



The FAVE Project

Financial Assistance and Victims' Experiences

Technical Report No. 7: Victims' Experiences Seeking Financial Assistance for Sexual Offences

Kathleen Daly, Robyn Holder, and Victoria Meyer

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Griffith Criminology Institute
Griffith University

The FAVE Project
Financial Assistance and Victims' Experiences

Technical Report No. 7:
Victims' Experiences Seeking Financial Assistance for Sexual Offences

Kathleen Daly, Robyn Holder, and Victoria Meyer
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice and
Griffith Criminology Institute

Griffith University

May 2019

When citing this report, please use:

Daly, K., R. Holder, and V. Meyer (2019). *The FAVE Project, Financial Assistance and Victims' Experiences, Technical Report No. 7: Victims' Experiences Seeking Financial Assistance for Sexual Offences*. Brisbane: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice and Griffith Criminology Institute, Griffith University.

© Kathleen Daly, Robyn Holder, and Victoria Meyer

Technical Report No. 7: Victims' Experiences Seeking Financial Assistance for Sexual Offences

Introduction

Technical Report No. 7 is one of two technical reports for the Financial Assistance and Victims' Experiences Project (the FAVE Project). *Report No. 7* centres on a study of victims' experiences with Queensland's financial assistance scheme, focusing on the relevant research literature, study methods, research ethics, and research instruments for those applying for and awarded financial assistance. *Report No. 6* describes the legal context and operational activities of Victim Assist Queensland (VAQ); it focuses on the relevant research literature, methods used to assemble the FAVE and FLOW datasets, and selected findings on outcomes (Daly, Holder, and Meyer 2019). Whereas *Report No. 6* depicts the *financial assistance* side of the FAVE Project, *Report No. 7* depicts the *victims' experiences* side. Both analyse financial assistance for *primary victims of sexual offences*. The VAQ scheme began on 1 December 2009 and is administered by staff at VAQ, an organisational unit in Queensland's Department of Justice and Attorney-General.

The FAVE Project is part of a broader program of research, funded by two ARC research grants (Daly, Chief Investigator, 2008-2011; 2013-2015), with continuing support from a third ARC grant (Daly, Chief Investigator, 2017-20), on conventional and innovative justice responses to violent victimisation. The aim is to assess and compare different justice mechanisms (financial assistance being one such mechanism) in different contexts of sexual and violent victimisation, from a victim's or survivor's perspective. Selected reports, conference papers, and publications to date include Daly (2011, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b); Daly and Holder (2017, 2019); Daly and Wade (2017); and Holder and Daly (2018).

The two sides of the FAVE Project are an integrated whole, and each has proceeded in tandem throughout the project. Likewise, the research literature relevant to each has overlap. However, we decided to write two reports because the aims and methods of each side of the project differed. *Report No. 6* presents the quantitative methods and findings from datasets on assessor decisions and outcomes of cases. *Report No. 7* presents the methods and findings of an online survey and interviews with survivors on their experiences seeking financial assistance.

Technical Report No. 6 provides a brief history of the rise of state schemes for victims of violent crime, types of schemes in Australia, and legislative changes in Queensland. Two sources of de-identified data were used to assemble the FAVE dataset: VAQ's administrative database and variables created and coded from the Statement of Reasons, which accompanies VAQ's decision on each application. A third source of VAQ de-identified data were case dispositions to January 2015 (the FLOW dataset), which permitted a more accurate analysis of time to decide an application. *Technical Report No. 6* describes VAQ's decision-making processes, how the FAVE and FLOW datasets were assembled, and the variables coded. Selected findings are reported, and detailed appendices supply supporting information about the scheme and outcomes. To understand assessor discretion and potential bias, we drew upon the criminal justice literature on real rape and credible victims.

Technical Report No. 7 reviews the empirical literature on victims' experiences with state schemes and new knowledge that the FAVE Project sought to contribute. It gives the

conceptual basis for the questions asked in the online survey and interviews, the methods used, and instruments created to carry out the research.

For the victims' experiences side of the FAVE Project, our research questions were as follows. Why do victims apply to financial assistance and what do they hope to achieve? How do they judge their experiences with staff and the payments they received? What difficulties do they face in seeking financial assistance? Does the money they receive assist in their recovery from crime (as VAQ intends)? Does it provide appropriate recognition of their victimisation (as the legislation calls for)? What is the meaning of the *recognition payment* to victims, and how do they decide to spend the money and why?

At the time of the FAVE research, the recognition payment for sexual offences ranged from \$1,301 to \$10,000. For category A (more serious sexual offences), it could range from \$5,000 to \$10,000; and for category B (less serious sexual offences), \$1,301 to \$3,500. Once determining the category of violence, an assessor had discretion, without legislative guidance, to determine the amount to award within the band. This wide-ranging discretion was eliminated with amendments to legislation taking effect on 1 July 2017. However, at the time of the FAVE Project, it formed a key area of analysis of the role of assessor discretion in deciding outcomes (the financial assistance side of the project). All eligible applicants receive a recognition payment, and they can spend it entirely as they wish. A second key area for inquiry, of relevance to the victims' experiences side of the project, is the meaning of the recognition payment to victims and its role in facilitating recovery and a sense of justice.

There are preferences in using the terms *victim* or *survivor*, especially in research on sexual and violent victimisation. We alternate usage of both terms in this report.

Acknowledgments

Many people contributed to the success of the FAVE Project, and we are grateful for their support. The ARC contributed significant funding with DP130103775 (2013-2015, extended to February 2017), aided with funds by Griffith University's Art, Education, and Law Pro-Vice Chancellor (Professor Paul Mazerolle) and (then) Head of School (Professor Janet Ransley) to support a post-doctoral fellow on the 2013-2015 ARC grant (Robyn Holder).

The VAQ office and staff have been key partners. We especially acknowledge Nicola Doumany (Director, December 2009 to October 2016) and Dean Corless (Acting Director, 12 October 2016 to 15 February 2018; Director, 16 February 2018 to present) for their active engagement, assistance, and support throughout the FAVE Project.

Daly made initial contact with VAQ in 2011, with several phone conversations and email exchanges with VAQ staff member Jonty Bush, who provided data and insight to structure a research stream in an ARC research proposal. When the project was awarded funds from the ARC, key people at the research implementation stage in 2013 and 2014 were Nicola and Jonty, along with Bill Duffy (VAQ data specialist), Amanda Shipway, and Shannon Lowrie, who guided the data transfer process and provided the de-identified data. In developing the interviews, Holder thanks Melinda Purdie, Megan Topping, and Shannon for developing an office protocol on ways of inviting victim participation in the research, facilitating contact with interviewees, and assisting in the online survey. In bringing *Technical Report No. 6* and *No. 7* to press, we acknowledge the superb editorial review and assistance of Juliet Davis, Research Fellow on the team.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Acknowledgments

Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Participants and response rates for the online survey and interview | 20 |
| Table 2. Shared questions in the online survey and interview | 28 |
| Table 3. Interview mode and recruitment pathway | 29 |

Legislative Abbreviations

COVA (*Criminal Offence Victims Act 1995*)
 VOCAA (*Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009*)
 The Code (*Criminal Code 1899 (Qld)*)

| | |
|--|---|
| Notes on compensation as a term, changes to VAQ practice since the FAVE research period, money currents, and Financial assistance and FA | 6 |
|--|---|

Part I. Historical and legal context (refer to *Technical Report No. 6*, pp. 11-23)

Part II. VAQ decision-making under VOCAA (refer to *Technical Report No. 6*, pp. 24-33)

Part III. State payments to victims of violent crime

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Overview | 9 |
| B. Research on victims' experiences with schemes and their impact | 10 |
| C. Other research on state schemes | 13 |

Part IV. FAVE studies of victims' experiences

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Research questions | 13 |
| B. Research design | 13 |
| 1. Participant eligibility criteria | 14 |
| 2. VAQ and service sector liaison | 15 |
| 3. Ethical considerations and formal approval | 16 |
| C. Implementation | 17 |
| 1. Prospective design | 17 |
| 2. Retrospective design | 18 |
| (a) recruitment | 18 |
| (b) response rates and participant numbers | 19 |
| D. Conceptual foundations | 19 |
| 1. Characterising the research literature | 20 |
| 2. Recovery | 21 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3. Justice | 22 |
| (a) procedural and outcome justice | 22 |
| (b) belief in a just world | 23 |
| (c) events as misfortune or injustice | 23 |
| 4. Sexual victimisation and disclosure | 23 |
| E. Content of the online survey | 24 |
| F. Mode and content of the retrospective design interview | 25 |
| 1. Demographics | 25 |
| 2. Financial assistance process | 25 |
| 3. Incident(s) | 26 |
| 4. Effects of the incident(s) and help-seeking | 26 |
| 5. Reporting to police and justice responses | 27 |
| 6. Feelings today | 27 |
| 7. Views on recovery and justice | 27 |

Part V. Reflections on the research

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Interview mode | 28 |
| 1. What we would do differently next time | 29 |

| | |
|------------|----|
| References | 31 |
|------------|----|

Appendices

| | |
|--|----|
| Appendix A. Case summaries provided by the Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service | 37 |
| Appendix B. Participant recruitment pathways via VAQ | 38 |
| Appendix C. FAVE Project contact protocol | 40 |
| Appendix D. Invitation scripts for VAQ verbal contact | 42 |
| Appendix E. Instruments reviewed when designing the FAVE instruments | 43 |
| Appendix F. Prospective design interviews at time1 and time2 (summary) | 44 |
| Appendix G. Retrospective design online invitation and survey | 48 |
| Appendix H. Retrospective design interview | 55 |

Notes

1. Compensation as a term. When the idea of providing money to victims of violent crime first emerged in the 1960s, the term *compensation* was widely used by legislators and researchers to refer to state- or criminal court-determined payments to eligible crime victims. When used this way, the term is not accurate. Compensation more properly refers to money awarded to a plaintiff in a civil court case. Thus, whenever possible, our preference is to use alternative terms such as monetary payments, awards, or recompense to crime victims. However, the term compensation is used when quoting or paraphrasing the work of others.

2. Changes to VAQ practice since the FAVE study period. The FAVE Project analysed financial assistance decisions and victims' experiences for applications lodged and decided from 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2013. Since then, a number of changes to VAQ practice have occurred.

During 2014-15, a legislated review of VAQ took place, which resulted in 15 recommended changes (see *Technical Report No. 6*, Appendix 6). All the recommendations were accepted and took effect on 1 July 2017. Of the legislative changes, the most relevant to the FAVE Project was the introduction of fixed amounts for each category of violence for the

recognition payment. Thus, there is no longer assessor discretion when deciding the payment within the category (or band), once the category is determined.

Another legislative change responded to recommendation 7: ‘to expand the definition of “act of violence” in [VOCAA] to include an act of domestic and family violence to align with the definition under the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012*’. The implication is that acts of violence within domestic and family violence are not limited to physical violence alone, but may include psychological, emotional, or economic abuse. This change has seen applications for domestic and family violence triple from 512 in FY 2017 to 1,539 in FY 2018 (Stone 2019).

In 2015, VAQ implemented two internal changes. First, a ‘rapid assessment’ process was introduced to fast-track cases not requiring additional evidence. This has significantly reduced the time frame for processing applications. Second, VAQ engaged an external consultant to assist with re-wording correspondence and Statements of Reasons (SoRs) into plain English. VAQ continues to implement these changes in their formal communication with victims.

3. Money currency. Unless otherwise shown, all money amounts are in Australian dollars.

4. Financial assistance and FA. Throughout this report and in the research instruments used, we use these terms interchangeably.

Parts I and II are in *Technical Report No. 6*, pp. 11-33. They provide background on state schemes for victims of violent crime in historical and international perspective and detail on Queensland's financial assistance scheme.

III. State payments to victims of violent crime

A. Overview

State schemes for criminal injuries compensation (CIC) or financial assistance (FA) to victims of violent crime emerged in the 1960s. A compilation by the United States (US) Office for Victims of Crime (2005) lists 35 countries with schemes; the federated countries (Australia, Canada, and the US) alone have 70. Depending on the jurisdiction, decision-making sites are courts, tribunals, boards, legal units in government, and specialist administrative units.

All schemes are only for victims of violent crime. Most provide funds not only to primary (or direct) victims, but also to secondary victims (witnesses of the crime or parents/guardians of child victims) and related victims (family members of those who died). Eligibility is limited to those who did not conspire to commit the offence, cooperated with the police, and can provide evidence of the incident and injury (typically with a report to the police). Criminal conviction of an offender is typically not required today, as it once was. All schemes assume that they are a payer of last resort; thus, payments that victims may have received from other sources are deducted from the final award.

There are three types of schemes. The first is criminal injuries compensation (CIC), what Miers (2014a: 119) terms the 'civil remedy surrogate'. It recompenses injury (non-economic loss such as bodily injury, pain and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life) and actual and future expenses (economic loss, including medical and dental costs, loss of earnings) resulting from a violent crime. CIC schemes differ across jurisdictions and have changed over time.

The second type is financial assistance (FA), which in Australia pays for expenses and awards a capped lump sum that is keyed to crime seriousness (a reduced non-economic loss component). The third type of scheme pays for expenses only. Schemes in Britain and New Zealand use CIC; and US jurisdictions, expenses only. Canadian jurisdictions use CIC and expenses only; and Australian jurisdictions, CIC and FA. Amounts awarded are generally highest in CIC jurisdictions and lowest for expenses only. FA jurisdictions are mid-way.

Four jurisdictions in Australia continue to use CIC, and four have shifted to FA.¹ All Australian jurisdictions cover eligible crime-related expenses such as medical and dental costs, counselling, and loss of earnings. The capped lump sum in FA schemes is called a *recognition* or *special assistance* payment. For primary victims, the maximum is \$10,000 (except the ACT with a \$26,500 cap). The total payment (including expenses) that a primary victim may receive across Australia ranges from \$30,000 (Tasmania, for a single offence) to

¹ The CIC jurisdictions are the Northern Territory, South Australia, Tasmania, and Western Australia. For those shifting to FA, Victoria was the first (1996), then Queensland (2009), New South Wales (2013), and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) (2016).

\$100,000 (South Australia) (see Victorian Law Reform Commission 2017, Appendix B, for a comparison of schemes in Australian states and territories).

Under the *Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009* (VOCAA), the Queensland FA scheme began on 1 December 2009. The parameters of the scheme for primary victims (the focus of the FAVE project) are as follows. A person must have been a victim of violence in Queensland and reported it to the police. This reporting requirement is waived for ‘special primary victims’ (including victims of sexual offences), when a report to a counsellor, psychologist, doctor, or (as of 1 July 2017), domestic violence service is accepted.

For primary victims, the FA payment comprises eligible expenses and a recognition payment, which is based on four categories of seriousness: A, B, C, and D. Sexual offences are in the A and B categories. During the research period (decisions and awards made 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2013), category A was \$5,000 to \$10,000; and category B, \$1,301 to \$3,500. For primary victims, the objective is ‘to give the victims amounts representing a *symbolic expression* by the State of the community’s *recognition* of the injuries suffered by them’ (VOCAA s 3(2)b, emphasis added). The payment can be spent entirely as a victim wishes. The maximum award for primary victims is \$75,000 plus \$500 for legal costs.

