

Revision to Satisfaction and willingness to engage with the Criminal Justice System: Findings from the Witness and Victim Experience Survey, 2009–10 (WAVES report)

British Crime Survey data – page 34

The WAVES report cited British Crime Survey (BCS, now known as the Crime Survey for England and Wales or CSEW) findings based on unpublished analysis, which had been compiled for a forthcoming research report. This report was published today (Support for victims – Findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales) and revises the following figure:

Page 34 – victims in 37 per cent of burglary incidents wanted some form of information, advice or support (not 39 per cent as stated originally).

As a result, the Ministry of Justice have today revised the figure in the WAVES report, to ensure that it matches the published figure in the CSEW report.

Any enquiries about this revision and wider enquiries about these reports should be directed to the Surveys team of the Ministry of Justice: surveys@justice.gsi.gov.uk

7 May 2013



Ministry of
JUSTICE

**Satisfaction and willingness
to engage with the
Criminal Justice System**
Findings from the Witness and Victim
Experience Survey, 2009–10

Ramona Franklyn

Ministry of Justice Research Series 1/12
February 2012

Satisfaction and willingness to engage with the Criminal Justice System

Findings from the Witness and Victim Experience
Survey, 2009–10

Ramona Franklyn

This information is also available on the Ministry of Justice website:
www.justice.gov.uk/publications/research.htm

Analytical Services exists to improve policymaking, decision taking and practice by the Ministry of Justice. It does this by providing robust, timely and relevant data and advice drawn from research and analysis undertaken by the department's analysts and by the wider research community.

© Crown Copyright 2012

Extracts from this document may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes on condition that the source is acknowledged.

First published 2012

ISBN: 978-1-84099-519-0

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Tracey Budd in MoJ Analytical Services for her guidance and oversight throughout the project. Thanks also to Mark Peck, Krista Jansson, Laura Freeman and Alissa Redmond in MoJ Analytical Services for their assistance.

The author would also like to thank Ipsos MORI who conducted the Witness and Victim Experience Survey, and the independent peer reviewers who provided comments on an earlier draft.

Final thanks go to the victims and witnesses who kindly agreed to take part in the survey.

Disclaimer

The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily shared by the Ministry of Justice (nor do they represent Government policy).

Contents

List of tables

Summary	i
Methodology	i
Main findings	i
Recommendations	iv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 The Witness and Victim Experience Survey	2
1.2 Outline of the report	8
2. Initial contact with the CJS	9
2.1 Receiving information	9
2.2 Giving a statement	10
2.3 Victim Personal Statements	11
2.4 Information about case progress	14
2.5 Witness Care Officers	16
2.6 Summary	18
3. Preparing for and attending court	19
3.1 Preparing for court	19
3.2 Attending court	24
3.3 Giving evidence	25
3.4 Summary	30
4. Support	32
4.1 The Witness Service	32
4.2 Needs resulting from the crime	33
4.3 Victim Support	34
4.4 Injuries resulting from the crime and the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme	35
4.5 Summary	36
5. Perceptions of the case outcome and sentence	37
5.1 Perceptions of the case outcome	37
5.2 Perceptions of the sentence	39
5.3 Summary	41

6.	Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System	42
6.1	Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System	42
6.2	Factors associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Criminal Justice System	45
6.3	Summary	51
7.	Willingness to engage with the CJS	52
7.1	Victims	53
7.2	Witnesses	56
7.3	Giving evidence again	58
7.4	Summary	61
8.	Conclusions	63
8.1	Recommendations	65
	References	67
	Appendix A	69
	Survey methodology and respondent profile	69
	Appendix B	80
	Multivariate analysis	80

