| Non-Metro | 42 | 36.2% |
| Metro | 74 | 63.8% |

## Chi-Square Statistics

<u>Geographic Location and Types of Barriers</u>

Eleven separate chi-square analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between the geographic location of a service provider and the different types of barriers that are encountered. As illustrated in Tables 2.0 through 2.10, results from the chi-square analyses indicated that there are no statistically significant relationships between the geographic location of an agency and the types of barriers that are encountered. In addition, 11 separate chi-square analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between the different types of barriers that are encountered and the geographic location of the agency within the state based on judicial districts. This analysis was conducted to see how the results differed between the geographic location classification based on population, and the geographic location classification based on physical location within a state. As demonstrated in Table 3.0 through Table

---

[4] According to the Economic Research Service by the United States Department of Agriculture

3.10, there were no statistically significant relationships. A possible explanation for this result could be the low cell size within each statistic.

**Table 2.0        Geographic Location and Barriers-Rural Outreach**

|  | __No__ | __Yes__ | __Total__ |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 34 (81.0%) | 8 (19.0%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 54 (73.0%) | 20 (27.0%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 0.932$, Sig. $= 0.334$
*$p < 0.05$
df $= 1$
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.1        Geographic Location and Barriers-Non English Speaking Victims**

|  | __No__ | __Yes__ | __Total__ |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 31 (73.8%) | 11 (26.2%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 57 (77.0%) | 17 (23.0%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 0.151$, Sig. $= 0.697$
*$p < 0.05$
df $= 1$
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.2        Geographic Location and Barriers-Lack or Shortage of Volunteers**

|  | __No__ | __Yes__ | __Total__ |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 35 (83.3%) | 7 (16.7%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 64 (86.5%) | 10 (13.5%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 0.213$, Sig. $= 0.644$
*$p < 0.05$
df $= 1$
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.3      Geographic Location and Barriers-Lack or Shortage of Employees**

|                     | **No** | **Yes** | **Total** |
|---------------------|--------|---------|-----------|
|                     | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 28 (66.7%) | 14 (33.3%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count**     | 58 (78.4%) | 16 (21.6%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 1.917$, Sig. = 0.166
*$p < 0.05$
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.4      Geographic Location and Barriers-Employee and Volunteer Training**

|                     | **No** | **Yes** | **Total** |
|---------------------|--------|---------|-----------|
|                     | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 37 (88.1%) | 5 (11.9%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count**     | 62 (83.8%) | 12 (16.2%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 0.398$, Sig. = 0.528
*$p < 0.05$
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.5      Geographic Location and Barriers-Referrals from Law Enforcement**

|                     | **No** | **Yes** | **Total** |
|---------------------|--------|---------|-----------|
|                     | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 39 (92.9%) | 3 (7.1%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count**     | 68 (91.9%) | 6 (8.1%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 0.035$, Sig. = 0.852
*$p < 0.05$
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.6    Geographic Location and Barriers-Referrals from Other Service Providers**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 38 (90.5%) | 4 (9.5%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 66 (89.2%) | 8 (10.8%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 0.048$, Sig. = 0.827
*p < 0.05
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.7    Geographic Location and Barriers-Community Support**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 39 (92.9%) | 3 (7.1%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 69 (93.2%) | 5 (6.8%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 0.006$, Sig. = 0.937
*p < 0.05
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.8    Geographic Location and Barriers-Community Awareness of Services**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 36 (85.7%) | 6 (14.3%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 53 (71.6%) | 21 (28.4%) | 74 |

$\chi^2 = 2.980$, Sig. = 0.084
*p < 0.05
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.9    Geographic Location and Barriers-Board Capacity and Functionality**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 37 (88.1%) | 5 (11.9%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 71 (95.9%) | 3 (4.1%) | 74 |

$\chi^2$ = 2.572, Sig. = 0.109
*$p < 0.05$
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 2.10    Geographic Location and Barriers-None of the Above**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Non-Metro Count** | 39 (92.9%) | 3 (7.1%) | 42 |
| **Metro Count** | 68 (91.9%) | 6 (8.1%) | 74 |