B. Research on victims’ experiences with schemes and their impact

Research on state payments to crime victims is scant, with little conceptual coherence and no marked debates. Our search of the academic empirical literature² identified 27 studies that met our criteria of analysing victim-sourced data on common crime and state schemes for victims, alone or compared with other justice mechanisms such as civil litigation. There are three streams of research, using victim-sourced data.

The first, which we term *access to justice*, describes victims’ knowledge of or access to state schemes, but it gives little or no analysis of their experiences or scheme outcomes (N=8). The second, *experiences of justice*, analyses victims’ motivations for applying to schemes and their experiences and judgments of the process and outcomes, typically using measures of satisfaction (N=13). The third, *distress-recovery*, analyses the negative psychosocial consequences of violent victimisation and whether state schemes, processes, or outcomes can reduce these negative consequences and increase well-being (N=6). Some authors discuss what is termed *therapeutic expectations* or *therapeutic* and *anti-therapeutic* effects of processes and outcomes, using terms from the literature on therapeutic jurisprudence. Studies that use these terms are in the second group of *experiences of justice* because they do not use psychological or behavioural measures of well-being.

In the following review, we exclude studies in the access to justice stream because they were not directly relevant to our research questions, and we include only the more recent studies, i.e., those from 1995 onwards. Ten studies met these criteria. Of these, five are from the Netherlands, and five are from Australia, Canada, and the US. Four focus on sexual victimisation, and all focus primarily or exclusively on state schemes for victims of violent crime. Of the ten, four were in the distress-recovery stream, and six, the experiences of justice stream.

² This section is drawn from Holder and Daly (2018). Government reports were excluded, such as a Victoria Department of Justice (August 2014) report on the Victims of Crime Compensation Tribunal.

All five Dutch studies analysed the Dutch Violent Offences Compensation Fund, using quantitative analyses of all types of violent victimisation. Three of the Dutch studies were in the distress-recovery stream, and all were led by Maarten Kunst. He and his colleagues found that half of those awarded money continued to suffer post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms some years after receiving it (Kunst, Winkel, and Bogaerts 2010), the severity of symptoms did not affect whether the amount awarded for non-economic loss (pain and suffering) was high or low (Kunst 2011), and victims with mental health problems were less likely to be satisfied with the amount awarded (Kunst 2012)—the latter study raising questions about what lies behind the concept of satisfaction.

The fourth study in this stream concerned child sexual assault victims in NSW. It found that the size of the award was not related to psychological or behavioural measures of well-being 18 months later, and was inversely related to depression and anxiety 5 years later (Swanston, Parkinson, Shrimpton, O’Toole, and Oates 2001).

For experiences of justice, three of the six studies were quantitative. Of these, Mulder’s (2013) was the most comprehensive. She surveyed 217 successful victim applicants to the Dutch Fund, 24 percent of whom had experienced a sexual crime. The most frequent reason for applying was financial (44 percent), followed by what Mulder terms ‘therapeutic expectations’ (25 percent).³ Just over 60 percent of victims were satisfied or very satisfied with their total award. There was no relationship between the amount of money received and measures of what Mulder terms ‘outcome satisfaction’ and ‘procedural satisfaction’.

Of the many variables analysed, what Mulder termed ‘procedural matters’ were more often related to victims’ satisfaction with the money awarded. The strongest predictors of satisfaction were the applicant’s contact with the Fund and a speedy decision time. In analysing the symbolic value of the money, Mulder identified two dimensions: social/external and personal/internal. The former she associated with a societal affirmation of the victim as innocent, as deserving the award, and as a form of justice; and the latter, with supporting the victim emotionally, being acknowledged as a victim, and helping the victim to cope. The amount of money a victim received did not relate to either dimension.

Kunst, Koster, and Van Heugten (2017) investigated how satisfaction with the services provided by the Dutch Fund may be mediated by victims’ prior expectations of how they would be treated and what they might receive. Victims were interviewed by phone before and after they had received the money. The authors found that at time2, victims’ satisfaction with the Fund depended on their evaluations of treatment by Fund workers and information provision, but not on ‘receipt of compensation’ (p. 11). Victims’ satisfaction was related to the fact that their request for recompense was approved, but not related to the amount they received. The authors interpret the latter finding as reinforcing Mulder (2013): it is not so much the amount of money but ‘some kind of recognition for the harm suffered’ (Kunst et al. 2017: 3036). Satisfaction was also related to a speedy decision.

A national phone survey of US victims by Newmark, Bonderman, Smith, and Liner (2003) found that 78 percent said the outcome was ‘fair and reasonable’ and that 78 percent received it in a reasonable amount of time. The authors carried out a multivariate analysis of factors

³ Mulder (2013) uses the term *therapeutic expectations* to refer to victims seeking ‘recovery of their well-being’ (p. 51, drawing from Feldthusen, Hankivsky, and Greaves [2000: 75]) and to ‘receiving acknowledgment as a victim and finding closure’ (p. 52). In combining recovery and justice aims, Mulder’s term *therapeutic expectations* unfortunately conflates the two.

associated with victims' 'positive assessments'. This was a variable constructed from 12 items that tapped victims' experiences with process and outcome. More positive assessments were significantly associated with quicker processing times and claimants who had more of their claimed expenses paid. Less clear is why positive assessments were also significantly associated with white and female applicants. The authors reported these findings, but they did not attempt to interpret them. Nor did they report or analyse the payment amounts awarded to victims.

Three interview studies, one from Australia (Victoria) (CASA House 1997) and two from Canada (Ontario) (Des Rosiers, Feldthusen, and Hankivsky 1998; Feldthusen, Hankivsky, and Greaves 2000) probed victims' experiences, using qualitative methods. All three were of sexual offence survivors.

The Australian study surveyed the experiences of those applying to the Victorian CIC scheme from 1987 to 1994. A total of 168 applicants (93% female) were in the sample.

Almost all (96 percent) received an award for pain and suffering. Of this group, the median awarded was \$13,001 to \$15,000, although 36 percent received the top amount of \$17,000 to 20,000. Most (60 percent) received no expense payment; but of those who did, the average was less than \$1,000. Three quarters (77 percent) had a positive response to the award, with 75 percent saying their overall experience of the tribunal hearing was 'very or generally positive'. Although most victims emphasised the incommensurability of the monetary amount with 'what had happened', it also meant 'recognition' and 'acknowledgement' (pp. 88-89). The study highlighted survivors' relief in '[being] believed. ...The award ... represented an official vindication of their own account of the assault and its consequences and that the State was, in this way, offering a formal gesture of recompense' (CASA House 1997: 62).

The two Canadian studies used a therapeutic jurisprudence framework.⁴ The first by Des Rosiers et al. (1998), analysed interviews of 24 sexual assault survivors who sought CIC in Ontario. (The authors also interviewed 10 survivors who pursued civil litigation, but we focus on the CIC applicants here.) Most pursued the application for 'public affirmation of the wrong', followed by 'justice or closure' (Des Rosiers et al., 1998: 442). The second study by Feldthusen et al. (2000) had CIC claimants,⁵ a high share (82 percent) of whom said that they 'were seeking public affirmation of the wrong or closure'. They 'wanted to be heard and to have their experiences acknowledged as hurtful and wrong' and to 'receive affirmation of wrong from a person in a position of power' (Feldthusen et al. 2000: 75-76), which the authors interpret as survivors' 'therapeutic expectations'. The authors called attention to the practical ways that survivors spent the money: to pay for counselling, further education, and

⁴ Therapeutic jurisprudence was a term introduced in the late 1980s in the US for mental health cases, but then expanded to include family, criminal, and civil cases. It 'focuses on the ... law's impact on emotional life and psychological well-being' and 'proposes ... [to] use the tools of the behavioural sciences to study the therapeutic and antitherapeutic impact of the law' (Wexler and Winick 2003). See Marchetti and Daly (2007) for a comparison of therapeutic jurisprudence, restorative justice, and Indigenous sentencing courts, and the ways in which these concepts were combined or merged by researchers and judicial officers in the early 2000s, which led to considerable confusion and imprecision in their meaning.

⁵ They also interviewed 13 civil litigants and 26 claimants in the Grandview redress scheme for institutional abuse of children, but we focus on the CIC claimants.

family care, to purchase a car, or to put the money towards children or the future (2000: 79, 99).

C. Other research on state schemes

In addition to victims' experiences with schemes and their impact, there are two other foci of research: debate on the rationale for establishing schemes, their purpose, and legislative change over time (e.g., Ashworth 1986; Duff 1998; Miers 1990, 2007, 2014a, 2014b); and description and comparison of schemes (e.g., Barrett Meyering 2010; Davies 1991; Forster 2005; Freckelton 2001; Miers 2014a; Stubbington 2009; Thomson Reuters Foundation 2015). In contrast to these well-developed areas, few researchers have pursued what monetary amounts victims have received, variation in awards, and whether potential bias exists in decisions. Daly and Holder (2019) develop this new line of research, exploring sex/gender differences in the recognition payment and the impact of societal constructs of real rape and credible victims on the recognition payment, using the FAVE dataset.

Part IV. FAVE studies of victims' experience

A. Research questions

Building upon and extending previous research on victims and state schemes, we sought to address these questions:

- What are survivors' motives in applying for financial assistance?
- What is the meaning of the money to them?
- Does the amount of money matter?
- What is the place of receiving the money in their lives?
- How do they experience the application process and assess its outcomes?

We also wished to understand how survivors of sexual offences *framed* what happened to them. By this we mean, did they perceive the victimisation as an injustice or a wrong, or did they perceive it as 'one of those things'? How did their framing then relate to concepts of harm, injustice, and justice?

B. Research design

As outlined in *Technical Report No. 6* (Part III A), on 24 January 2014, a data sharing agreement was signed between Griffith University and the Queensland Department of Justice and Attorney-General (DJAG) for the FAVE Project. It said that VAQ would provide all the relevant de-identified data from VAQ's Case Management System, and all the associated Statements of Reasons (de-identified) for these cases, which accompanied assessors' decisions. The sampling window would run for 18 months, from 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2013, during which time all applications for primary victims of sexual offences, which had been received and 'finalised'⁶, were in the FAVE sample. A total of 291 cases met these criteria, and it constitutes FAVE Project Study 1.

⁶ By finalised we mean that a decision was made by a VAQ assessor to grant funds under general or main assessment; however, future amendments could be sought and received, and these were part of some FAVE cases.

Research in Griffith Fellow Holder arrived University on 1 May 2014, and soon after, plans were set in motion for interviewing victims who had applied to VAQ for financial assistance. Meetings were held with VAQ staff to better understand policies and procedures and to design a realistic research plan. The initial plan envisaged a *prospective* design, with interviews at two points in time: when a victim was taking steps to apply to VAQ for financial assistance or had applied, and after a decision had been made on their application. Prospective designs are good when analysing survivors' experiences with crime and justice because they capture what goes on in their minds over time, in particular, what they hope for and expect, and then how they respond to decisions made in their case (Holder 2018; Plano Clark, Anderson, Wertz, Zhou, Schumacher, and Miaskowski 2015). Retrospective studies, which are far more typical, ask survivors to recall what they hoped for and expected, but through a lens in which they already knew what the outcomes were.

Despite the advantages of a prospective design to provide a better understanding of victims' experiences of crime and justice over time (e.g., Shapland, Willmore, and Duff 1985), we found it difficult to implement. Concerted recruitment efforts began in late July 2014, and by December 2014, just two people had completed the time1 interview.⁷ In January 2015, we began to shift our focus to a *retrospective* design.

The retrospective design had two components: an online survey (*FAVE Project Study 2*) and interviews of victims after they had received a VAQ decision (*FAVE Project Study 3*). The online survey had 49 valid responses, and the interview sample had 20 victims.⁸

Of general relevance to the prospective and retrospective designs were (1) participant eligibility criteria; (2) VAQ and service sector liaison; and (3) ethical considerations and formal approval.

1. Participant eligibility criteria

The inclusion parameters were males and females who were primary victims of sexual offences that took place in Queensland.

For the *prospective* design, participants had to be 18 years or older when they were taking steps to apply to VAQ for financial assistance or had applied.

For the *retrospective* design, participants needed to have applied for financial assistance during the FAVE research window, 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2013. For the online survey, participants had to be 18 years or older when they applied; in addition, VAQ had to have an email address for them. Those participating in the online survey were invited to participate in an additional interview.

Although victims had to be aged 18 or over at application to VAQ (or when taking steps to do so), their age at victimisation could be much younger.

⁷ By April 2015, each had completed the time2 interview.

⁸ Of the 20, two had been in the prospective design, 17 had completed the online survey and been recruited into the retrospective study via the online survey, and one had been recruited via a service sector organisation.

2. VAQ and service sector liaison

When we began research on victims' experiences in May 2014, we were optimistic that a prospective design could be accomplished. Here we describe what we did in the early phases of the research, in particular, meeting with VAQ staff and service sector organisations.

We knew it was crucial to communicate our research intentions and to consult with a wide range of people and organisations to bring the research to fruition. This was all the more critical because the prospective design envisaged that research participants would be recruited both from VAQ and service sector organisations.

Six meetings were held with VAQ staff during 2014 that discussed these areas:

- research design, access to participants, and data management;
- VAQ processes and key concepts used in the office;
- LinkUp,⁹ client support, and categories of research participant;
- assessment processes;
- interview instrument design; and
- coordination of research participants.

Members of the Queensland Sexual Assault Network (QSAN) were consulted. Holder had a phone conversation with the convenor of QSAN to discuss the aims and scope of the interviews. In addition, she attended a QSAN meeting in July 2014. Information about the research was circulated to all QSAN members, and an invitation was sent to all QSAN members to contact the FAVE Project if they wished to know more about the research.

For background, the FAVE dataset of 291 cases showed that the majority (63 percent) of applications from sexual offence victims came from the Southeast corner of the state: Greater Brisbane (34 percent), Sunshine Coast (17 percent), and Gold Coast (12 percent). Smaller percentages (6 to 8) came from Far North Queensland, North Queensland, Central Queensland, and Southwest Queensland, with 9 percent from other regions. Our consultations were confined to the Southeast corner of the state because travel time and costs precluded travel to regional locations. Indigenous status was not known for 30 cases (11 percent). Of the 261 known cases in the FAVE dataset, 13 percent were of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander heritage.

At the July 2014 QSAN meeting, members were interested to learn if the project was seeking to boost numbers of women into the FAVE research, who were from vulnerable groups such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, culturally and linguistically diverse, and disability communities. This was, of course, desirable, but given the eligibility criteria of the study, the research team was largely reliant on the sector's engagement with clients and their clients' intentions to apply for financial assistance from VAQ.

Following the July QSAN meeting, Holder held individual meetings in August 2014 with community-based sexual assault services: Immigrant Women's Support Service, the Gold

⁹ LinkUp is the name given by Victim Assist to describe the helpline it operates for victims. LinkUp is the main access point for victims to receive information about financial assistance and other services.