List of tables

Table 1.1: Demographic characteristics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10	4
Table 1.2: Case characteristics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10	4
Table 1.3: Criminal justice process of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10	5
Table 1.4: Case characteristics by crime type, WAVES 2009–10	6
Table 2.1: Proportion of victims who reported receiving a <i>Victims of Crime</i> leaflet, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10	10
Table 2.2: Proportion of victims and witnesses who reported receiving a <i>Giving a statement</i> leaflet, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10	11
Table 2.3: Proportion of victims who recalled being offered the opportunity to make a VPS, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10	12
Table 2.4: Proportion of victims offered a VPS who recalled being offered the opportunity to make a VPS, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10	12
Table 2.5: Proportion of victims who recalled making a VPS, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10	13
Table 2.6: Proportion of victims offered a VPS who recalled making a VPS, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10	13
Table 2.7: Proportion of victims who felt their views as set out in the VPS were taken into account during the criminal justice process, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10	14
Table 2.8: Period between respondents' first contact with the police and when they next heard anything officially about the progress of the case, WAVES 2009–10	15
Table 2.9: How often respondents were kept updated about the progress of their case, WAVES 2009–10	15
Table 2.10: Proportion of victims and witnesses who had contact with a Witness Care Officer, by crime type and whether attended court, WAVES 2009–10	17
Table 2.11: Services provided by Witness Care Officers, WAVES 2009–10	18
Table 3.1: Information received prior to attending court to give evidence, WAVES 2009–10	21
Table 3.2: Concerns about attending court, WAVES 2009–10	22
Table 3.3: Who victims and witnesses told about their concerns, WAVES 2009–10	24
Table 3.4: Proportion of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence who actually gave evidence, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10	25

Table 3.5: How often victims and witnesses were kept informed while they waited to give evidence, WAVES 2009–10	26
Table 3.6: Special measures to give evidence, WAVES 2009–10	27
Table 3.7: Proportion of victims and witnesses who felt intimidated during the CJS process, by crime type and whether they gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10	28
Table 3.8: Who respondents felt intimidated by, WAVES 2009–10	29
Table 3.9: Who respondents told about feelings of intimidation, WAVES 2009–10	30
Table 4.1: Contact with the Witness Service, WAVES 2009–10	33
Table 4.2: Proportion of respondents who had needs resulting from the crime, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10	33
Table 5.1: Perceptions of case outcome, WAVES 2009–10	38
Table 5.2: Proportions of victims and witnesses who thought case outcome was fair, by case outcome and whether attended court and gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10	38
Table 5.3: Perceptions of the sentence, WAVES 2009–10	39
Table 5.4: Proportions of victims and witnesses who thought sentence was fair, by whether provided with an explanation and whether attended court, WAVES 2009–10	40
Table 6.1: Victim and witness satisfaction with different aspects of their CJS experience, WAVES 2009–10	42
Table 7.1: Willingness to engage with the CJS in future, WAVES 2009–10	53
Table 7.2: Proportion of victims who would report a future crime to the police, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10	53
Table 7.3: Proportions of victims who would report a future crime to the police, by case outcome and whether attended court and gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10	54
Table 7.4: Proportions of witnesses who would report a future crime to the police, by case outcome and whether attended court and gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10	56
Table A1: WAVES response rates for cases closed in 2009–10	71
Table A2: Comparison of original sample profile and profile of interviewed respondents, WAVES 2009–10	73
Table A3: Case characteristics by demographics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10	74
Table A4: Criminal Justice Process by Case Characteristics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed 2009–10	76
Table A5: Criminal justice process by demographics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed 2009–10	77

Table A6: Victim and witness satisfaction with different aspects of their CJS experience, WAVES 2009–10	79
Table B1: Factors associated with victim satisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	82
Table B2: Factors associated with victim dissatisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	84
Table B3: Factors associated with witness satisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	86
Table B4: Factors associated with witness dissatisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	88
Table B5: Factors associated with satisfaction of those who attended court to give evidence with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	90
Table B6: Factors associated with dissatisfaction of those who attended court to give evidence with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	92
Table B7: Factors associated with whether a victim would report a future crime to the police (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	94
Table B8: Factors associated with whether a witness would report a future crime to the police (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	96
Table B9: Factors associated with whether those who gave evidence would agree to give evidence again in future (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	98
Table B10: Factors associated with whether those who gave evidence would not agree to give evidence again in future (using logistic regression), WAVES 2009–10	100