$\chi^2$ = 0.35, Sig. = 0.852
*$p < 0.05$
df = 1
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.0    Judicial District and Barriers-Rural Outreach**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Judicial District 1** | 15 (83.3%) | 3 (16.6%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 7 (87.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 10 (71.4%) | 4 (28.6%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 27 (77.1%) | 8 (22.9%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 11 (84.6%) | 2 (13.4%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 10 (71.4%) | 4 (28.6%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 6 (50.0%) | 6 (50.0%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2$ = 7.394, Sig. = 0.389
*$p < 0.05$
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.1    Judicial Districts and Barriers-Non English Speaking Victims**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| Judicial District 1 | 16 (88.9%) | 2 (11.1%) | 18 |
| Judicial District 2 | 7 (87.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 8 |
| Judicial District 3 | 9 (64.3%) | 5 (35.7%) | 14 |
| Judicial District 4 | 27 (77.1%) | 8 (22.9%) | 35 |
| Judicial District 5 | 8 (61.5%) | 5 (38.5%) | 13 |
| Judicial District 6 | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| Judicial District 7 | 7 (58.3%) | 5 (41.7%) | 12 |
| Statewide Agency | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 8.530$, Sig. = 0.288
*$p < 0.05$
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.2    Judicial Districts and Barriers-Lack or Shortage of Volunteers**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| Judicial District 1 | 15 (83.3%) | 3 (16.7%) | 18 |
| Judicial District 2 | 8 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| Judicial District 3 | 11 (78.6%) | 3 (21.4%) | 14 |
| Judicial District 4 | 31 (88.6%) | 4 (11.4%) | 35 |
| Judicial District 5 | 11 (84.6%) | 2 (15.4%) | 13 |
| Judicial District 6 | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| Judicial District 7 | 9 (75.0%) | 3 (25.0%) | 12 |
| Statewide Agency | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 3.811$, Sig. = 0.801
*$p < 0.05$
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.3       Judicial Districts and Barriers-Lack or Shortage of Employees**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Judicial District 1** | 12 (66.7%) | 6 (33.3%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 7 (87.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 9 (64.3%) | 5 (35.7%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 28 (80.0%) | 7 (20.0%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 9 (69.2%) | 4 (30.8%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 7 (58.3%) | 5 (41.7%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2$ = 6.389, Sig. = 0.495
*p < 0.05
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.4       Judicial Districts and Barriers-Employee and Volunteer Training**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Judicial District 1** | 16 (88.9%) | 2 (11.1%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 8 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 11 (78.6%) | 3 (21.4%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 31 (88.6%) | 4 (11.4%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 9 (69.2%) | 4 (30.8%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 10 (83.3%) | 2 (16.7%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2$ = 5.652, Sig. = 0.581
*p < 0.05
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.5       Judicial Districts and Barriers-Referrals from Law Enforcement**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Judicial District 1** | 18 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 18 |

| | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Judicial District 2** | 8 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 33 (94.3%) | 2 (5.7%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 11 (84.6%) | 2 (15.4%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 11 (91.7%) | 1 (8.3%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 5.414$, Sig. = 0.610
*$p < 0.05$
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.6    Judicial Districts and Barriers-Referrals from Other Service Providers**

| | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Judicial District 1** | 17 (94.4%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 8 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 33 (94.3%) | 2 (5.7%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 10 (76.9%) | 3 (23.1%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 11 (78.6%) | 3 (21.4%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 11 (91.7%) | 1 (8.3%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 6.989$, Sig. = 0.430
*$p < 0.05$
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.7    Judicial Districts and Barriers-Community Support**

| | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Judicial District 1** | 17 (94.4%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 8 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 34 (97.1%) | 1 (2.9%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 11 (84.6%) | 2 (15.4%) | 13 |

| | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Judicial District 6** | 13 (92.9%) | 1 (7.1%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 11 (91.7%) | 1 (8.3%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 4.479$, Sig. = 0.723
*p < 0.05
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.8      Judicial Districts and Barriers-Community Awareness of Services**

| | <u>No</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Judicial District 1** | 14 (77.8%) | 4 (22.4%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 8 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 8 (57.1%) | 6 (42.9%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 26 (74.3%) | 9 (25.7%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 10 (76.9%) | 3 (23.1%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 11 (78.6%) | 3 (21.4%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 10 (83.3%) | 2 (16.7%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 6.829$, Sig. = 0.447
*p < 0.05
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.9      Judicial Districts and Barriers-Board Capacity**

| | <u>No</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **N (%)** | **N (%)** | **N** |
| **Judicial District 1** | 18 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 8 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 13 (92.9%) | 1 (7.1%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 33 (94.3%) | 2 (5.7%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 11 (84.6%) | 2 (15.4%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 14 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 9 (75.0%) | 3 (25.0%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 10.932$, Sig. = 0.142
*p < 0.05
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Table 3.10    Judicial Districts and Barriers-None of the Above**

|  | No | Yes | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N (%) | N (%) | N |
| **Judicial District 1** | 17 (94.4%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **Judicial District 2** | 7 (87.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 8 |
| **Judicial District 3** | 13 (92.9%) | 1 (7.1%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 4** | 32 (91.4%) | 3 (8.6%) | 35 |
| **Judicial District 5** | 13 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 13 |
| **Judicial District 6** | 12 (85.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 14 |
| **Judicial District 7** | 11 (91.7%) | 1 (8.3%) | 12 |
| **Statewide Agency** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |

$\chi^2 = 2.618$, Sig. = 0.918
*p < 0.05
df = 7
Note: Missing cases are excluded

**Independent Samples T-Test**

Geographic Location and Number of Barriers.