Coast Sexual Assault Service, and WWILD¹⁰ (Holder had a second meeting with WWILD in September 2015). The aim was to answer questions about the research, listen to suggestions made by service providers, and enjoin support. Flyers about the FAVE research were sent to QSAN organisations to distribute to their clients. A notice was also circulated on the Queensland 'Reclaim the Night' Facebook page.¹¹

In September 2014, Holder contacted community legal centres through their state-wide body, the Queensland Association of Independent Legal Centres (QAILS). The FAVE research flyer was distributed to association members. Specific invitations for assistance were made by the research team to the Women's Legal Service and to the Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service (QIFVLS). Women's Legal regrettably declined to participate, saying that they were busy and did not receive many requests for financial assistance. QIFVLS provided summaries of four de-identified cases to show the types of challenges faced by survivors (Appendix A).

In October 2014, Holder participated in an information workshop at the request of Brisbane Rape and Incest Survivors Support Centre (BRISSC). A FAVE research flyer was circulated through the BRISSC contact list and promoted on their twitter and Facebook pages.

3. Ethical considerations and formal approval

The key ethical considerations for the prospective design, some of which were also relevant for the retrospective online survey and interviews, were as follows:

- The research population was a sensitive one because the experience of rape and sexual assault is intrusive and personally traumatic. Researchers needed to consider and prepare for the possibility that participants¹² may have had their experience a few months ago or years ago, or that it could have been recent. Participants may become distressed during the interview process. (This was relevant to both the prospective and retrospective designs).
- Participants may be vulnerable in other ways. For example, a person may have an intellectual impairment or mental health problem or their immigration status may be uncertain. (This was relevant to both the prospective and retrospective designs).
- Participants were going to be invited through their contact with support services. FAVE researchers needed to guard against participants feeling pressured to participate or compromising their relationship with the support service.
- Participants were also going to be invited through their contact with VAQ, the government agency responsible for managing financial assistance. FAVE researchers

¹⁰ WWILD was the original acronym for *Women with Intellectual and Learning Disabilities*, but its client group today is people (male and female) aged 14 and older who have experienced sexual abuse or been victims of crime, including exploitation.

¹¹ Despite the fact that 60 people had viewed the post (as of 19 March 2015), by that date, we had decided to shift to the retrospective design.

¹² When referring to *participants*, we mean both those who were potential participants and those who agreed to participate in the research.

needed to ensure that participants understood that their involvement in the research did not improve (or hinder) VAQ's consideration and assessment of their application.

- Limited participant anonymity was necessary to carry out the second interview after an application was decided. VAQ would hold a list of those interviewed at time1 and run fortnightly reports of applicants who were sent a decision and Statement of Reasons. If a FAVE participant appeared on the list, the VAQ coordinator would inform the FAVE researcher, who would then make contact with the participant.

A more general ethical concern throughout the research was that as researchers, we wanted to act and be in a place of empathy and respect with survivor participants. This was not simply by virtue of their traumatic experiences, but because they were more than just victims. They were meaning-makers and acted on that meaning. As researchers, we understand that survivors have multiple identities and affiliations, and express their views and opinions from different perspectives.

In seeking approval for the prospective design by Griffith University's Ethics Committee, a variation to Daly's 2011 ethics package was sought. The variation described plans for the conduct of the interviews and Holder's lead role. A participant information and consent package was prepared in plain English. The participant agreement to participate had specific agreements for the first interview and for contact arrangements for a possible second interview; and it provided consent provisions for the second interview. The application was submitted on 10 July 2014 and approved on 11 July 2014.

In seeking approval for the retrospective design (online survey and interview) by Griffith University's Ethics Committee, another variation to Daly's 2011 ethics package was sought. The online survey aimed to provide a snapshot of victims' experiences and views of financial assistance and to serve as a recruitment mechanism for an in-depth interview. The application was submitted on 3 June 2015 and approved on 12 June 2015.

C. Implementation

Although 18 of 20 FAVE interviews were recruited via the retrospective design, we briefly describe the steps taken in the prospective design.

1. Prospective design

We estimated (over optimistically, in hindsight) that we would be able to recruit 10 people per month and to retain 70 percent for the time2 interview.

For recruitment, there were two pathways: by the state-wide victim support and services sector and by VAQ. Two different types of invitation were developed. The first was a one-page general information flyer (the green flyer), and the second was an invitation package that comprised a signed cover letter and a two-page information sheet.

For the first pathway, information about the research was provided to QSAN through the network coordinator, at a meeting of the QSAN, and then later, in individual follow-up meetings with QSAN members. General information (green) flyers were provided for distribution.

For the second pathway via VAQ, there were several entry points (see Appendix B). A comprehensive contact protocol was prepared for VAQ staff (Appendix C), which included invitational scripts (Appendix D). A designated VAQ research coordinator (there were two during the research period, Melinda Purdie and Megan Topping) would maintain a contact log of all potential and actual research participants.

The prospective design was launched in late July 2014. By December 2014, two people had completed the time1 interview. With these small numbers, plans were set in motion for the retrospective design in January 2015.

2. Retrospective design

After discussions with VAQ staff, the research team decided on a two-stage process. First, we would invite applicants to complete an online survey; and second, those who had completed this survey would be invited to participate in an interview.

During the first part of 2015, the retrospective online survey and interview were developed, drawing from the considerable work that had been done on the prospective design interviews.

For the online survey, we considered two platforms: VAQ's *Survey Monkey* or Griffith University's survey tool, *LimeSurvey*. We decided to use VAQ's platform because VAQ staff members were more familiar and comfortable with it, and VAQ held an email list of potential respondents. The general plan was as follows. Upon completing the online survey, respondents would be provided with a link to Griffith University's platform to receive a \$20 thank you gift voucher for completing the survey. They would also be invited to participate in an interview for an additional \$50 gift voucher. If they agreed, they would be asked to provide contact information and the optimal times to be contacted. The procedures, as implemented, are detailed next.

(a) recruitment

The recruitment process had four steps. In the *first step*, we supplied VAQ with a list of applicant identification numbers from the FLOW dataset. We used this dataset because it increased the number of potential online respondents. (As described in *Technical Report No. 6*, the FLOW dataset has a longer window of time [applications lodged from 1 July 2012 and finalised in January 2015] than the FAVE dataset [finalised in December 2013]). We supplied VAQ with email text for introducing the survey and the survey questions.

In the *second step*, VAQ sent the email to eligible respondents, which had an embedded url that took them to the survey. The survey results were returned directly to VAQ.

In the *third step*, for respondents to receive their \$20 thank you gift voucher, they were directed to the Griffith University platform, where they were asked to provide contact information, including a mailing address. This was the 'consent to contact' step. They were also invited to participate in an interview and offered a further \$50 gift voucher as an incentive. Their identifying information could not be linked to their answers to the online survey.

In the *fourth step*, FAVE researcher Holder followed up with potential interviewees in a manner each chose. She answered any questions they had about the research. If the person

did not wish to be interviewed, they were mailed their \$20 gift voucher for completing the online survey. If the individual did agree to an interview, a second voucher of \$50 was mailed after it was completed.

(b) response rates and participant numbers

From the FLOW dataset, we identified 221 eligible respondents. Their application ID numbers were sent to VAQ, which said that a smaller number (164) had an active email address. VAQ sent the invitation emails and survey to 164 eligible respondents in late September 2015. At the end of the first week, 26 surveys were returned. In the second week, a reminder was sent; and by 20 October, a total of 40 surveys were returned. On 27 October, a third and final invitation email and survey was sent to those who had not yet responded. (Respondents in the third sweep were not invited to an additional interview because by this time, interviewing had ended.) On 12 November 2015, the research team received summary data for 49 valid responses¹³ (a response rate of 30 percent), supplied in csv format without identifying information.

Respondents wishing to collect the \$20 voucher needed to provide their name and postal address on the Griffith survey link for the FAVE Project to mail the voucher. At this point, respondent names were known to FAVE researchers, but individuals could not be linked to their responses to the online survey. A total of 28 requested and received a \$20 voucher.

Of 49 on-survey respondents, 19 agreed to participate in an interview, and 17 were interviewed.¹⁴ Along with two people recruited via the prospective design and one via a service provider, there were a total of 20 interviews.¹⁵ The numbers and response rates are shown in Table 1 (next page).

D. Conceptual foundations

The content of the online survey and retrospective design interview were distilled from the prospective design instruments, together with what we learned when interviewing two survivors in the prospective design and one in a pilot interview.

The conceptual foundations for the prospective design instruments were based on our review of debates on responses to sexual victimisation, responses to victims in general, and how such responses have been researched. Many instruments and measures that had been used in previous research were considered in developing the FAVE instruments (see Appendix E).

¹³ We initially received 54 responses, but upon review, five were removed. One was a VAQ 'test responder' and had no data, and two respondents had answered only the first one or two questions. Two respondents were similar in saying they had applied for financial assistance on behalf of their disabled daughters, and they could not answer the questions on their behalf, with one saying she was concerned the questions may upset her daughter and confuse her if each question had to be explained.

¹⁴ After four unsuccessful attempts to make contact with the two potential interviewees, efforts to recruit them were abandoned.

¹⁵ The 17 retrospective design interviews were carried out during October and November 2015. The interview recruited via the service provider was earlier, in mid-January 2015 (it served as a pilot of the retrospective design instrument). The two prospective design interviews were carried out in October and December 2014 (time1 interview) and March and April 2015 (time2 interview).

The prospective design called for a time1 interview (administered when an eligible participant has decided to lodge or just lodged an application for financial assistance) and a time2 interview (administered after VAQ has assessed the application and made a decision). Appendix F summarises the components of each of these instruments.

The development of the time1 interview instrument occurred during June-July 2014 and underwent 14 major revisions. The development of the time2 interview instrument occurred in early 2015 and had three major revisions. The retrospective online and interview instruments merged and distilled items in the prospective design instruments.

Table 1. Participants and response rates for the online survey and interview

| | N | response rate % |
|--|-----|--|
| Eligible respondents identified from the FLOW dataset | 221 | |
| Eligible respondents with a VAQ-known email address, to whom VAQ sent an email and survey | 164 | |
| Valid survey responses received | 49 | 30% of 164 with VAQ-known email address |
| Online respondents who sought a \$20 gift voucher | 28 | 57% of online survey respondents |
| Online respondents who elected to participate in a further interview and were interviewed | 17 | 35% of valid survey responses; 10% of 164 with VAQ-known email address |
| Other interviews (2 prospective and 1 via service organisation) | 3 | |
| Total interviews (all retrospective participants received a \$50 gift voucher; the prospective participants received two \$50 gift vouchers) | 20 | cannot calculate: different recruitment methods were used |

1. Characterising the research literature

The literature on responses to crime victims is broadly of two types. One is focused on *justice institutions* (police, prosecution, courts) or *justice mechanisms* (conventional or innovative). The second is focused on the *subjectivities of victims, the harm or impact of victimisation, and ways of ameliorating it* (such as by counselling or other socio-psychological responses).

The first tends to be focused on justice institutions and retrospective. It often uses victim satisfaction as an evaluation measure, and separates victim assessments of procedures and outcomes of justice activities. The second draws from different sources, ranging from biographical accounts of victims to socio-psychological and medical measures and scales.

The two literatures are both concerned with the *secondary victimisation* by justice institutions.

Terms commonly seen in both literatures – recovery (or healing) and justice – are poorly conceptualised from a victim’s perspective. The relationship between the two and what victims seek over time are also poorly conceptualised. Thus, we wished to explore these under-developed concepts, with the aim of giving them greater substance and depth, in the FAVE instruments. In addition, we were interested to learn why Queensland victims applied for financial assistance and what meanings (personal, social, civic, political) they attributed to the scheme and the money they received from the recognition payment and expenses.

2. Recovery

Recovery is a term commonly used in the victim service sector, which has now bled into the research literature. It is a shorthand term that refers to the aim or objective of interventions for victims of many types of offences. Related concepts are *healing* (Dudgeon, Milroy, and Walker 2014; Hegarty et al. 2017), *trauma-informed recovery and practice* (Greenwald 2013; Herman 1992; van der Kolk, Roth, Pelcovitz, Sunday, and Spinazzola 2005), and *restoration and repair* (Koss, Bachar, and Hopkins 2003; Strang 2002). Researchers emphasise differing elements or differing combinations of elements involved in recovery, and they locate victims’ recovery as taking place at the level of the individual, within their community, and at a wider social level.

Recovery is typically not defined. However, it is understood to refer to a set of internal and external processes by which a person can reach psycho-social equilibrium following a traumatic event. Broadly, it encompasses psychological, emotional, social, communal, and practical or material elements. In recent years, there appears to be an increasing interest in victim *recovery*, as compared to victims’ needs for things (or necessary life conditions) that facilitate basic or optimal human functioning (ten Boom and Kuijpers 2012).

Responses to sexual victimisation have private (or personal) implications, as well as public consequence for survivors and their social circles. The literature on trauma gives greater emphasis to the personal.

In developing a more sophisticated idea of recovery, we considered an expansive new scale developed in the UK for a longitudinal study of women rebuilding their lives following domestic violence (Kelly, Sharp, and Klein 2014). The ‘space for action’ scale comprised eight themes drawn from the literature: parenting, sense of self, community, friends and family, help-seeking, competence, well-being and safety, and finances, with each having a different set of questions. We also considered an Australian scale developed for evaluating programs for women and men who seek to rebuild and maintain violence-free lives following domestic violence (Meyer 2014). Ultimately, we decided to adapt the Australian scale for its brevity and local comparative potential.

We were also interested to understand victims’ perspectives on recovery. Thus, we included questions about the impact of the incident(s) and items that measured aspects of a person’s well-being. We asked what types of expenses were applied for and why, and what types were not applied for and why. An open-ended question asked participants how they would describe the idea of recovery.

3. Justice

Some readers might see little connection between state payments to victims of crime and concepts of justice. Indeed, the term *justice* is not asserted in the legislative objectives of CIC

or FA schemes that we are aware, nor is it claimed in ministerial or public policy pronouncements for them. Such objectives and policy pronouncements focus instead on the (presumed) ameliorative impact of the schemes.

However, we were interested in what justice meant (or could mean) to victims and how it was given effect by Queensland's financial assistance scheme. We were also interested to determine how victims perceived financial assistance as a response to crime.

In developing the justice items, we drew upon three literatures: (a) procedural and outcome justice, (b) belief in a just world, and (c) events as misfortune or injustice.

(a) procedural and outcome justice

We asked questions about process and outcome with respect to VAQ, police, prosecution, and court. In Queensland's FA scheme, applicants are required to report the offence to the police, but alternative reporting is accepted for 'special primary victims', which includes those victimised by sexual offences.¹⁶ The FAVE dataset of 291 cases showed that reports to police were made in 98 percent of cases (the remainder were made to counsellors) and that 48 percent of all cases resulted in court conviction. The percent of cases with court convictions, of those reported to the police, is considerably higher in the FAVE dataset than that reported in rape case attrition studies (Daly and Bouhours 2010).¹⁷

We asked questions on reporting to police, the time taken to report, aspirations and preferences for reporting, and what applicants expected might flow from it with regard to case prosecution and court conviction. We considered a number of scaled items designed to assess distributive and procedural justice (Holder 2013) in criminal justice responses, but decided against this to keep the instrument brief. Instead, we created an overall satisfaction item for police, prosecutor, and court outcomes.