Summary

Ensuring that victims and witnesses are supported to participate in the Criminal Justice System (CJS) and are satisfied with their contact with the CJS is important for the delivery of justice. This report examines the experiences and perceptions of victims and witnesses involved in cases of violence against the person, robbery, burglary, criminal damage and theft and handling stolen goods in which someone was charged. It provides an overview of their experiences, before examining the factors most strongly associated with victim and witness satisfaction and their willingness to engage with the CJS again in future. The findings are based on analyses of the Witness and Victim Experience Survey (WAVES), a large-scale survey of such victims and witnesses, undertaken in England and Wales.

Methodology

WAVES covers victims and prosecution witnesses (aged 18 and over) involved in cases where someone was charged, in the following crime types: violence against the person (excluding fatalities, sexual offences and domestic violence), robbery, burglary, criminal damage and theft and handling stolen goods.

The findings presented in this report are primarily based on responses from 37,779 interviews with victims (n=19,032) and witnesses (n=18,747), relating to cases finalised by the CJS in 2009–10. Some high level trend information is also provided.

Main findings

Experiences of the CJS

On a number of measures, a high proportion of victims and witnesses said they had received certain services, such as information leaflets, information about the case, and the offer of a pre-trial court familiarisation visit. On other measures, fewer recalled receiving services, such as being offered the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement or watch the 'Going to Court' DVD.

Experiences and perceptions of the services received from the CJS, such as receiving leaflets and having contact with a Witness Care Officer, varied depending on whether they were a victim or a witness, and case characteristics, such as case outcome and crime type.

Victims and witnesses whose cases resulted in a conviction were more likely to recall receiving services than those involved in cases that were dropped or the defendant was acquitted. It is possible that case outcomes could affect victims' and witnesses' perceptions, with those whose outcomes are satisfactory to them more likely to recall their experiences and rate them positively.

Experiences also varied by crime type, with victims and witnesses of violence and burglary more likely to recall receiving specific services than other crime types. This may arise if CJS agencies interact more with victims and witnesses of these crime types, perhaps because they are more likely to have been personally affected by the crime, or it may be that those involved in these crime types are more likely to be engaged with the system and thus recall their experiences.

Victims said that they were kept informed by CJS agencies more regularly and at an earlier stage than witnesses, although they were less likely to report being satisfied with the amount of contact they had than witnesses, indicating that victims and witnesses had different expectations of how often they should be contacted.

Attending court

Two fifths (41 per cent) of victims and witnesses said they had been asked to give evidence, of which 57 per cent attended court expecting to give evidence. The remainder did not attend court, usually because they were told that their evidence was no longer needed or that the defendant had changed their plea.

Just over a half (55 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence ended up doing so, with over a third (37 per cent) of court attendees being told that their evidence was no longer needed.

Almost a quarter (24 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence reported feeling intimidated by an individual during the criminal justice process. This varied by victim/witness status, case outcome and crime type, as well as by some demographic characteristics. Victims and witnesses who gave evidence were more likely to feel intimidated than those who were originally asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so. The majority of those who felt intimidated stated they felt intimidated by the defendant. Of those victims and witnesses who told a CJS official about their feelings of intimidation, almost three-fifths (58 per cent) felt that their concerns were addressed.

The majority of victims and witnesses (96 per cent) who had contact with the Witness Service were satisfied with the support the Witness Service provided to them. Similarly, the majority of victims (87 per cent) who had contact with Victim Support were satisfied with their contact.

Perceptions of outcomes

The majority (83 per cent) of victims and witnesses who knew what the case outcome was thought it was fair. This varied by what the outcome was, with victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction far more likely to think the outcome was fair than those involved in cases resulting in an acquittal, or dropped or written off cases.