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the means of two independent groups. The result from Table 4.0 indicated that the F value was not statistically significant (F = 0.04, p > 0.05). The variance in the number of barriers was not significantly different between metro and non-metro agencies. Since the F-test was not significant, the variances between the two groups are similar, which means that an exact t-test was conducted where equal variances were assumed. The results from Table 4.0 indicated that the effect of the geographic location on the number of barriers was not statistically significant (t = -0.072, p > 0.05).

**Table 4.0    Bivariate Analysis of Geographic Location and Number of Barriers**

| F | t | df | Mean Difference |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0.040 | -0.072 | 114 | -0.3282 |

N = 116
*p < 0.05
Means of number of barriers (Non-metro = 1.6429; metro = 1.6757)

## Qualitative Analyses

While the results from the chi-square analysis indicated that there is not a significant relationship between the geographic location of an agency and the types of barriers that are encountered, qualitative data provided by metro and non-metro agencies gave meaningful insight into the challenges that arise in service provision. Some of the most common barriers discussed within the qualitative data included a lack of employees and volunteers, rural outreach, and working with non-English speaking victims of crime.

With regards to agencies lacking employees and volunteers, one participant gave a unique statement of, "I am a one woman shop who handles every aspect of victim services along with being the Constituent Liaison for my division." Another participant wrote:

> As a smaller department, many of our officers must perform a large variety of duties in the limited amount of time given each week. Many of our officers find themselves donating time and their own resources to the department to keep our community safe.

Finally, a participant stated, "Living in a very rural area directly effecting finding suitable employees. We have had five advocates in one grant cycle. Funding to hire suitable employees is often hard to come by." While this information pertained to a shortage of employees and volunteers, it demonstrated the need for more funding which is often a concern in victim services.

One participant from a metro agency stated that rural outreach was important because, "we live in a very large and rural state, particularly this area." In addition, one non-metro agency reported that, "For victims who do not live in [our town], transportation to and from our office is an issue. We are not able to provide transportation for them." As previously mentioned, while the results from the chi-square analysis did not indicate a significant relationship, the qualitative data that was provided through open-ended questions helps demonstrate how rural outreach affected service provision.

Through open-ended responses, agencies reported that a common barrier in service provision was working with victims who do not speak English. Participants of metro agencies stated that, "we need to be able to provide better resources for Non-English speaking victims" and "we have members of our agency who are bilingual, but may not be available or on shift." Agencies located in non-metro locations voiced similar concerns with this language divide indicating that there is a, "lack of Spanish speaking officers to assist beyond the initial call for service." Furthermore, another non-metro agency disclosed that it is, "difficult to accommodate Spanish speakers." Again, while the chi-square analysis results did not indicate a significant relationship between an agency's location and this reported barrier of working with non-English speaking clients, concerns from agencies in both localities indicate that it is hindering service provision.

Other trends were discovered when examining the qualitative data that was provided by metro and non-metro agencies. Metro agencies most frequently reported that a lack of community awareness was a major barrier in service provision. Furthermore, many metro agencies acknowledged that rural areas need more funding. In fact, one participant stated that, "community awareness is essential for individuals

to receive much needed help and support," while another individual said, "community support…many community members and stakeholders, including elected officials, still do not see domestic violence as a real issue or see a need for programs to help prevent or reduce domestic violence." With regard to funding rural agencies, a participant reported, "we need funding to provide services in rural areas in [the state]." Additionally, another agency wrote, "rural access to services and supports for victims is a huge issue in [the state]. Even the most populous region of the state [ranges from state border to border]." While metro agencies often reported a lack of community awareness and support, non-metro agencies reported a lack of funding. One agency stated, "we need financial support for basic operations" while another participant indicated that a major barrier with funding was "a lack of funds to help move or transport [victims]." Finally, another participant commented, "funding is always an issue. [It] would be great to have more designated funds to assist with direct client needs." Overall, the qualitative data indicated that many agencies suffer from numerous barriers that hinder service provision, despite the lack of statistical significant relationships within the analyses. In addition, this data demonstrated that agencies located in metro counties often experience different barriers that agencies in non-metro counties encounter.