VAQ had consistently high satisfaction ratings from applicant feedback surveys, but staff were interested to learn at a deeper level how people experienced the process and outcomes. Applicants' evaluations of substantive outcomes depend on many elements, including the following:

- the impact and harm the offence caused them;
- what resources (formal and informal) they had already drawn upon and their experiences of them;
- their expectations and understandings of a state financial assistance scheme; and
- what was sought and why, and what was not sought and why, and with what outcomes for each.

We asked open-ended questions in relation to these elements. In addition, we adapted questions from a retrospective study in The Netherlands that sought to differentiate different meanings people had for the CIC scheme there (Mulder 2013).

¹⁶ In addition to victims of sexual offences, special primary victims are child victims, those with an impaired capacity, and those for whom offences were committed by a person in a position of power, influence, or trust. For these victims and offence contexts, victims can report an offence to a counsellor, psychologist, or doctor instead of a police officer.

¹⁷ Of 291 cases, 48 percent had court convictions.

How a person understands what has happened to them will influence expectations and perceptions of a resource such as financial assistance. We utilised research on belief in a just world (Lerner 1980) and perceptions of the nature and the attribution of the cause of events (Shklar 1990).

(b) belief in a just world

There are two components to *having a belief in a just world*: a belief that people get what they deserve and that they deserve what they get. Believers in a just world are more likely than nonbelievers to admire fortunate people and to derogate victims, thus permitting the believers to maintain the perception that people in fact get what they deserve (Montada and Lerner 1998). Belief in a just world works differently when applied to self and when applied to others (Lipkus, Dalbert, and Siegler 1996; Lucas, Zhdanova, and Alexander 2011). We reasoned that if victims believed in a just world for themselves, this would influence their sense of having a right or entitlement to state-based financial assistance, and it would influence their assessment of the outcome.

(c) events as misfortune or injustice

Shklar (1990) draws a distinction between the perceptions of *events as a misfortune* or as *an injustice*. Distinguishing the two and making decisions about which interpretation – whether from a victim perspective or that of others – is discussed as a ‘political choice’ with political consequences in terms of recognition and response (Shklar 1990: 5). These ideas were potentially more productive and theoretically important for our research than those drawn from a belief in a justice world. Yet, it was uncertain if they would be applicable to crime victims and a state financial assistance scheme, compared to the more public arena of criminal court responses to crime and accountability of offenders. To resolve this uncertainty, we decided to ask participants what the ‘idea of justice’ meant to them and who contributed (and in what ways) to that sense of justice.

Items that drew from a belief in a just world and events as misfortune or injustice were incorporated in the prospective design instruments, but were reduced when the time1 and time2 interviews were merged into the retrospective design interview.

4. Sexual victimisation and disclosure

For experiencing sexual victimisation, we considered a number of existing scaled items on sexual experience (Koss et al. 2006) and sexual victimisation (Fisher, Cullen, and Turner 1999). We considered incident variables from other Australian and international surveys such as the Australian Women’s Safety Survey, Personal Safety Survey and Victimisation Survey, and the International Violence Against Women Survey. We also considered a more recent Australian survey that evaluated the relationship between demographic, incident, and police response variables (Taylor, Muldoon, Norma, and Bradley 2012). Ultimately, we decided that the interview needed only minimal information about the experience of victimisation. Thus, we asked whether the incident(s) were single or multiple, the victim’s relationship to the offender, and an open-ended question about ‘what happened’ in general terms.

However, it was important to generate information about the timing of the victim/survivor’s actions. This was important because of widespread discussion in the legal and redress literature about delay in disclosure, reporting, and legal mobilisation. Therefore, we asked

when the incident(s) took place, when disclosures took place (and to whom), when participants first learned about financial assistance, when they received information, and when they decided to lodge an application.

Items on the demographic characteristics of the research participants were drawn from the Australian census and had been used in other Australian longitudinal research (Holder 2013). We were interested in the possibility of constructing socio-economic categories through which we could analyse concepts of recovery and justice.

Conducting research with survivors of sexual violence involves a series of sensitive encounters (Schwartz 1997). Although it was likely that time would have elapsed between sexual victimisation and a person's application and possible engagement in the research, we nonetheless developed the time1 interview with a view to minimise distress. We understood that interaction with a researcher, however well it may have been conducted with empathy and care, was an emotional and cognitive journey for the participant. Therefore, in addition to our theoretical and empirical interests, we constructed the time1 and time2 interviews so that questions about 'then' (the incident and its impacts) took place early in the interview. We aimed also for the final section to be forward-looking and to engage personal and civic identities other than of a victim.

E. Content of the online survey

The online survey was developed after two survivors had completed the time1 and time2 interviews. It was important to keep the online survey short, and based on the two survivors' responses, we were better able to identify the core questions.

The online survey (Appendix G) sought to gain a broad snapshot of reasons and motivations for applying for financial assistance after sexual victimisation. For reasons for applying, we adapted a series of items from Mulder's (2013: 62-65) research on the degree to which certain outcomes were achieved for victims when receiving financial assistance. We asked instead whether these were reasons that a victim may seek financial assistance; specifically, that a payment would:

- make me feel acknowledged as a victim of violence
- provide me with a form of emotional support
- confirm my innocence as a victim of violence
- provide me with a form of justice
- help me cope with the aftermath of the incident(s).

The online survey asked for the degree to which a survivor agreed or disagreed with each of these reasons, which was the most important, and if, on reflection, the payment met each of these reasons.

It also asked how important the recognition payment was to a survivor and how the money was spent. Other questions asked for survivor assessments of expense payments. A final set of questions asked for survivors' overall experiences with financial assistance, with nine items adapted from Daly's (2014b, 2017a) construct of victims' justice interests for participation, voice, validation, vindication, and offender accountability-taking responsibility.

F. Mode and content of the retrospective design interview

The final set of 20 interviews comprised 17 people recruited via the online survey, one via a service provider, and two via the prospective design. Survivors were given the option of selecting the interview mode. Of 20 interviews, nine were conducted by phone; and five, face-to-face. Six completed it (self-administered) by email. All those who had completed the interview received an additional \$50 voucher.

The retrospective design interview (Appendix H) had seven sections:

- demographics
- the financial assistance process
- the incident(s)
- the effect(s) on the victim of the incident(s) and help-seeking
- reporting to police and justice responses
- the victim's feelings today
- the victim's views on recovery and justice.

We review and comment on each section, noting which questions worked and what we would do differently next time. This reflection may assist others in conducting research on CIC or FA schemes. Note that our recommendations for future research assume a relatively small sample (like ours) and the use of both closed and open-ended questions.

1. Demographics

This section worked well. However, questions about the applicant's employment status and occupation *at the time* of sexual victimisation emerged as being important when analysing the data later. A revised instrument should ask both. The demographic variables can permit analysis of socio-economic factors associated with survivors' responses, as was revealed in the Victorian (2014) survey on the CIC Tribunal, although that survey had a larger number of respondents.

2. Financial assistance process

Section 2 asked when the person lodged the application, if they had made any other application, and who helped them apply. However, we found that what would work better was an opening question that asked, 'it would help me to understand your answers to know a timeline for when the incident(s) took place, when (if) you reported to police, and when you applied for financial assistance'.

Then an interviewer can ask, 'so when in this timeline did you first find out about financial assistance?' Answers to the question 'what was going on for you over that time?' emerged as being important when analysing the data.

The questions on motivations to apply and disincentives to apply (Q2.05-2.07) generated important information. We used open phrasing asking about the individual's 'thoughts and feelings' inclining them 'towards' applying or 'against' applying. The top three reasons for applying emerged as important when analysing the data.

There were eight questions on the process of applying (Q2.08-2.15), but these might have been reduced to a smaller set. Alternatively, open-ended questions might have been asked such as 'what steps did you take' and 'who helped you', with follow-up questions.

The closed questions about experiences with VAQ staff (Q2.16 and 2.17) were reduced to asking about being 'helpful' or 'fair' in dealing with a survivor. (Closed questions on staff treatment were reduced even further in the phone mode.) A revised instrument should identify fewer items, i.e., the core or most essential ones. However, we note that even when respondents gave mostly positive assessments of the staff in a general question (Q2.16), their responses to the more detailed questions in Q2.17 were varied.

Questions about the VAQ decision (Q2.18 to 2.22) were important in later analysis, but it would have been better to have differentiated the recognition and expense payments. A revised instrument would ask: (a) exactly what was the decision, (b) whether the survivor received an award for particular expense items, and (c) how they felt about receiving the recognition payment, which should be asked separately from expense payments.

For the phone mode, the five closed questions about the decision (Q2.22) focused on whether it was 'fair'.

The questions about which categories of expense were important (Q2.24) were confusing for survivors to answer (and also difficult to ask). Thus, rather than using a detailed scale, we asked if each category of expense was important (whether or not they actually received it).

The recognition payment and how it was spent was important (Q2.26) as was asking if there was anything they would have liked to apply for (Q2.27) and why they did not (Q2.28).

3. Incident(s)

Section 3 questions on what happened in the incident(s) worked well. However, adaptations of this FAVE instrument would need to be mindful of the relevant victim-offender relationships, depending on the offences studied.

4. Effects of the incident(s) and help-seeking

Section 4 questions worked well. Questions about continuing effects may need to be considered if all or most adult respondents were victimised in childhood. It is important to keep open the possibility of both positive and negative effects. For example, a common understanding of negative effects is that a person may turn to substance misuse to cope. It is less well understood that a person might report positive effects such as becoming more resilient or more determined to 'do life differently'.

5. Reporting to police and justice responses

Section 5 worked well. However, two additional questions may be relevant for those who wish to adapt the FAVE instrument. For respondents victimised as children, but who are now adults, one might ask, who else was the offence disclosed to and when? For convicted court cases, one might ask, what was the sentence imposed? Our analysis found that if a survivor viewed the sentence as being too lenient, they were less likely to be satisfied with the court response. The prosecution and court questions can be reduced to asking whether the case went to court; and if yes, did it result in conviction? These can be asked in addition to satisfaction with police, prosecution, and court questions.

6. Feelings today

It was important to keep questions open on the possibility of continuing positive effects, as well as continuing negative effects (Burt and Katz 1987; Thompson 2000). Victim and survivor identities are entwined, and negative assessments by victims about sexual victimisation can co-exist with perceptions of post-traumatic growth (Cole and Lynn 2010).

Meyer's (2014) well-being questions and whether each was affected by financial assistance (Q6.03 to 6.21) worked well for those in email and face-to-face modes. However, they were abandoned for the phone mode because they were too detailed in conversation. A future instrument, especially one used for a phone mode, might ask a more general question about overall well-being.

The seven misfortunes or injustice questions, based on Shklar's (1990) research, worked reasonably well. When administering the instrument, at the conclusion of the seven statements, we would suggest making a comment to the effect that 'these were difficult questions, but it is important not to assume what victims think'. This is important to say so that a participant was not left feeling an undercurrent of victim-blaming.

For the item about who the victim would have preferred to pay their expenses (Q6.23), most respondents (65 percent) said they would have preferred 'the offender to pay in full'.

7. Views on recovery and justice

For the face-to-face and phone interviews, the questions about recovery and justice were asked as general and open-ended ones, with follow-ups to pursue certain ideas, in some cases.

At the end of the interview, all participants agreed to receive a summary of findings. There was also a 'check-in' question to see if there was anyone that the research participant could talk to after the interview or if they had supports, if they were feeling upset by ideas raised in the interview. No person appeared to be negatively affected by the interview, and all indicated they had supports to turn to, if needed.

Table 2. Shared questions in the online survey and interview

| Q NUMBER | ONLINE SURVEY | Q NUMBER | INTERVIEW |
|-----------------|---|-----------------|---|
| 1 and 3 | Six motivations (drawn from the literature) on reasons for applying | Q2.05 Q2.07 | Reasons for applying (open-ended) |
| 2 | My own important reason for applying | | |
| 5 | Achievement of the motivations (closed and 5-point scale) | | Achievement of the motivations (closed and 3-point scale) |
| 6 | Importance of special assistance (recognition payment) (closed and 5-point scale) | Q2.24 | Importance of special assistance (recognition payment) (closed but also open-ended) |
| 7 | How spent the payment (open) | Q2.26 | How spent the payment (open) |
| 8 | How important other financial assistance items (6 items and 4-point scale) | Q2.24 | Importance of other financial assistance items (closed but also open-ended) |
| 9 | Receipt of items (6 items and 4-point response) | Q2.19 | What was decision (open) |
| 10 | Justice interests (9 items and 5-point response) | various | How experienced the process and reflections on offender (open) |
| 11 | Did financial assistance help recovery (4 response options) | Q7.04 and 7.05 | Who was helping or hindering recovery (open) |

Part V. Reflections on the research

In this section, we consider the impact of differing interview modes and what we would do differently, if we were to do research on victims' experiences with state schemes again.

A. Interview mode

The different modes of administering the interviews affected the data gathered. Some closed-ended questions were difficult to administer by phone and were not asked. Other open-ended follow-up questions could not be pursued with those using email mode. The final SPSS dataset smoothed the variability in the closed questions (particularly variation introduced by the phone interviews) by coding one variable in a sub-set. For example, for how the participant experienced VAQ staff, the dataset variable asks if the VAQ staff person was 'fair' in dealing with them and if VAQ 'made you feel included'. The mode of interview by ID is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Interview mode and recruitment pathway

| FAVE ID | retrospective or prospective ID | mode of interview | interview recruitment pathway |
|---------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | R01 | face-to-face | service provider (BRISSC) |
| 2 | R02 | phone | online survey for |
| 3 | R03 | face-to-face | FAVE ID's 2 to 18 |
| 4 | R04 | phone | |
| 5 | R05 | phone | |
| 6 | R06 | phone | |
| 7 | R07 | phone | |
| 8 | R08 | phone | |
| 9 | R09 | email | |
| 10 | R10 | phone | |
| 11 | R11 | email | |
| 12 | R12 | email | |
| 13 | R13 | phone | |
| 14 | R14 | face-to-face with follow-up email | |
| 15 | R15 | phone | |
| 16 | R16 | email | |
| 17 | R17 | email | |
| 18 | R18 | email | |
| 19 | P01 | face-to-face with follow-up email | Victim Assist QLD |
| 20 | P02 | face-to-face | Victim Assist QLD |

Questions on well-being today (Q6.03 to 6.20) were not asked of phone mode respondents, and this is the largest source of missing data in the dataset. By comparison, email respondents were more easily able to answer the closed-ended questions. Those in the face-to-face mode were given the instrument to check off their answers to the close-ended items for themselves. For face-to-face and phone interviews, the mode of interview made it easier to ask follow-up questions, which provided in-depth information not present to the same degree in the email mode. Interviews conducted by phone or face-to-face took an average of 70 minutes.

Researchers will need to consider the trade-offs between flexibility for victims and variation in data quality and depth. If three modes are to be used, then the instrument must be amenable to all three modes. This matter is taken up further in the next section.

1. What we would do differently next time

If we were to do this research again, there are three things we would do differently. First, we would have reduced the number of questions to those that were most essential, and reduced the detail for some questions (particularly, the closed-ended sub-questions).