Satisfaction with the CJS

The majority of victims and witnesses (84 per cent) were satisfied with their overall contact with the CJS.

The majority were satisfied with the information they received about the criminal justice process (85 per cent), with how well they were kept informed of the progress of their case (79 per cent) and with the way they were treated by CJS staff (91 per cent). Levels of satisfaction have risen slightly over time.

Victim and witness satisfaction with the CJS varied, most notably by victim/witness status and case outcome. Witnesses were generally more satisfied than victims, and those involved in cases which resulted in a conviction were more satisfied than those involved in cases which resulted in an acquittal or were dropped or written off.

Multivariate analysis suggests that the strongest factors associated with satisfaction were related to the services and information received from the CJS. This suggests that CJS agencies should continue to provide information and a good service to victims and witnesses to maintain satisfaction levels, and that where case outcomes are not satisfactory to them, receiving information and a good service can help in managing expectations.

Willingness to engage with the CJS in future

The majority of victims (90 per cent) and witnesses (92 per cent) said they would report a future incident to the police if a similar crime occurred.

Two thirds of victims and witnesses who gave evidence (67 per cent) said they would agree to give evidence again in future.

Victims' and witnesses' willingness to engage with the CJS in future varied, most notably by crime type, case outcome and level of participation in the case. For example, victims and witnesses of violence and criminal damage crimes were slightly less likely to say that they would report a future crime or give evidence again than other crime types.

Those involved in cases which resulted in a conviction were more likely to say they would engage with the CJS again in future. Among victims and witnesses whose cases resulted in an acquittal or were dropped or written off, those who had attended court or given evidence were less likely to say they would engage with the CJS in future than those who had not. This suggests that victims and witnesses may regard participating in the process as too burdensome if the outcome is not satisfactory to them. Particular consideration should be given to how outcomes are explained to victims and witnesses in this situation to mitigate against the risk of them being unwilling to engage with the CJS again in future.

Multivariate analysis suggested that the strongest factors associated with willingness to engage with the CJS again in future were satisfaction with their contact with the CJS, and the outcome of the case.

Recommendations

Overall, the research suggests that providing a good service to victims and witnesses, particularly around information provision, is important in maintaining high levels of satisfaction and willingness to engage with the CJS in future. The findings also suggest that more could be done to manage victims' and witnesses' expectations and to explain outcomes to them.

Although the outcome of the case is important in how victims and witnesses felt about their experiences of the CJS, process factors are more important, particularly in relation to information provision. CJS agencies should therefore continue to provide information and

support to victims and witnesses to ensure they are satisfied with their contact with the CJS, regardless of the outcome of the case.

However, as the outcome of the case is important, particularly in relation to future engagement with the CJS, CJS agencies should continue providing explanations of the outcome, and where relevant the sentence, to victims and witnesses, and consider how to manage victims' and witnesses' expectations.

Although case and demographic characteristics, such as crime type and disability status, do not appear to directly affect levels of satisfaction once other factors are taken into account, they can enable CJS practitioners to identify groups of victims and witnesses who may benefit from additional support. For example, disabled victims and witnesses and victims and witnesses of violence crimes could benefit from additional support, as they are often involved in cases which require them to attend court or give evidence.

The existence and purpose of the Victim Personal Statement (VPS) scheme should be better communicated to victims when they are making their evidence statements, so they realise they are being offered the opportunity to make a VPS to explain the impact that the crime had on them. Currently less than half of victims (43 per cent) recall being offered this opportunity.

1. Introduction

The Criminal Justice System (CJS) relies on victims and witnesses to report crimes to the police, make witness statements and, in some cases, give evidence in court. Participating in the criminal justice process in this way involves time and effort on the part of victims and witnesses, and can be stressful, especially if they are still dealing with the effects of the crime. Ensuring that victims and witnesses receive the information and support they need to be able to participate in the CJS, and are satisfied with the services they receive and their contact with the CJS is important for the delivery of justice.