As indicated above, even though there were no statistically significant relationships between the variables that were examined, descriptive statistics and qualitative data demonstrated that multiple barriers were reported by agencies located in non-metro counties as well as agencies located in metro counties. Major barriers that were discussed included lack of funding, rural outreach, community support, and working with survivors of crime who do not speak English. In addition, many agencies indicated that they have had to deny services to crime victims for one reason

or another.  Even though the relationships between the variables were not significant, the qualitative results provided more insight into the challenges that providers encounter when serving victims of crime.

DISCUSSION

As previously indicated, there has been an abundance of research that has documented the different barriers encountered by victims seeking services (Logan et al., 2001; McGrath et al., 2012; Rural Clearinghouse, 1993). In addition, research has addressed the striking differences found between rural communities and urban communities with regards to isolation and traditional gender roles (Eastman et al., 2007; Grama, 2000; Logan et al., 2001; McGrath et al., 2012; Rural Clearinghouse, 1993). However, in order to gain a better understanding of the field of victim services, specifically in regards to service provision, it is critical for research to address the barriers that arise when organizations are serving different crime victims.

The overall purpose of this study was to address the gap in the current literature with regards to the relationship between geographic location and barriers in service provision. Unfortunately, there were no statistical significant relationships between the geographic location of an agency and the type of barrier that was encountered. In addition, when the location of an agency was examined by judicial district, results still indicated that there were no statistically significant relationships. However, a likely explanation for this result could be the small sample size, which was discussed further in the limitations of this study. Furthermore, when the qualitative data was examined, it was clear that agencies within metro and non-metro communities faced many barriers that hinder service provision. Some of these barriers were similar, such as working with non-English speaking victims, and some were very different. Finally, it is important to note that while there was not a

statistically significant relationship between the geographic location of a service provider and the number of barriers that were encountered, more than half of the agencies reported that they had encountered at least one barrier in service provision.

Rural outreach was another barrier that was reported by 19.0% of non-metro agencies and 27.0% of metro agencies. While there was not a statistically significant relationship between this barrier and the geographic location of the different agencies, this barrier was the second most frequently listed barrier by agencies. In addition, when asked what barrier was believed to be most important to address, multiple agencies indicated that rural outreach was critical and needed to be addressed. These percentages may seem low, but it does indicate that agencies, including metro agencies, realize and acknowledge that rural outreach poses a threat to service provision. By acknowledging that rural outreach is a barrier, service agencies can begin to focus on reaching out to victims who face unique challenges that arise in a rural community setting.

One barrier that warrants discussion is a lack of funding for adequate service provision. While this was not provided as a barrier to choose from within the survey, many agencies, specifically non-metro agencies, reported in open-ended text that this was a major problem in service provision. Similar to past research, agencies indicated that certain services, like counseling, were not available for crime victims because of funding problems. In addition, many of the non-metro agencies discussed that basic amenities, such as gas cards, phones, stalking kits, and hygienic products were needed, but there were no allocated resources to obtain these needed resources. Lack of appropriate funding can also be connected to other problems that were indicated by agencies, such as a shortage in employees.

Of the agencies that completed the survey, 25.6% report that they faced an employee shortage in their organization with 33.3% of all non-metro agencies indicating this to be a barrier. Even though there was not a statistically significant relationship between the two variables, more participants from non-metro communities expressed this to be a concern because of the problems that can occur when agencies are not fully staffed. Supporting previous research (Maier, 2011), employees indicated that a shortage in staff could signify a lower quality of service provision to those in needs. An agency that employs fewer employees may not be able to provide as many individualistic services, as it becomes a quality versus quantity problem. Another issue that was documented included working an extended number of hours within the work week time frame. Previous research has demonstrated that overworking employees or a lack in employees has led to high rates of staff turnover, frustration, and vicarious trauma (Maier, 2011; Macy et al., 2010; Ullman & Townsend, 2007).

## Policy Implications

While there were no statistically significant relationships between the geographical location of an agency and the types and numbers of barriers encountered, descriptive statistics and qualitative data gave insight into some of the main issues in service provision and locality of an agency. A recurring theme that was discovered through the qualitative data revolved around the issue of a shortage in funding. As previously discussed, funding directly impacts service provision, especially in non-metro agencies, and needs to be addressed at multiple levels of government. In fact, the state in question currently does not provide any funding for service provision, which means services providers, specifically community based advocacy organizations, must rely solely on federal funds and/or compete for highly

sought after grants.  By implementing policy that provides adequate funding for providers, barriers in service provision could diminish, thus, enhancing the quality and quantity of services.