Second, despite its strengths, we would not use a prospective design. Perhaps other researchers would have greater success in other jurisdictions, and perhaps there would be offence-based differences. Our experience was that despite intensive recruitment efforts, it

was difficult to encourage participation via the pathways available to us. The online mode proved to be highly successful, both for asking short questions and for encouraging participation in a more in-depth interview. Although prospective designs are valuable for understanding victims' expectations and how they are (or are not) realised in responses to crime over time, they may need to be used selectively for research that requires them. Alternatively, researchers need to assess the likelihood of success in recruiting participants.

Third, although we wanted to be flexible by offering victims the interview mode of their choice, this came at the price of incomplete or varied information, depending on the mode used. If flexibility is the key criterion for interview implementation, all questions must be amenable to answer by all modes. If, instead, the goal is to have a depth of knowledge about victims' experiences, then mainly open-ended questions by phone or face-to-face are optimal. If the goal is to have a large number of cases, but less in-depth knowledge, then phone or email or online is optimal, although the response anchors must be simple to understand and convey in a phone interview.

A related final observation on instrument content and implementation concerns the goal of including a diverse range of survivors. None of the 20 people interviewed identified as Indigenous, although they were 13 percent of FAVE dataset. Furthermore, we learned from the online survey that some mothers could not easily relay the questions to their adult children who had disabilities. Research that seeks to be truly inclusive must consider specific and targeted strategies of recruiting and encouraging particular groups of survivors, and of implementing research in ways that do not assume able-ism of participants.

To date, we have published one paper that utilises the interview material (Holder and Daly 2018), and others are in the pipeline. Research on state schemes for victims of crime is scant, particularly that using in-depth interviews. The FAVE Project instruments and findings on victims' experiences will, we hope, advance the field and refine future lines of inquiry.

References

- Ashworth, A. (1986). Punishment and compensation: victims, offenders and the State. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 6(1), 86-122.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012). Personal Safety Survey. Accessed Feb 2019 at <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4906.0Chapter1002012>.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1996). Women's Safety Survey. Accessed Feb 2019 at <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4128.0/>.
- Barrett Meyering, I. (2010). Victim compensation and domestic violence: a national overview, *Stakeholder Paper No. 8*. (Sydney: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, University of New South Wales).
- Burt, M. and B. Katz (1987). Dimensions of recovery from rape: focus on growth outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2(1), 57-81.
- CASA House (1997). *Just Tokens? A Report on the Experience of Victim/Survivors of Sexual Assault when Making Application for Crimes Compensation*. (Melbourne: CASA House).
- Cole, A. and S. Lynn (2010). Adjustment of sexual assault survivors: hardiness and acceptance coping in posttraumatic growth. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 30(1), 111-127.
- Dalbert, C. (2000). Belief in a just world questionnaire. In J. Maltby, C. Lewis, and A. Hill (eds), *Commissioned Reviews of 250 Psychological Tests*. (Lampeter, Wales: Edwin Mellen Press), pp. 461-465.
- Dalbert, C., L. Montada, and M. Schmitt (1987). Glaube an die gerechte Welt als Motiv: Validierungskorrelate zweier Skalen (Belief in a just world: Validation correlates of two scales). *Psychologische Beitrage*, 29, 596-615.
- Daly, K. (1998). *South Australia Juvenile Justice Research on Conferencing (SAJJ), Technical Report No. 1: Project Overview and Research Instruments* (Brisbane: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University).
- _____ (2001). *South Australia Juvenile Justice Research on Conferencing (SAJJ), Technical Report No. 2: Research Instruments in Year 2 (1999) and Background Notes* (Brisbane: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University).
- _____ (2011). Conventional and innovative justice responses to sexual violence. *ACSSA Issues 12* (with Appendix by K. Daly and B. Bouhours) (Melbourne: Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault, Australian Institute of Family Studies).
- _____ (2014a). *Redressing Institutional Abuse of Children* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

- _____ (2014b). Reconceptualizing sexual victimization and justice. In I. VanFraechem, A. Pemberton, and F. Ndahinda (eds), *Justice for Victims: Perspectives on Rights, Transition and Reconciliation* (London: Routledge), pp. 378-396.
- _____ (2015). Sexual violence and justice: how and why context matters for justice. In A. Powell, N. Henry, and A. Flynn (eds), *Rape Justice: Beyond the Criminal Law* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 36-52.
- _____ (2016a). Money for justice: ex gratia redress for historical institutional abuse. In Y. Smaal, A. Kaladelfos, and M. Finnane (eds), *The Sexual Abuse of Children: Recognition and Redress* (Melbourne: Monash University Publishing), pp. 160-77.
- _____ (2016b). Redressing wrongs: whether, how, and why money matters to victims. Plenary address presented at Victims and Justice National Conference, Melbourne, 8-9 August.
- _____ (2017a). Sexual violence and victims' justice interests. In E. Zinsstag and M. Keenan (eds), *Sexual Violence and Restorative justice: Legal, Social and Therapeutic Dimensions* (London: Routledge), pp. 108-139.
- _____ (2017b). Variation in expense payments, 2012-13, FAVE dataset. (Brisbane: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University) (25 September).
- Daly, K. and B. Bouhours (2010). Rape and attrition in the legal process: a comparative analysis of five countries. In M. Tonry (ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 39, 565-650.
- Daly, K. and R. Holder (2017). Financial assistance for victims of sexual offences. Presented to National Victims of Crime Conference, Brisbane, 6-7 September.
- Daly, K. and R. Holder (2019). State payments to victims of violent crime: discretion and bias in awards for sexual offences. *British Journal of Criminology* (forthcoming).
- Daly, K., R. Holder, and V. Meyer (2019). *The FAVE Project, Financial Assistance and Victims' Experiences, Technical Report No. 6: Contexts, Data, and Decisions by Victim Assist Queensland for Sexual Offences* (Brisbane: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice and Griffith Criminology Institute, Griffith University).
- Daly, K. and D. Wade (2017). Sibling sexual violence and victims' justice interests: a comparison of youth conferencing and judicial sentencing. In E. Zinsstag and M. Keenan (eds), *Sexual Violence and Restorative justice: Legal, Social and Therapeutic Dimensions* (London: Routledge), pp. 143-178.
- Davies, I. (1991). Compensation for criminal injuries in Australia: a proposal for change in Queensland. *Bond Law Review*, 3(1), 1-24.
- Des Rosiers, N., B. Feldthusen, and O. Hankivsky (1998). Legal compensation for sexual violence: therapeutic consequences and consequences for the judicial system. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 4(1-2), 433-451.

- Dudgeon, P., H. Milroy, and R. Walker (eds) (2014). *Working Together: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Mental Health and Wellbeing Principles and Practice*. (Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia). Accessed March 2019 at <https://www.telethonkids.org.au/globalassets/media/documents/aboriginal-health/working-together-second-edition/working-together-aboriginal-and-wellbeing-2014.pdf>.
- Duff, P. (1998). The measure of criminal injuries compensation: political pragmatism or dog's dinner? *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 18(1), 105-142.
- Feldthusen B., O. Hankivsky, and L. Greaves (2000). Therapeutic consequences of civil actions for damages and compensation claims by victims of sexual abuse: an empirical study. *Canadian Journal of Women and Law*, 12(66), 66-116.
- Fisher, S., F. Cullen, and M. Turner (1999). *The Extent and Nature of the Sexual Victimization of College Women: A National-Level Analysis, Final Report*, submitted to the National Institute of Justice (NCJ 179977) (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice). Accessed March 2019 at <http://www.midss.org/content/sexual-victimization-screening-questionnaire-svsq>.
- Forster, C. (2005). Good law or bad lore – the efficacy of criminal injuries compensation schemes for victims of sexual abuse: a new mode of sexual assault provisions. *University of Western Australia Law Review*, 2, 264-298.
- Freckelton, I. (2001). *Criminal Injuries Compensation: Law, Practice and Policy* (Sydney: Law Book Company).
- Greenwald, R. (2013). *Progressive Counting within a Phase Model of Trauma-Informed Treatment* (New York: Routledge).
- Hegarty, K., L. Tarzia, S. Rees, A. Fooks, K. Forsdike, D. Woodlock, L. Simpson, C. McCormack, and S. Amanatidis (2017). *Women's Input into a Trauma-informed systems model of care in Health settings (The WITH Study) Final Report* (ANROWS Horizons 02/2017). (Sydney: ANROWS).
- Herman, J. (1992). *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence – From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror* (New York: Basic Books).
- Holder, R. (2013), *Just Interests: victims, citizens and the potential for justice*, PhD Thesis, (Canberra: Australian National University). Accessed Feb 2019 at <http://hdl.handle.net/1885/11464>.
- Holder, R. (2018). Untangling the meanings of justice: a longitudinal mixed methods study. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 12(2), 204-220.
- Holder, R. and K. Daly (2018). Recognition, reconnection, and renewal: the meaning of money to sexual assault survivors. *International Review of Victimology*, 24(1), 25-46.
- Johnson, H., N. Ollus, and S. Nevala (2008). *Violence Against Women: An International Perspective*. (New York: Springer-Verlag).

- Kelly, L., N. Sharp, and R. Klein (2014). *Finding the Costs of Freedom: How Women and Children Rebuild their Lives After Domestic Violence* (London: Solace Women's Aid).
- Koss, M., A. Abbey, R. Campbell, S. Cook, J. Norris, M. Testa, S. Ullman, C. West, and J. White (2006). The Sexual Experiences Short Form Victimization questionnaire (SES-SFV). (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona). Accessed March 2019 at <http://www.midss.org/sites/default/files/ses-sfv.doc>.
- Koss, M., K. Bachar, and C. Hopkins (2003). Restorative justice for sexual violence: repairing victims, building community, and holding offenders accountable. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 989(1), 384-396.
- Kunst, M. (2011). Employment status and post-traumatic stress disorder following compensation seeking in victims of violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(2), 377-393.
- Kunst, M. (2012). Mental health problems and satisfaction with amount of state compensation for intentional violent crime victimization in The Netherlands. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 48(4), 527-534.
- Kunst M, N. Koster, and J. Van Heugten (2017). Performance evaluations and victim satisfaction with state compensation for violent crime: a prospective study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(19), 3027-3044.
- Kunst M, F. Winkel, and S. Bogaerts (2010). Prevalence and predictors of posttraumatic stress disorder among victims of violence applying for state compensation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(9), 1631-1654.
- Lench, H. and E. Chang (2007). Belief in an unjust world: when beliefs in a just world fail. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 89(2), 126-135.
- Lerner, M. (1980). *The Belief in a Just World* (New York: Springer).
- Lipkus, I., C. Dalbert, and I. Siegler (1996). The importance of distinguishing the belief in a just world for self versus for others: implications for psychological well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(7), 666-677.
- Lucas, T., L. Zhdanova, and S. Alexander (2011). Procedural and distributive justice beliefs for self and others: assessment of a four-factor individual differences model. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 32, 14-25.
- Marchetti, E. and K. Daly (2007) Indigenous sentencing courts: towards a theoretical and jurisprudential model. *Sydney Law Review*, 29, 415-443.
- Meyer, S. (2014). Victims' experiences of short- and long-term safety and wellbeing: findings from an examination of an integrated response to domestic violence. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 478, June.
- Miers, D. (1990). *Compensation for Criminal Injuries* (London: Butterworths).

- Miers, D. (2007). Looking beyond Great Britain: the development of criminal injuries compensation. In S. Walklate (ed.), *Handbook of Victims and Victimology* (Cullompton: Willan Publishing), pp. 337-362.
- Miers, D. (2014a). State compensation for victims of violent crime. In I. Vanfraechem, A. Pemberton, and F. Ndahinda (eds), *Justice for Victims: Perspectives on Rights, Transition and Reconciliation* (Abingdon, England: Routledge), pp. 105-139.
- Miers, D. (2014b). Offender and state compensation for victims of violent crime: two decades of development and change. *International Review of Victimology*, 20(1), 145-168.
- Montada, L. and M. Lerner (eds) (1998). *Responses to Victimisation and Belief in a Just World* (New York: Plenum Press).
- Mulder, J. (2013). *Compensation: The Victim's Perspective* (Oisterwijk, The Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers).
- Newmark, L., J. Bonderman, B. Smith, and B. Liner (2003). *National Evaluation of State Victims of Crime Act Assistance and Compensation Programs: Trends and Strategies for the Future* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Centre).
- Office for Victims of Crime (2005). Directory of International Crime Victim Compensation Programs, 2004-2005. VC Archive, National Criminal Justice Reference Service. Accessed March 2019 at https://www.ncjrs.gov/ovc_archives/reports/intdir2005/welcome.html.
- Office for Victims of Crime (2015). Nationwide analysis, *2014 Victims of Crime Act, Performance Report, State Compensation Program*. Accessed March 2019 at https://www.ncjrs.gov/ovc_archives/reporttonation2015/VOCA-compensation-and-assistance-statistics.html.
- Plano Clark, V., N. Anderson, J. Wertz, Y. Zhou, K. Schumacher, and C. Miaskowski. (2015). Conceptualizing longitudinal mixed methods designs: a methodological review of health sciences research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 9(4), 297-319.
- Queensland Department of Communities (no date) Partnership Responses at Domestic Violence Occurrence (PRADO) survey. (Brisbane: Queensland Government).
- Ruch, L. and C. Wang (2006). Validation of the sexual assault symptom scale II (SASS II) using a panel research design. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(11), 1440-1461.
- Schwartz, M. (ed.) (1997). *Researching Sexual Violence Against Women: Methodological and Personal Perspectives* (California: Sage Publications).
- Shapland, J., J. Willmore, and P. Duff (1985). *Victims in the Criminal Justice System* (Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing).
- Shklar, J. (1990). *The Faces of Injustice* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Strang, H. (2002). *Repair or Revenge: Victims and Restorative Justice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Stone, L. (2019). Spike in payout claims as law includes victims of financial, emotional abuse. *Brisbane Times*, 28 January. Accessed 1 February 2019 at <https://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/national/queensland/spike-in-payout-claims-as-law-includes-victims-of-financial-emotional-abuse-20190124-p50tgv.html>.
- Stubbington, S. (2009). Criminal Offence Victims Act 1995 (Qld): an evaluation. *Queensland Law Student Review*, 2(2), 56-67.
- Swanston, H., P. Parkinson, S. Shrimpton, B. O'Toole, and R. Oates (2001). Statutory compensation for victims of child sexual assault: examining the efficacy of a discretionary system. *International Review of Victimology*, 8, 37-62.
- Taylor, S., S. Muldoon, C. Norma, and D. Bradley (2012). *Policing Just Outcomes: Improving the Police Response to Adults Reporting Sexual Assault*. (Perth, Western Australia: Social Justice Research Centre, Edith Cowan University).
- Ten Boom, A. and K. Kuijpers (2012). Victims' needs as basic human needs. *International Review of Victimology*, 18(2), 155-179.
- Thompson, M. (2000). Life after rape: a chance to speak? *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 15(4), 325-343.
- Thomson Reuters Foundation (2015). *Comparative Report on National State Compensation Schemes* (London: Thomson Reuters Foundation).
- Van der Kolk, B., S. Roth, D. Pelcovitz, S. Sunday, and J. Spinazzola (2005). Disorders of extreme stress: the empirical foundation of a complex adaptation to trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 18(5), 389-399.
- Victoria Department of Justice (2014) (unpublished). *Building the Confidence of Victims in the Criminal Justice System. Final Report* (Melbourne: Victims Support Agency).
- Victorian Law Commission (2017) Review of the *Victims of Crime Assistance Act 1996*, Supplementary Consultation Paper. (Melbourne: Victorian Law Commission).
- Wexler, D. and B. Winick (2003). Putting therapeutic jurisprudence to work. *ABA Journal*, 89, 54-57.
- World Health Organisation (2005). *WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women: Summary Report of Initial Results on Prevalence, Health Outcomes and Women's Responses* (Geneva: World Health Organization).

Appendix A. Case summaries provided by Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service

Extract from email dated 3 November 2014

These case examples were supplied by the Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service (QIFVLS) to illustrate the types of challenges faced by survivors and their advocates.

Case 1

24 year old woman from _____ was sexually assaulted by aunty and uncle when 10 years old, the matter fell under the repealed COVA legislation. QIFVLS referred her to a psychologist at the _____ hospital. The psychologist explained they do not have the resources in community to deal with this particular client and would need to assist further in Cairns. I contacted Victim Assist in respect to helping this client go to Cairns for treatment, the information person explained their preferred supplier is Relationships Australia who will provide telephone counselling only. The VOCAA legislation provides a person with the right to choose their own counsellor and when the time comes that this client is in a position to claim Victim Assistance a review of any decision consistent with the above would be on the cards.

We advised she needed to report it to the police and the perpetrators had to be convicted in either the District or Supreme Court before she could apply to Victims Assist. She phoned back sometime later and informed QIFVLS charges had been laid. We advised to contact QIFVLS as soon as a conviction is made. So far have not been told of the outcome.

Case 2

Young girl in _____ 14 sexually assaulted by 17 year old male, became pregnant and was flown to Victoria for abortion as Qld abortion laws appear to scare QLD doctors away. Application was made to Victim Assist and child paid \$10,000 into public trustee until turns 18.

Case 3

12 year old in _____ applied through QIFVLS via mother, sexually assaulted when 5 years old. Paid \$10,000 into public trustee until turns 18.

Case 4

21 year old girl sexually assaulted when 5 years old by home invader. Mother did not tell her of the event. QIFVLS referred her to sexual assault counselling after girl was suffering nightmares of the incident; the girl explained the nightmares to her mother who then disclosed the home invader. Advised to report it to the police as require conviction in either District or Supreme Court. Girl advised QIFVLS that she then proceeded to make complaint to police but they did not press charges. QIFVLS advised to continue to seek counselling. Girl even though annoyed charges were not laid was still happy with QIFVLS involvement and support from the Client Support Officer.

QIFVLS advised that they do not get that many VAQ applicants, and felt this “is because they do not wish to discuss it with us”. QIFVLS advised of several DV matters where individuals do not disclose sexual assault but still have sought sexual assault counselling and have requested they do not want anyone to know. Clients are in a position to claim but appear to just not want to.

Appendix B. Participant recruitment pathways via VAQ

- A: VAQ LinkUp (staff provides initial and follow-up information, first point of contact); phone contact
- B: VAQ Intake (staff receives a completed application); no phone contact
- C: VAQ Client Support (staff reviews application) and Team Leader (staff allocates application); both may have phone contact to follow-up on the need to clarify information on an application

NOTE: the invitation to participate is made after a staff member has completed those interactions with a client that discharge their primary obligations.

| Point (1) | Who (2) | When (3) | How (4) |
|--------------|------------|---|---|
| A | VAQ LinkUp | When informing a client (who also meets the FAVE criteria) of the support and assistance options available to them from VAQ, and at follow-up calls | <p>(a) Include a FAVE green flyer in information provided (by email or post) (first contact)</p> <p>(b) Verbal offer to participate and provision of invitation package (cover letter and information sheet) (at follow-up contacts)</p> <p>Verbal offer script: ‘I can see from our files that you were sent information about important research that we are supporting?</p> <p>Would you like to know more about this? It is an opportunity for you to have a say on something really important. May I have your permission to pass your name and number to the researchers so that they can tell you about it? They are independent from us and you can say what you want. There is no obligation on you one way or the other.’</p> <p>IF ALREADY KNOWS ABOUT PROJECT FROM ANOTHER SERVICE: ‘Is there any other information about the research that I can help you with? Can I put you in touch with the researchers?’</p> <p>If NO, then ‘may I ask you again at a better time, or do you prefer not to be asked again?’</p> |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| C | VAQ Client Support or Team Leader | When following up with a client to discuss the progress of an application or clarify information that may be missing (Client Support); or if there initially seems to be no need for clarification, but then there is (Team Leader). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal offer script, as above at point A • Possible SMS contact • Send invitation package, if appropriate |
| D | VAQ LinkUp Team Leader | To advise FAVE when an application is finalised and the participant has given permission for the Statement of Reasons to be provided | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly cross-check of Client Contact Record and finalised applications • Email to FAVE with copy of Statement of Reasons |

Appendix C. FAVE Project contact protocol

Purpose of Protocol

This Contact Protocol is for VAQ staff members, whose clients have experienced a sexual offence and intend to make an application for financial assistance as a primary victim. The protocol sets out the steps that staff shall take when inviting a VAQ client to participate in the FAVE research project.

The aim of this protocol is to ensure that the invitation to participate in the research is carried out in an ethical manner, that the physical and emotional safety of the client is paramount, and that the research project has a minimal impact on VAQ.

VAQ has nominated a central contact person for the research. This person will hold and secure the Client Contact Record. This person is:

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name: | MP | MT |
| Position: | Team Leader, Victims LinkUp | Research Officer, Client Support |

When to issue an invitation to participate?

Please consider inviting potential research participants (hereafter PRP) to participate in the research after they have made contact with VAQ and at a suitable time after your primary service response. Place the participant flyer (*the green flyer*) in the package of financial assistance information normally sent to applicants.

Use your judgement about issuing a *verbal invitation* if the PRP is too distressed or for some other reason, for example, safety or another reason. As the staff person, you may also assess that issuing the invitation might compromise the trust that has been built with the client. However, if the situation changes for the person, then you may consider it ok to invite them on another occasion. There is no ideal or preferred person to invite to participate. The researchers are interested to talk with anyone, whether they are positive about the service or whether they are critical of it.

How to issue the invitation?

- a. Please make the offer to a VAQ client (or PRP) to participate in the research after you have finished your main conversation.
- b. If the PRP would like to know more about the research, give basic information and say that the researchers can contact him/her without obligation to provide more details. Or simply provide the PRP with the green flyer and invitation package (email or post). We do not ask that you persuade the PRP to accept the invitation but be encouraging that this is an important opportunity to have a say.
- c. If the PRP already has heard about the research from another service provider, there is no need for you to know if they have already agreed to participate. But you can ask if there is any other information you could provide about the research, or offer to put the person in direct contact with the researchers if they have any questions.
- d. If the PRP declines to participate on this occasion, ask if they would be prepared to consider participating at another time. If the PRP declines now and for the future, record this on their file so that they are not asked again. If the PRP agrees to consider the invitation at another time in the future, ask when (how far into the future) they might want a second invitation, or perhaps offer to recontact within

- one week. Record the response in the VAQ file for the client and enter the PRP details on the Contact Record.
- e. When having this conversation, please ensure that the PRP understands that they are under no obligation to participate, and whether or not they agree to participate will have no impact on the decision in their application, positively or negatively.
 - f. If the PRP does agree to participate, or would like more information, ask what is the best (safest, easiest) way that the researchers may make contact. This could be by phone or email, or at the location of a service provider, or at some other place.
 - g. If the PRP agrees to provide contact details, get instructions from them about the best method and time of contact.
 - h. Make sure that the PRP understands that you will pass these contact details to the researchers. Reassure the PRP that the researchers will hold the information in strict confidence.

Subsequent contact with the researchers and maintaining the Contact Record

- i. A record of all sexual assault applicants who have been sent the green flyer and/or the invitation package should be maintained on the contact log.
- j. The researchers can telephone or otherwise contact the PRP *according to the PRP's instructions* during the day or evening or weekend. The actual interview may be conducted at another time convenient to the victim.
- k. If agreed by the PRP, please send all contact details and instructions on safe contact via email to r.holder@griffith.edu.au This is the preferred method because it is secure and allows the researchers to be proactive.
- l. If the PRP has agreed to contact by the researchers (and how), make a record of this in the VAQ file for the client. Enter the PRP's details on the Contact Record.
- m. The researchers can supply further information to the PRP in advance and/or at the time of contact. If the PRP would like information in advance of giving agreement to participate in the research, then this package can be supplied (item 6).¹⁸
- n. A separate record of all PRPs, who have agreed to contact with the researchers and/or who agree to participate will be kept and secured by VAQ's nominated contact person.

All phases of VAQ staff contact

Assure the PRP (or person who agrees to participate) that all information they give in a research interview is confidential between them and the researcher.

¹⁸ Item 6 was a cover letter for potential participants and the participant information sheet.

Appendix D. Invitation scripts for VAQ verbal contact

NOTE: The participant invitation flyer (the green flyer) will have been sent out to eligible participants by LinkUp with the usual package of financial assistance information sent out.

Invitation script for contact point A – LinkUp

Verbal offer script: ‘If there are no other questions that you have today, I would like to mention a little more to you about the research project that we are supporting. I can see from our files that you were sent a flyer about this (if you can’t recall it was on green paper). The research is a really good opportunity for you to have a say. The researchers are independent from us so you can say what you like. They would like to ask you about your reasons for applying for financial assistance and what you think about the process. No-one has done a study like this before so you would contribute to something ground-breaking.’

‘Do you think you might be interested in this? Would you like to know more about it? The easiest thing is for me to pass your name and phone number [*in preference, but email will do*] to them so that they can tell you more about it. May I have your permission to do this? I can also send you an Information Sheet. There is no obligation on you one way or the other once you talk with them. I know they will keep your contact details confidential and secure.’

IF ALREADY KNOWS ABOUT PROJECT FROM ANOTHER SERVICE: ‘Is there any other information about the research that I can help you with? Can I put you in touch with the researchers?’

If **NO**, then ‘may I ask you again at a better time, or do you prefer not to be asked again?’

Invitation script for contact point C – Client Support and/or Team Leader

Verbal offer script: ‘If there are no other questions that you have today, I would like to mention a little more to you about the research project that we are supporting. I can see from our files that you were given information about this. [*or asked to be invited at a later date or as per previous interactions with LinkUp*]

Are you in a place now where you might be prepared to have a talk with the researchers? I know that they would very much like to hear from you. They would like to ask people about their expectations and experiences of applying for financial assistance. They are independent so we will not know what you have to say. It won’t have any impact on your actual application. You can be as positive or negative as you like.

Do you think you might be interested in this? Would you like to know more about it? May I have your permission to pass your name and phone number [*in preference, but email will do*] to the researchers so that they can tell you about it? There is no obligation on you one way or the other.’

If **NO**, then ‘may I ask you again at a better time, or do you prefer not to be asked again?’

Appendix E. Instruments reviewed when designing the FAVE instruments

| Author(s) (see References) | Instrument name |
|--|---|
| Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012) | Personal Safety Survey |
| Australian Bureau of Statistics (1996) | Women's Safety Survey |
| CASA House (1997) | Crimes Compensation Survey |
| Dalbert, Montada, and Schmitt (1987) see Dalbert (2000) for English version | General Belief in a Just World Scale and Specific Beliefs in a Just World Scale |
| Daly (1998, 2001) | South Australia Juvenile Justice (SAJJ) Victim Interview |
| Daly (2014, 2017a) | Victims' Justice Interests framework |
| Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (1999) | The Sexual Victimization Screening Questionnaire (SVSQ) |
| Holder, R. (2013) | Violence and Justice Responses Questionnaire |
| Johnson, Ollus and Nevala (2008) | International Violence Against Women survey questionnaire |
| Kelly, Sharp, and Klein (2014) | Coercive Control UK (CCUK) scale and Space for Action (SFA) scale |
| Koss, Abbey, Campbell, Cook, Norris, Testa, Ullman, West, and White (2006) | Sexual Experience Survey (SES) |
| Lench and Chang (2007) | Unjust World Views Scale |
| Mulder (2013) | Financial Compensation for Victims of Crime Questionnaire |
| Queensland Department of Communities (no date) | PRADO (Partnership Responses at Domestic Violence Occurrence) Survey |
| Ruch and Wang (2006) | Sexual Assault Symptom Scale II (SASS II) |
| Taylor, Muldoon, Norma, and Bradley (2012) | Reporting to Police On-line questionnaire |
| Victoria Department of Justice (2014) | Victims of crime: their experience, needs, and perception of procedural fairness (variables used in <i>Building the Confidence of Victims in the Criminal Justice System</i>) |
| World Health Organisation (2005) | WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Life Experiences |

Appendix F. Prospective design interviews at time1 and time2 (summary)

Note: Complete instruments used in the prospective design are available from the senior author.

Time 1: when applying for financial assistance

The instrument had eight sections:

1. Demographics
2. Financial Assistance process
3. Incident(s)
4. Effect(s) on you of the incident(s)
5. Early help-seeking
6. Reporting to police and justice responses
7. Your feelings today
8. Opinions

Section 1

Personal and demographic questions were adapted from the Australian census (Holder 2013). These were kept to the minimum necessary to create socio-economic categories to depict the profile of participants and to compare the sample's responses by socio-economic status.

Section 2

Although the participant's engagement with the financial assistance (FA) process was out of sequence to the general characterisation of help-seeking following sexual victimisation, we decided to ask questions about it early in the interview. We reasoned that the person would be expecting such questions because their help-seeking spawned the invitation to participate in the research. Furthermore, their experience of and thinking about FA would be recent and fresh in their mind. Of course, why people apply for FA was a crucial component of the FAVE Project.

We wanted to understand when and how people had learned about FA. We also wanted to consider the time taken between incident and application, and between when they first heard about FA and application. We also wanted to know what they thought about FA and what thoughts or feelings were disincentives or motivations to apply. These questions were open-ended. We asked their top three reasons for making the application. We also drew a series of closed questions from Mulder's (2013) research on the degree to which certain outcomes were achieved for victims when receiving financial assistance. We instead itemised reasons for applying as acknowledgement, emotional support, validation, justice, coping, and entitlement.

We asked about some of the practical steps the person had to take to make the application such as finding information, understanding information, getting together supporting documentation, and getting assistance to complete the form. We asked what they had applied for and why, and what they had not applied for and why.

We asked questions about their engagement with VAQ staff in preparing and making the application. These drew from the procedural justice literature, but they were also related to certain legislative rights of victims. For example, provisions in the Victims Charter specify

that a victim ‘will be treated with courtesy, compassion, respect and dignity, taking into account the victim’s needs’.¹⁹ Q2.17 in the interview asked the victim if VAQ treated them ‘with dignity and respect’.

At the end of this section, we asked what their preferences were for who should pay expenses incurred as a result of the victimisation: the offender, the state, or a combination.