**Future Research**

While the statistical analyses did not yield significant results, qualitative data demonstrated that there are clear barriers in service provision, which illiterates the importance of utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods in research.  In addition, to incorporating mixed methods, researchers need to strive to obtain larger sample sizes, which will help with the generalizability, validity, and reliability of the results.  In addition, researchers should use a variety of statistics, such as regression models, so that predictive statements can be made about the types of barriers that are encountered and impact that geography might have in service provision.  Another area that future research should address is the lack of a best practices service provision model.  Researchers need to evaluate the different models to establish a best practice service provision model.  With the lack of literature that addresses the barriers that service providers encounter, it is evident that future research needs to continue to address this gap in research.

CONCLUSION

Previous research has indicated that rural communities often encounter obstacles, like isolation and lack of resources, which are not as prevalent in urban communities (Logan et al., 2001; McGrath et al., 2012; Rural Clearinghouse, 1993; Websdale, 1995). This is especially evident in the research that has addressed the barriers that victims face when seeking services (Rural Clearinghouse, 1993; Websdale, 1995; Logan et al., 2001; Bennett et al., 2004; Logan et al., 2004; Logan et al., 2005; Sims et al., 2005; McGrath et al., 2012). While the different statistical analyses within this study indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship between the location of a service provider and the type of barrier encountered, the qualitative data that was gathered through open-ended questions provided meaningful insight into the problems within non-metro communities in regards to rural outreach, a shortage of qualified employees, and working with non-English speaking victims. This is important for both the victims and the service providers for a variety of reasons. First, and foremost, if service agencies are not able to provide adequate services because of the prominent barriers, then there is a direct impact on the quality and quantity of services that victims receive. More importantly, the state in question affords victims of crime constitutional rights. When agencies are not able to provide adequate services and crime victims are not able to receive services because of the barriers that arise due to geographic locality, those constitutional rights are being violated. In essence, those constitutional rights are being violated based solely on the geographic location of the victim within the state.

REFERENCES

Babbie, E. R. (2013). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Bennett, L., Riger, S., Schewe, P., Howard, A., & Wasco, S. (2004). Effectiveness of hotline, advocacy, counseling, and shelter services for victims of domestic violence: A statewide evaluation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(7), 815-829.

Bostaph, L. G., & Jackson, M. (2008). Professionalization of the victim assistance discipline. In *Idaho victim assistance academy advanced curriculum,* L.G. Bostaph & M. Jackson (eds). Boise, ID: IVAA.

Butler, P., Swenson, G., Krugerud, M., Plante, J., & Clausen, W. (2001). *Minnesota Center for Crime Victims Services survey*. Retrieved from http://www.d.umn.edu/cla/faculty/jhamlin/3925/Readings/MNCrimeVictimsre port.pdf.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Campbell, R., Townsend, S. M., Long, S. M., Kinnison, K. E., Pulley, E. M., Adames, S. B., & Wasco, S. M. (2006). Responding to sexual assault victims' medical and emotional needs: A national study of the services provided by SANE programs. *Research in Nursing & Health, 29*, 384-398.

Clawson, H. J., Small, K. M., Go, E. S., & Myles, B. W. (2003). Needs assessment for service providers and trafficking victims. Washington D.C.: U. S. Department of Justice.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method.* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Eastman, B. J., & Bunch, S. G. (2007). Providing services to survivors of domestic violence: A comparison of rural and urban service provider perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(4), 465-473.

Eastman, B. J., Bunch, S. G., Williams, A. H., & Carawan, L. W. (2007). Exploring the perceptions of domestic violence service providers in rural localities. *Violence Against Women, 13*(7), 700-716.

Grama, J. (2000) Women forgotten: Difficulties faced by rural victims of domestic violence. *Journal of Family Law,* 14, 173-189.

Grossman, S. F., Lundy, M., George, C. C., Crabtree-Nelson, S. (2010). Shelter and service receipt for victims of domestic violence in Illinois. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(11), 2077-2093.

Grossman, S. F., Lundy, M., Bertrand, C., Ortiz, C., Tomas-Tolentino, G., Ritzema, K., & Matson, J. (2009). Service patterns of adult survivors of childhood versus adult sexual assault/abuse. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 18*, 655-672.

Hart, B. (1992). Battered women and the criminal justice system. *Do arrests and restraining orders work*, 98-114.

Henning, K., & Klesges, L. (2002). Utilization of counseling and supportive services by female victims of domestic abuse. *Violence and Victims, 17*(5), 623-636.

Kulkarni, S. J., Bell, S., & Rhodes, D. M. (2012). Back to the basics: Essential qualities of services for survivors of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 18*(1), 85-101.

Logan, T. K., Evans, L., Stevenson, E., & Jordan, C. E. (2005). Barriers to services for rural  and urban survivors of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(5), 591-616.