Section 3

Section 3 asked for minimal information about the incident. Core information was whether the incident was a single event or multiple, what was their relationship (if any) to the person who assaulted them, and the victim’s perception of the seriousness of the incident. All these questions have been shown in the literature to be relevant to the meanings that people make of their victimisation.

Section 4

This section asked about the effects of the incident(s) on the survivor at the time. Again, these were minimal. Two questions were open-ended so that participants could say as much or as little as they wished. Two were closed and anchored questions, which dealt with the emotional effects and with the injury or harm of the incident or victimisation.

Section 5

This section asked about the person’s early help-seeking. This is a critical time when a victim hears social and cultural messages about themselves, what happened, and what avenues of response are (or not) socially validated and available. The initial question was open-ended, but we also had a list of sources of support that victims commonly turn to, drawn from the literature. We wanted to know how long after the incident a particular help-source was accessed. We anticipated that that this question would yield important information about potential ‘delay’ in disclosing sexual victimisation. We were interested to learn what survivors found helpful or unhelpful in the responses of other people and service providers. We also wanted to know if anyone had mentioned financial assistance (and with what connotations) and what other information sources may have been relevant.²⁰

Section 6

This section asked about people’s experiences with police, prosecution, and court. We asked who had reported the incident and why; if it was not reported, why not; and the time taken to report.

For each of the criminal justice entities—police, prosecution, and court—we asked what had transpired from the encounter, and what the person would have preferred to see happen and why. As a simple measure, we asked to rate overall satisfaction with police, prosecution, and court, seeking further elaboration on their answers.

¹⁹ The Victims Charter is Schedule 1AA of the *Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009* (Qld).

²⁰ At the time of the FAVE Project, an Australian Royal Commission on institutional responses to child sexual abuse was underway (its 5-year time frame was 2013 to 2017). The public and media discussion about the need for the Royal Commission may have affected potential research participants when they were considering making a financial assistance application. Some may already have attempted to use other avenues such as civil litigation or reparation orders at sentence, private insurance, or other welfare payments.

The literature suggests that prior victimisation experiences can influence how people later view the world around them, their resilience, and the meaning they draw from the events. We asked two questions: the first was about earlier experience of other violence, and the second was about any other event that had ‘really affected you – good or bad’, and the meaning that survivors drew from these events.

Section 7

For the later sections, we were cognisant of moving the participant forward (emotionally, cognitively) into the present and future. Section 7 sought self-assessment on the person’s present well-being. The closed questions were adapted from a Queensland instrument devised for pre- and post-testing of male and female victims of domestic violence (Meyer 2014). These questions were simple and direct, and they covered different domains: emotional well-being, physical safety, housing and financial stability, social support, sense of self, relationship intimacy, job stability, and education. These self-assessment questions were intended to be used as repeat measures in the second interview. We also asked about people’s vision for their future and how different (if at all) it was from their hopes before the incident(s).

We sought responses to a series of statements about the meaning of the incident (or on-going victimisation, if relevant). The statements largely focused on evaluating the incident as a ‘misfortune’ or an ‘injustice’, drawing from Shklar (1990). This way of categorising would, we hoped, shed light on victims’ perceptions of agency and the meaning of an incident in a socio-political context. We anticipated that answers would reveal the moral, social, and political perceptions that underpin peoples’ orientations to social resources like financial assistance.

Section 8

The final section asked people their opinions about what should be available more generally for victims of crime. The statements echoed similar lines of enquiry as those in Section 7 although they were more direct about the sources of support. For example, Q8.04 asked about the helpfulness of police, counsellor, lawyer, and doctor, among others.

In this section we pulled back to ask people to reflect of concepts of recovery and justice. We anticipated that the meanings participants had of these terms would be complex and would draw on their personal experience, social location, and social and political self.

Final considerations

At the end of the time1 interview, we asked ‘check-in’ questions. This part was designed to assist the person to think concretely about next steps after the interview. Was there anyone they could talk to later? What comforting things they might do for themselves after talking about an emotional topic? This discussion would vary according to what the researcher already knew about the survivor: the person’s sex/gender, age, social supports, and other information from the interview. We also had a list of specialist services across Queensland, if this was helpful for the survivor to know.

At the end of the interview but before the check-in, we asked participants if they would agree to be contacted a second time. It was emphasised that this was only an agreement to be contacted, and that they could decline a second interview. We gave people the option for (a) agreeing that researchers be told by VAQ when a decision on their application was made, or (b) that we contact the person monthly to see if they had received a decision.

Time2 interview: after receiving VAQ's decision

The instrument had three sections:

1. Financial Assistance decision and process
2. Other help or support
3. Your feelings today

Section 1 asked about the decisions VAQ had made, the reasons they gave, and the applicant's rating of how important each component was to them. The participant was given a series of statements about the decision: they were satisfied with it, it was fair, it was what they expected, what they deserved, and what they wanted. For each they were asked to say, on a 4-point scale, whether they agreed (or strongly agreed) or disagreed (or strongly disagreed) with it. For each item, they were asked to say more.

The participant was then asked about the person making the assessment and about the process itself, using variables drawn from the procedural justice literature (treated fairly, with respect, victim voice, among other variables). The section also asked about assessments on the reasons and objectives for applying for FA that had been asked at time1.

Section 2 asked about the help and support that the interviewee had received in the intervening months since the time1 interview, and any comments supporters may have made about financial assistance.

Section 3 asked about how the interviewee self-assessed their current wellbeing. These were repeat measures from the time1 interview, which had been adapted from an instrument developed in an evaluation of an initiative called Partnership Responses at Domestic Violence Occurrence (PRADO), which was intended to reduce risk and increase support for female victims of domestic violence (Meyer 2014). The instrument, devised for use at the beginning of an intervention and after 6 weeks, comprised 13 multi-scaled questions. We adapted nine of the questions for the retrospective interview.

It concluded by asking participants open-ended question about their reflections on our two principal concepts of interest: justice and recovery.

Appendix G. Retrospective design online invitation and survey

EMAIL

SAMPLE

Distributed to 164 eligible respondents from the FLOW dataset, for whom VAQ had email addresses.

TEXT

Dear ... (use person's name if possible)

You previously applied to Victim Assist Queensland for financial assistance and have been selected to participate in an important research project. The project is being conducted by independent researchers from Griffith University. Your views and experiences are really important and will help Victim Assist and others to improve what they do.

The survey should only take you about 5 minutes. The answers you give are confidential. They will be received by and protected in Griffith University secure storage. The results of the survey will be written in reports and academic papers. You will not be identified in any published material.

As a thank you for participating and upon completing the survey Griffith University would like to offer you a \$20 gift voucher.

A full information sheet about the research and the conditions of your participation is available *here* [url] [or in an attachment]. By proceeding into the survey it will be considered that you have read and agreed to the conditions.

Should you have any questions about the research please contact r.holder@griffith.edu.au
Thank you for your time.

QUESTIONS FOR ONLINE SURVEY

APPLYING FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

People have different reasons for applying for financial assistance.

1. For you, can you say how much you agree or disagree with the following reasons:

| I thought that the financial assistance would: | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | Don't know/ Unsure |
|---|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|--------------------|
| make me feel acknowledged as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| provide me with a form of emotional support | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| confirm my innocence as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| provide me with a form of justice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| help me cope with the aftermath of the incident(s) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |

2. I had another important reason(s) for applying for financial assistance. The reason(s) were:

3. I thought that I was entitled to financial assistance.

| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | Don't know/ Can't say |
|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |

YOUR MOST IMPORTANT REASONS

4. Of your reasons for applying, which two were the most important to you?

| Because it would: | Pick top reason | Pick second top reason |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| make me feel acknowledged as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 |
| provide me with a form of emotional support | 1 | 2 |
| confirm my innocence as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 |
| provide me with a form of justice | 1 | 2 |
| help me cope with the aftermath of the incident(s) | 1 | 2 |
| I thought I was entitled to financial assistance | 1 | 2 |
| For my own important reason(s) | 1 | 2 |

AFTER RECEIVING THE GRANT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

5. After you learned the amount of money to be granted to you, did the money achieve the following for you:

| Yes, the financial assistance: | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | Don't know/ Can't say |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|--------------------------|
| made me feel acknowledged as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| provided me with a form of emotional support | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| confirmed my innocence as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| provided me with a form of justice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| helped me cope with the aftermath of the incident(s) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| confirmed that I was entitled to it | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| met my own important reason(s) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |

WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO YOU ABOUT THE SPECIAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

6. Thinking about your grant of financial assistance how important was the special recognition payment (special assistance payment) to you?

| Not at all important | A little important | Important | Very important | Can't recall receiving this |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

7. What did you decide to do with the special recognition payment (or to spend it on), and why was this (item or activity) important to you:

WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO YOU ABOUT THE EXPENSES FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

8. How important was it to you to be granted money for the following ...

| Expense item | Not at all important | A little important | Important | Very important |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Counselling expenses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Medical expenses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Report expenses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Loss of earnings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Damage to clothing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Other items of expense | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

9. Did you receive a grant for any of the following ...

| Expense item | Yes, awarded this | No, not awarded this | Can't recall if I was granted this |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Counselling expenses | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Medical expenses | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Report expenses | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Loss of earnings | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Damage to clothing | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Other items of expense | 1 | 2 | 7 |

YOUR OVERALL EXPERIENCE WITH FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

10. Thinking about your overall experience with Victim Assist Queensland and financial assistance, how much you agree or disagree with the following ...

| <i>Please answer each statement</i> | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | Don't know/unsure |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| a. I was informed of developments in my application to Victim Assist..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| b. I was able to tell Victim Assist what happened to me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| c. I was able to tell Victim Assist about the impact of what happened | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| d. I was believed by Victim Assist..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| e. Victim Assist's decision on my application was influenced by my story about what happened and its impact | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| f. My experience with Victim Assist affirmed that what happened to me was wrong..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| g. My experience Victim Assist affirmed the incident was against the law | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| h. The offender was held accountable for the incident through Victim Assist ... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| i. The offender took active responsibility for the incident through Victim Assist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 |

YOUR RECOVERY

11. Overall, did the financial assistance help you recover from the effects of the offence?

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Not at all important | A little important | Important | Very important |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

12. Is there anything else you want to say about what helped you with the effects of the offence?

Or is there anything else you'd like to say?

ABOUT YOU

13. I am ...

| Male | Female | Other |
|------|--------|-------|
| | | |

14. I identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander ...

| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
| | |

15. To the best of my memory the act of violence against me for which I applied for financial assistance took place in ...

- Central Queensland
- Far North Queensland
- Gold Coast
- Greater Brisbane
- North Queensland
- South West Queensland
- Sunshine Coast
- Multiple places in Queensland
- Other
- Can't recall

Thank you very much. That is the end of our questions. If this survey has raised any issues for you please phone the Statewide Sexual Assault Helpline on 1800 010 120 (24 hours). As a token of our thanks please go to [*other url link*] to claim your gift voucher from Griffith University.

THANK YOU!

If you wish to receive your \$20 gift voucher from Griffith University, we need a name and address to post it to. Giving us this information does not link you to your survey results.

I wish to receive the \$20 gift voucher. Please mail it to me at the following address:

| | |
|------------|----------------------------------|
| NAME/ALIAS | <i>Free text box to write in</i> |
| ADDRESS | <i>Free text box to write in</i> |
| POSTCODE | <i>Free text box to write in</i> |

Would you be interested to participate in an additional short interview with Griffith University researchers? If you agree, and as a small token of thanks after the interview, we would like to offer an additional \$50 gift voucher. Are you interested to know more?

The best method to contact me to talk about an interview is ...

| | | |
|---------------|-------|----------------------------------|
| <i>select</i> | Email | <i>Free text box to write in</i> |
| <i>select</i> | Phone | <i>Free text box to write in</i> |
| <i>select</i> | Other | <i>Free text box to write in</i> |

The best time to contact me is ...

| | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|-----------|----------|--------|----------|--------|
| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday |
| am/pm | am/pm | am/pm | am/pm | am/pm | am/pm | am/pm |

If you have any questions about the offer of a voucher or about the research, please email r.holder@griffith.edu.au or phone (07) 3735 3440

Appendix H. Retrospective design interview

FAVE PROJECT: FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND VICTIMS' EXPERIENCES

(Note: Introductory material was written with email mode respondents in mind.)

Thank you for agreeing to respond to these further questions about your experience in seeking financial assistance and what this means to you. Your help is hugely valuable. Please take your time in completing this questionnaire. It can be done all in one go or in parts.

Please remember that if the questions raise concerns or emotions, you can phone the 24-hour helplines:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Statewide Sexual Assault Helpline | 1800 010 120 (24 hours) |
| 1800 Respect (national helpline) | 1800 737 732 (24 hours) |

This is new research for Australia so what you say is really important. The research is independent from Victim Assist Queensland. The information you give is confidential and anonymous. It will be used in academic presentations and journal articles. You will not be identified.

The questions are a mix of open ones, and some are just tick boxes or ask you to rank particular things, and some ask for you to type in your answer. Just answer as much or as little as you can.

I apologise in advance because some questions you might recall from the online survey. However, because that was anonymous, we cannot link answers to people.

STRUCTURE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Demographic questions
2. Financial Assistance process
3. The incident(s)
4. The effect(s) on you of the incident(s) and help-seeking
5. Reporting to police and justice responses
6. Your feelings today
7. Your opinions

COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

It is probably simplest if you save the questionnaire on to a disk or your hard drive. Once you have completed it, please email back to r.holder@griffith.edu.au

When I have received it, I will post out to you a thank you voucher of \$50. Thank you again very much for agreeing to help with this research.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE |
|---------------------------------------|

Now I have some practical Qs to ask about you. Be assured that the information you give me will not identify you.

Q1.01. Are you? male female other

Q1.02 What is your date of birth?

Q1.03 What country were you born in?Australia

.....other (specify)

Q1.04. Do you speak a language other than English at home?

..... no, English only

..... yes, another language (specify)

Q1.05. Do you identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?

..... no

..... yes, Aboriginal

..... yes, Torres Strait Islander

..... yes, both

Q1.06. Do you have a disability of any kind?

no 1

yes (*please specify*) 2

Q1.07. What is your current relationship status? (*Please circle one*)

partnered (including married, de facto relationships) 1

single (including divorced, separated, widowed) 2

Q1.08. What is your current housing situation? (*Please circle one*)

own (including paying off a mortgage) 1

rent 2

other 3

Q1.09. What is your current employment status? (*Please circle one*)

working full-time 1

working part-time 2

not employed 3

retired 4

studying full-time 5 (Go to Q1.11)

home duties 6 (Go to Q1.11)

Q1.10 And your occupation?

| | |
|--|---|
| manager or administrator | 1 |
| professional | 2 |
| tradesperson..... | 3 |
| clerical, sales, or service worker..... | 4 |
| labourer, transport, or factory worker | 5 |

Q1.11 What is the highest level of education you have completed?

| | |
|---|---|
| no formal schooling | 1 |
| year 6 Primary school | 2 |
| year 12 High school | 3 |
| College/TAFE..... | 4 |
| Bachelor's Degree | 5 |
| Post Grad qualification (of some kind)..... | 6 |
| Masters or PhD | 7 |

| |
|--|
| SECTION 2: THE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROCESS |
|--|

Thank you. My next questions ask about applying for financial assistance through Victim Assist Queensland.