Logan, T. K., Stevenson, E., Evans, L., & Leukefeld, C. (2004). Rural and urban women's perceptions of barriers to health, mental health, and criminal justice services: Implications for victim services. *Violence and Victims, 19*(1), 37-62.

Logan, T.K., Walker, R., Leukefeld, C. G. (2001). Rural, urban influenced, and urban differences among domestic violence arrestees. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(3), 266-283.

Macy, R. J., Giattina, M. C., Parish, S. L., & Crosby, C. (2010). Domestic violence and sexual assault services: Historical concerns and contemporary challenges. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(1), 3-32.

Maier, S. L. (2011). Rape crisis centers and programs: "Doing amazing, wonderful things on peanuts". *Women and Criminal Justice, 21*, 141-169.

McGrath, S. A., Johnson, M., & Miller, M. H. (2012). The social ecological challenges of rural victim advocacy: An exploratory study. *Journal of Community Psychology, 40*(5), 588-606.

Office of the Attorney General. (2004). *Idaho manual on the rights of victims of crime*. Retrieved from http://www.ag.idaho.gov/victimAssistance/crimeVictimsRights.html.

O'Sullivan, E. & Carlton, A. (2001). Victim services, community outreach, and contemporary rape crisis centers: A comparison of independent and multiservice centers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(4), 343-360.

Peterson, D., & Underwood, T. (2000). *Victim services needs assessment: A study of victim services in the community*. Retrieved from http://www.washburn.edu/academics/community-continuing-education/academic-outreach/jcvvs/reseach-special-projects/victim-services-needs.html.

Rosay, A. B. (2009). *Needs assessment survey results for Alaska State Victim Assistance Academy*. Retrieved from http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/research/2000/0907.asvaa/0907.01.asvaa.html

Rural Clearinghouse. (1993). National adult literacy survey overlooks rural illiteracy. *Rural Clearinghouse Digest on Rural Literacy, 1*(1), 1-8.

Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Statistics for people who think they hate statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sims, B., Yost, B., & Abbott, C. (2005). Use and nonuse of victim services programs: Implications from a statewide survey of crime victims. *Criminology & Public Policy, 4*(2), 361-384.

Sullivan, C. M., & Bybee, D. I. (1999). Reducing violence using community-based advocacy for women with abusive partners. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 43-53.

Ullman, S. E., & Townsend, S. M. (2007). Barriers to working with sexual assault survivors. *Violence Against Women, 13*(4), 412-443.

United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (2013). Rural-Urban Continuum Codes. Retrieved from http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-continuum-codes/documentation.aspx.

United States Department of Justice. (1984). *Violence Against Women Act*. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Justice (2011). *Use of victim service agencies by victims of serious violent crime, 1993-2009*. (NCJ 234212). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Government Accountability Office (2007). *Services provided to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking*. (GAO-07-846R Domestic Violence Services). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Warnken, H. (2012). *Violence against women needs assessment program*. Retrieved from https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/bccj/VAW_Study-FINAL.pdf.

Websdale, N. (1995). Rural woman abuse: The voices of Kentucky women. *Violence Against Women, 1*, 309-338.

Zweig, J. M., & Burt, M. R. (2007). Predicting women's perceptions of domestic violence and sexual assault agency helpfulness: What matters to program clients? *Violence Against Women, 13*(11), 1149-1178.

Zweig, J. M., Schlichter, K. A., & Burt, M. R. (2002). Assisting women victims of violence who experience multiple barriers to services. *Violence Against Women, 8*(2), 162-180.

**APPENDIX**

**Agency Survey**

**Agency Survey**

1.) Which of the following describes the type of agency/organization for which you are completing this survey? Check all that apply.

- o Direct victim service provider
- o Law enforcement
- o Prosecutor's office
- o Medical provider
- o Health/human services
- o Mental health services
- o Social services/welfare
- o Faith-based services
- o Other (please specify)

  _____

2.) Which of the following <u>best</u> describes the primary function of your agency/organization? Please select one answer.

- o Direct victim service provider
- o Law enforcement
- o Prosecutor's office
- o Medical provider
- o Health/human services
- o Mental health services
- o Social services/welfare
- o Faith-based services
- o Other (please specify)

  _____

3.) In the space below, please write the city/town in which your agency is located. This information will be used only for mapping purposes to provide a depiction of victim services throughout the state.

4.) In which county is your agency/organization located?

_____

5.) Which counties does your agency/organization serve? Check all that apply.