Q2.01. Can you tell me approximately the date when you lodged your application for financial assistance (FA)?

Q2.02 Have you made any other applications to VAQ in relation to any other acts of violence?

Q2.03 Can you tell me how you found out about the financial assistance (FA)? When was that?

So that would be approximatelymonths/years between when the incident(s) took place and when you lodged your application. Is this right?

Q2.04 *[If longer than 2 months] Can you tell me why it took that time? [Prompt: I am interested if there were things going on or things about applying for FA that caused delay]*

I would like to understand what you felt and thought about applying for FA at the time. Please answer to the best of your recollection.

Q2.05 What feelings and thoughts did you have that inclined you **towards** applying? *[Prompt: thoughts and feelings that you should [or would] apply?]*

Q2.06 And what feelings and thoughts did you have that inclined you **against** applying? *[Prompt: thoughts and feelings that you would not or should not apply?]*

Q2.07 Overall, can you give me the top 3 reasons why you eventually decided to apply for FA?

The process of applying

Q2.08 When you received the application form what were your first impressions?

Q2.09 Can you tell me about the process of completing the application? *[Prompt: did you stop and start the process? Was it difficult?]*

Q2.10 Did anyone help you complete the application? Who was that? What were the things that **most helped** you from that person/organisation?

Q2.11 Were the questions on the form reasonable or unreasonable? Why do you say that?

Q2.12 The application form also asked for some supporting documents – did you think it was reasonable or unreasonable to ask for those supporting documents? Why do you say that?

Q2.13 Were the supporting documents easy or difficult to locate?

Q2.14 Did you find the process of applying difficult or easy? Can you tell me a bit about that?

Q2.15 Were you affected by it? In what ways did it affect you?

Q2.16 I want to ask you some questions about the staff at Victim Assist Queensland. Were they generally:

| | No | Yes | yes sometimes/no other times |
|-----------------------------|----|-----|------------------------------|
| Helpful | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Easy to talk to | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Prompt in responding to you | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Fair in dealing with you | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Non-judgemental with you | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q2.17 And generally did VAQ:

| | No | Yes | yes sometimes/no other times |
|---|----|-----|------------------------------|
| Make you feel included | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Treat you with dignity and respect | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Respect your privacy | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Give you information about other services | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Give you ideas to consider when applying for financial assistance | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Provide information that you could understand | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Provide you with opportunities to have a say | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Now about the VAQ decision

Q2.18 Can you recall the date (approximately) when you were notified by VAQ of their decision on your application?

Q2.19 What actually was the decision they made on your application?

Q2.20 What did you feel/think about that?

Q2.21 Do you recall the reasons they gave you for making the decision? What did you feel/think about those?

Q2.22 Thinking about the decision VAQ made on your application, would you say ...

| <i>Please answer each statement</i> | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|
| a. I was satisfied with the <u>decision</u> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. The <u>decision</u> was fair..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. The <u>decision</u> was what I expected..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. The <u>decision</u> was what I deserved..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. The <u>decision</u> was what I wanted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Q2.23 Can you recall - in broad terms - what you did actually apply for?

Q2.24 The financial assistance decision was made up of a number of parts. I am interested to know how important to you each of these was *whether or not you received* it. On a scale of 1 to 10, could you rate how important these are to you. [Tick relevant box]

| Item | Not at all | | | | Important | | | | | Extremely | Not applicable |
|----------------------|------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|-----------|----------------|
| | important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | important | |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | 10 | |
| Counselling expenses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Medical expenses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Report expenses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loss of earnings | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Damage to clothing | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other expenses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Special assistance | | | | | | | | | | | |

Q2.25 Thinking about those items that you ranked 5+, can you tell me why these items are important to you?

Q2.26 May I ask what you have spent the grant of special assistance on? Why is this important to you?

Q2.27 Was there anything else that you think you would have liked to apply for those months/years ago but didn't? Can you tell me what this was?

Q2.28 And can you tell me why you did not apply for it?

Q2.29 Have you made subsequent amendment applications or changes to your original application? If yes, what was that about?

Q2.30 Is there anything else you want to tell me about the process of applying, or about the FA scheme itself?

Q2.31 Is there anything Victim Assist Queensland could do better to help people apply or to help in other ways?

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| SECTION 3: THE INCIDENT(S) |
|-----------------------------------|

Thank you. Now, so that I can put all of this into context, I need to ask a little about what happened to you. I don't need to know the details about what happened but just a general idea.

Q3.01. Was it a single incident or more than one incident? Single (GO TO Q3.03)
A number

Q3.02 If it was a number were there:
a couple, quite a few, or many?

How old were you at the time of the first occasion?.....

How old were you when the last incident took place?

Q3.03. Thinking about the incident(s), was the person who did this to you:

male

female

both male and female

Q3.04 What was their relationship to you: related/unrelated

Related: partner/ex-partner, mother/father, step parent, grandfather, uncle, sibling

Unrelated: friend, acquaintance, community leader, stranger

Q3.05. And where did it take place? [*Prompt: general location, inside/outside, her/his home etc*]

Q3.06 Can you tell me in general terms what happened? Again, I don't need to know the details.

Q3.07. **At the time**, how serious was the incident to you?

Not at all serious

A bit serious

Serious

Very serious

0

1

2

3

Q3.08 Why do you say that?

| |
|--|
| SECTION 4: THE EFFECT ON YOU AND HELP-SEEKING |
|--|

Thank you. Now, I am going to ask you a little about how the incident(s) affected you. I am thinking about how it affected you at the time. Again, please just take your time in answering.

Q4.01. Can you tell me a bit about how the incident(s) affected you *at the time*?

Q4.02. As a result of the incident, did you experience any type of injury?

Q4.03. Did it affect any other areas of your life at the time? Can you tell me a bit about this?
[Prompt: *relationships, work, schooling*]

Q4.04 Can you tell me a bit about who or what was most helpful to you after the incident?
[Prompt: *family, friends, police etc and type of support*]

Q4.05 And who do you recall was least helpful? Can you tell me why?

Q4.06 Did any of those you were in contact with after the incident mention the possibility of seeking financial payments from a source other than VAQ? IF NO, GO TO Q4.08

Q4.07 Did you follow-up on that? What happened?

Q4.08 Can you tell me a bit how the incident(s) has continued to affect you [Prompt: *positive and negative*]

| |
|--|
| SECTION 5: REPORTING TO POLICE AND JUSTICE RESPONSE |
|--|

In this section I'll ask you some questions about your experiences with police and the justice system.

Q5.01. Were police contacted about what happened to you? Yes (GO TO 5.03) no

Q5.02 If police were not contacted to report what happened, was there any other person/service that was told about it in a formal way? [*Prompt: child protection, doctor, psychologist, counsellor*]

Q5.03. Was it you who told them or someone else?

- | | |
|---|---|
| You (victim interviewee) (<i>go to Q 5.05</i>)..... | 1 |
| The person using violence..... | 2 |
| Neighbour..... | 3 |
| Don't know who reported it | 4 |
| Other (state what relationship to you)..... | 5 |

Q5.04. If the person who reported to police was not you, did you:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Want the report made..... | 1 |
| Not want the report made (<i>Go to Q5.06</i>) | 2 |
| Unsure | 3 |

Q5.05. What were the main reasons for getting police involved?

Q5.06 And how much time was there between the incident(s) and when the police were told?

Q5.07 (If any significant time delay) Can you tell me a bit about what was going on for you over that time period that made it difficult for you to report it to police?

Q5.08 And what happened next after police were told? [*Prompt: Take your statement? Investigation? Locate offender(s)? Charge offender(s)? Nothing? Don't know? Any contact?*]

Q5.09 What would you have preferred to see happen? Why?

Q5.10. Generally speaking, how satisfied were you with the way the police handled your case?

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Very dissatisfied | 0 |
| Dissatisfied..... | 1 |
| Satisfied..... | 2 |
| Very satisfied..... | 3 |

Q5.11. Can you tell me more about your answer?

| |
|--|
| IF NOTHING KNOWN OR NO OTHER JUSTICE PROCESSES, GO TO Q5.20 |
|--|

PROSECUTION

Q5.12. If police charged a person with an offence, do you know what happened after that? *[Prompt: Prosecute Y/N/DK? Plea? Charge negotiation? Any other contact with you?]*

Q5.13 What would you have preferred to see happen? Why?

Q5.14. Generally speaking, how satisfied were you with the way the prosecution handled your case?

- Very dissatisfied 0
- Dissatisfied 1
- Satisfied..... 2
- Very satisfied..... 3

Q5.15. Can you tell me more about your answer?

COURT

Q5.16. If the case went to court, do you know what happened after that? *[Prompt: Dismissed? Trial? Give evidence? Acquittal or not? Appeal? Sentence? Victim impact statement]*

Q5.17 What would you have preferred to see happen? Why?

Q5.18. Generally speaking, how satisfied were you with the way the court handled your case?

- Very dissatisfied 0
- Dissatisfied 1
- Satisfied..... 2
- Very satisfied..... 3

Q5.19. Can you tell me more about your answer?

RE-COMMENCE HERE

Q5.20. At any point in the justice process (police, prosecution, court) did you ask for a reparation or compensation order to be made?

Yes/no/didn't know it was possible/can't remember

If yes, why did you want this?

Do you know what happened?

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| SECTION 6: YOUR FEELINGS TODAY |
|---------------------------------------|

Thank you. We are now over half-way through. These questions ask about the time since your application and the decision, and how you are feeling *at this time*.

Q6.01 I have asked how the incident affected you at the time. I wanted to ask how you feel now about how it has affected/is affecting you.

Q6.02 I have some general statements about the financial assistance. Do you agree or disagree with them?

| I think that: | No | Yes | Maybe yes/ maybe no |
|---|----|-----|------------------------|
| the financial assistance made me feel acknowledged as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| the financial assistance provided a form of emotional support for me | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| the financial assistance confirmed my innocence as a victim of violence | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| the financial assistance provided a form of justice to me | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| the financial assistance helped me cope with the aftermath of the incident(s) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| I am/was entitled to financial assistance | 1 | 2 | 3 |

The next questions ask you to rate how you are feeling now on different aspects of your life. With each question I also ask if the financial assistance played any role. This will sound a little repetitive so please be patient!

Q6.03. How would you describe your physical safety now?

Very unsafe Unsafe Somewhat safe Very safe
0 1 2 3

Q6.04. Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

Not at all A bit Somewhat To a high degree
0 1 2 3

Q6.05 How would you describe your emotional wellbeing now?

Not good at all Not good Good Very good
0 1 2 3

Q6.06 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

Not at all A bit Somewhat To a high degree
0 1 2 3

Q6.07. How would you describe your housing stability now?

Very unstable Unstable Stable Very stable
0 1 2 3

Q6.08 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

| | | | |
|------------|-------|----------|------------------|
| Not at all | A bit | Somewhat | To a high degree |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.09 How would you describe your financial stability now?

| | | | |
|---------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| Very unstable | Unstable | Stable | Very stable |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.10 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

| | | | |
|------------|-------|----------|------------------|
| Not at all | A bit | Somewhat | To a high degree |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.11 How would you describe your social support now?

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| I have no social support at all | I have a few people I can ask for support | I have many people I could ask for support | I have an extended social network I can ask for support |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.12 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

| | | | |
|------------|-------|----------|------------------|
| Not at all | A bit | Somewhat | To a high degree |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.13. How would you describe your sense of self now?

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| I have no sense of who I am | I have a some but not much of a sense of who I am | I have a fairly good sense of who I am | I have a very good sense of who I am |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.14 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

| | | | |
|------------|-------|----------|------------------|
| Not at all | A bit | Somewhat | To a high degree |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.15 How would you describe your capacity for relationship (sexual) intimacy now?

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------|------|-----------|
| Not good at all | Not good | Good | Very good |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.16 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

| | | | |
|------------|-------|----------|------------------|
| Not at all | A bit | Somewhat | To a high degree |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.17 How would you describe your job stability now?

| | | | |
|---------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| Very unstable | Unstable | Stable | Very stable |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.18 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

| | | | |
|------------|-------|----------|------------------|
| Not at all | A bit | Somewhat | To a high degree |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q6.19. If you are in school or other education, how are you doing now?

Not good at all Not good Good Very good
0 1 2 3

Q6.20 Did the financial assistance play any role in that?

Not at all A bit Somewhat To a high degree
0 1 2 3

6.21 So there are 9 areas of your life that I have just asked about and if financial assistance played a role. Can you tell me in your own words why/how the financial assistance played the role it has had?

Q6.22 Here are some more statements about what you think **now** about what happened to you. I'd like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with them in relation to the incident(s).

[NOTE: not in relation to sexual offences generally]

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|
| a. What happened was a real injustice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. What happened is against the law | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. What happened arose from particular circumstances | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. What happened was partly my fault | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. What happened is not really regarded as serious by the community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. What happened was a moral wrong | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g. What happened was just one of those things | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Q6.23 And finally, if it were possible would you have preferred that the person who hurt you [*assaulted you/offender*] had paid your expenses [*the cost impact on you*]?

I would have preferred that:

| | |
|--|--------|
| The offender to pay in full | Yes/No |
| The state/government to pay in full | Yes/No |
| For the offender to pay some and the state to pay some | Yes/No |

Q6.24 Can you tell me more about your answer.

| |
|---------------------------------|
| SECTION 7: YOUR OPINIONS |
|---------------------------------|

Thank you. We are now on to the last set of questions. These ones ask you for your views and opinions more broadly.

Q7.02. Some organisations working with victims/survivors, use the word '**recovery**'. That is, that they are helping victims to 'recover' from the effects of the crime. We are interested in what the word/idea of 'recovery' means to you? I am really interested in the words you would use.

Q7.03 Given your description of 'recovery', in what ways do you think financial assistance has helped, if at all? What do you think it will **not** help with? [*Prompt – why do you say that?*]

Q7.04 Thinking today and on your idea of recovery, who or what has helped (is helping) you recover **the most**? Why?

Q7.05 And thinking today and on your idea of recovery, who or what is hindering your recovery?

Q7.06 Is there anything else about 'recovery' that you think is important to tell me about?

Now I have another question about your views.

Q7.07 Thinking today, what does the **idea of justice** mean to you? I am really interested in the words that you use.

Q7.08 Thinking today, do you think you have achieved the idea of justice you have just outlined? Can you tell me about that?

Q7.09 Who or what has helped (is helping) you achieve your idea of justice **the most**? Why?

Q7.10 Who or what is hindering?

Q7.11 Do you have any other suggestions about improving responses to people who have experienced sexual violence?

Q7.12 Is there anything else that I haven't asked you that you feel is important for me to know?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Before we finish, I want to ask if you would like to receive any information about the results of our research?

___ I agree to be contacted on a second occasion by the researchers to receive information about the results of the research. I would prefer that this contact is (*please specify* - by post or email)

.....
.....

CHECK-IN. Some of these were difficult questions. Please remember that you can phone either of the 24-hour helplines. The numbers are on the front of this form.