- All Counties
- Ada
- Adams
- Bannock
- Bear Lake
- Benewah
- Bingham
- Blaine
- Boise
- Bonner
- Bonneville
- Boundary
- Butte
- Camas
- Canyon
- Caribou
- Cassia
- Clark
- Clearwater
- Custer
- Elmore
- Franklin
- Fremont
- Gem
- Gooding
- Idaho
- Jefferson
- Jerome
- Kootenai
- Latah
- Lemhi
- Lewis
- Lincoln
- Madison
- Minidoka
- Nez Perce
- Oneida
- Owyhee
- Payette
- Power
- Shoshone
- Teton
- Twin Falls
- Valley
- Washington

6.) Did your agency/organization serve any crime victims between 2008-2014?

o   Yes

o   No ───────────────► If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 45

o   Don't know

7.) Which types of crime victims did your agency/organization serve between 2008-2014? Please check all that apply.

o   Domestic/intimate partner violence
o   Adult sexual assault/abuse
o   Child sexual assault/abuse
o   Stalking
o   Survivors of homicide victims
o   DUI
o   Economic/property crime
o   Other (Please specify) _____
o   N/A ───────────────► If you selected "N/A," please proceed to Question 45

8.) In the spaces provided below, write in the number of crime victims your agency/organization served during each of the following time periods. Please enter information for as many time periods as possible.

_____ January 1, 2008 - December 31, 2008

_____ January 1, 2009 - December 31, 2009

_____ January 1, 2010 - December 31, 2010

_____ January 1, 2011 - December 31, 2011

_____ January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012

_____ January 1, 2013 - December 31, 2013

_____ January 1, 2014 - Today

9.) For each year, indicate the types of victims that were served by placing a check in the appropriate box. Check all that apply.

| | 008 | 009 | 010 | 011 | 012 | 013 | 014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Domestic/Intimate partner violence | | | | | | | |
| Sexual assault/abuse | | | | | | | |
| Stalking | | | | | | | |
| Homicide survivors | | | | | | | |
| Economic/property crime | | | | | | | |
| DUI | | | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

10.) In the space below, please briefly describe the type(s) of victims your agency/organization <u>most frequently</u> served between 2008-2014.

11.) Please indicate if your agency/organization served crime victims from any of the following underserved/vulnerable populations between 2008-2014. Check all that apply.

- Under 12 years old

- 13-17 years old

- Over 65 years old

- College students

- Non-English speaking

- Migrant workers

- Hispanic/Latino

- Native American

- Physically disabled

- Mentally disabled

- Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender/Queer (LGBTQ)

- Other _____

12.) In the space below, please briefly describe the type(s) of underserved/vulnerable victims your agency/organization most frequently served between 2008-2014.

13.) Does your agency/organization ever have to deny services to a victim?

o   Yes

o   No ──────────────────► If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 15

o   Don't know


14.) If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please briefly describe the instances in which your agency/organization has to deny services to a victim, and why.


15.) Does your agency/organization regularly provide direct services to crime victims such as shelter, hotlines, counseling, or assistance with medical/legal systems?


o   Yes

o   No ──────────────────► If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 17

o   Don't know

16.) Please indicate which direct services your agency/organization currently provides to victims. Check all that apply.

- o Crisis intervention
- o Emergency services (e.g., food, clothing)
- o Individual counseling
- o Group counseling/programs
- o Accompaniment to hospital
- o Medical care/services
- o Referral to community services including legal assistance
- o Assistance applying for victim compensation
- o Assistance obtaining restitution
- o Assistance filing protection/restraining orders
- o Orientation to the criminal justice system
- o Accompaniment to court or other legal proceedings
- o Shelter
- o Hotlines
- o Child care
- o Transportation
- o Bilingual services
- o Other _____
- o N/A

17.) Please indicate which services your agency/organization would like to offer for crime victims, but is unable to due to lack of resources. Check all that apply.

- o Crisis intervention
- o Emergency services (e.g., food, clothing)
- o Individual counseling
- o Group counseling/programs
- o Accompaniment to hospital
- o Medical care/services
- o Referral to community services including legal assistance
- o Assistance applying for victim compensation
- o Assistance obtaining restitution
- o Assistance filing protection/restraining orders
- o Orientation to the criminal justice system
- o Accompaniment to court or other legal proceedings
- o Shelter
- o Hotlines
- o Child care
- o Transportation
- o Bilingual services
- o Other _____
- o N/A

18.) Besides the services indicated in the previous question, are there any other victim services that are needed or desired? If so, please briefly describe them below.

19.) Please indicate any other activities your agency/organization engages in related to crime victimization. Check all that apply.

- o Community education
- o Prevention efforts
- o Training personal
- o Attending victimization-related conferences
- o Other _____
- o N/A

20.) Does your agency/organization experience any of the following barriers in regard to providing services to crime victims? Check all that apply.

- o Rural outreach
- o Non-English speaking victims
- o Lack or shortage of volunteers
- o Lack or shortage of employees
- o Employee/volunteer training
- o Referrals from law enforcement
- o Referrals from other service providers (e.g., hospitals)
- o Community support
- o Community awareness of services
- o Board capacity/functionality
- o None of the above

21.) Of the barriers indicated in the previous question, which one is the <u>most</u> important for your agency/organization, and why?

22.) Please describe any other barriers your agency/organization experiences in regard to serving crime victims.

23.) If your agency/organization has experienced any barriers to providing victim services, were there any creative/innovative ways in which they were overcome? Please explain.

24.) Does your agency/organization administer victim satisfaction surveys?

o Yes

o No ⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯→ If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 26

o Don't know

25.) If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please briefly describe what is assessed in the victim surveys that are administered.

26.) Besides victim satisfaction surveys, does your agency/organization conduct other evaluations of services or programs?

- o Yes
- o No ────────────────► If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 28
- o Don't know

27.) If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please briefly describe the evaluations conducted by your agency/organization.

> *Instructions: The following questions ask about personnel in your agency including duration of employment, types of positions, and educational/training requirements.*

28.) How long have you worked for this agency/organization? Please indicate the total amount of time in years and months.

***If you have worked for this agency/organization for less than one year, please write "0" in the box next to "Years" and the number of months in the second box.

_____    Years

_____    Months

29.) What is the average amount of time most employees have worked for your agency/organization?

- o  Less than one year
- o  1-3 years
- o  4-6 years
- o  7-9 years
- o  10 or more years
- o  Don't know

30.) What is your current role/position in this agency/organization?

31.) Please list all positions in your agency/organization.

32.) How long have you worked in a position related to victim services? Please indicate the amount of time in years and/or months.

***If you have worked for this agency/organization for less than one year, please write "0" in the box next to "Years" and the number of months in the second box.

_____    Years

_____    Months

33.) What is the highest level of education you have <u>completed</u>?

o   Less than high school
o   High school diploma/GED
o   Some college
o   Bachelor's degree
o   Master's degree
o   Doctorate (e.g., MD, PhD, JD)
o   Other _____

34.) What are the educational requirements for your position?

35.) Have you received any specialized education/training in administrative management?

o   Yes

o   No   —————————————————► If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 37

o   Don't know

36.) If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please briefly describe the education/training you have received in administrative management.

37.) Have you received any specialized training in victim services?

o   Yes

o   No   —————————————————► If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 40

o   Don't know

38.) If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please briefly describe the training you have received in victim services.

39.) Is specialized training in victim services required for your position?

o   Yes

o   No

o   Don't know

40.) Are there any positions in your agency/organization for which specialized training in victim services is required? If so, please briefly describe the position and type of training required.

41.) Is there any additional training you believe would improve your ability, or the ability of other employees, to serve victims? For example, are there specific types of crimes or victims for which additional training is needed?

42.) In addition to examining the services available to crime victims and needs of agencies throughout Idaho, another goal of this project is to assess the resources and services needed from the victim's perspective. To that end, we would like to provide surveys to your agency to be distributed to crime victims. These surveys are anonymous, in paper format (with an option to complete the survey online if desired), and include pre-paid return envelopes. Would your agency be willing to distribute these surveys to all crime victims who come in for services?

- o  Yes
- o  No ─────────────────► If you selected "No," please proceed to Question 47
- o  Don't know

43.) How many crime victims come into your agency/organization in an average month? This will be used to determine the number of surveys we should provide.

44.) In the space below please provide the contact information (name, if necessary, and address) to whom the surveys should be sent for distribution. This information will only be used to send the victim surveys to your agency/organization. It will not be linked to the remainder of this survey.

*Instructions: Please answer Questions 45 and 46 only if your agency/organization does not currently provide services to crime victims. Otherwise, please proceed to the end of the survey.*

45.) Are there any services your agency/organization would like to offer for crime victims, but is unable to due to lack of resources? Check all that apply.

- o Crisis intervention
- o Emergency services (e.g., food, clothing)
- o Individual counseling
- o Group counseling/programs
- o Accompaniment to hospital
- o Referral to community services including legal assistance
- o Assistance applying for victim compensation

- o Assistance obtaining restitution

- o Assistance filing protection/restraining orders

- o Orientation to the criminal justice system

- o Accompaniment to court or other legal proceedings

- o Shelter

- o Hotlines

- o Child care

- o Transportation

- o Bilingual services

- o Other _____

- o None of the above

46.) What barriers have prevented your agency/organization from providing the services indicated above?

47.) Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey! If you have any additional comments, please write them below.