Victims and witnesses should be able to expect a minimum standard of service from the CJS when they report a crime. The *Code of Practice for Victims of Crime* – also known as the *Victims' Code* – is a statutory code which was introduced in 2006. It sets out the minimum standards of services which criminal justice agencies are obliged to provide for victims of crime in England and Wales. The *Witness Charter*, a non-statutory document introduced in 2007, sets out the services that criminal justice agencies aim to deliver for witnesses of crime. Both the *Victims' Code* and the *Witness Charter* include requirements relating to keeping victims and witnesses informed of the progress in their case and information about the CJS process. They have different levels of service for victims and witnesses.

Victims' and witnesses' experiences of the CJS vary due to the differing nature of the cases. Cases that involve a person being charged with the offence generally result in a hearing or trial at court, although in some cases the charges are dropped before the case reaches court. There are four main outcomes at court: defendants can plead guilty to the offence and receive a sentence; defendants can plead not guilty and be convicted by the court; defendants can plead not guilty and be acquitted by the court; or the case can be dropped or written off after it has begun at court. Defendants who initially enter a not guilty plea may change their plea to guilty during the case. Victims and witnesses may be asked to give evidence at court for contested cases (those where the defendant has pleaded not guilty).

Previous research indicates that different groups of victims and witnesses have different levels of satisfaction with their experiences of the CJS. For example witnesses are generally more satisfied with their CJS experience than victims, and victims and witnesses of burglary are more satisfied than victims and witnesses of other crime types (see Moore and Blakeborough, 2008; Whitehead, 2001; Angle *et al*, 2003).

Moorhead *et al* (2008) conducted a review of evidence relating to satisfaction with courts and the justice system. They found that surveys of participants (such as witnesses or jurors) found high levels of satisfaction. However, surveys of the general public found lower levels of satisfaction than participant surveys, and generally found that respondents who had prior experience of the justice system had lower levels of satisfaction than those who had no experience. Moorhead *et al* suggest that this could be because participant surveys are asking respondents to assess a specific experience of the justice system, whereas general public perception surveys are based on broader experiences.

A significant body of evidence suggests that processes are more strongly associated with perceptions of the CJS than outcomes (see for example Tyler and Huo, 2002). Recent research suggests that processes are associated with satisfaction with the CJS (see Whitehead, 2001; Angle *et al*, 2003; Hamlyn *et al*, 2004). For example, being kept informed both of the progress of the case and what to expect during the case, being treated fairly and with respect by staff, and feeling appreciated, were associated with satisfaction, and feeling intimidated (both by the process and by individuals), inconvenient court dates and long waiting times were associated with dissatisfaction.

There is some evidence that outcomes affect levels of satisfaction with the CJS. Both Whitehead (2001) and Angle *et al* (2003) found that perceiving the verdict as unfair was associated with dissatisfaction. However, Angle *et al*'s research suggested that process factors – such as feeling appreciated or intimidated – were more strongly associated than whether the verdict was perceived as fair, whereas Whitehead found that perceiving the verdict to be unfair was the strongest factor associated with dissatisfaction. Moorhead *et al* (2008) found mixed evidence on whether demographic characteristics are associated with satisfaction.

This report will examine the experiences of victims and witnesses and the factors most strongly associated with victim and witness satisfaction with the CJS through analysis of the Witness and Victim Experience Survey (WAVES).

1.1 The Witness and Victim Experience Survey

The Witness and Victim Experience Survey (WAVES) is a nationally representative survey that provided information about victims' and witnesses' experiences of the Criminal Justice System (CJS), the services they receive, and their satisfaction with different aspects of the system in cases that resulted in a defendant being charged. It was conducted from 2005–06 to 2009–10.

Adult victims and prosecution witnesses (aged 18 and over) in England and Wales were asked about different aspects of their experience with the CJS, from their first contact with the police to their experience at court. Questions covered giving a statement to the police, information on case progression, experience at court and of giving evidence, and perceptions of and satisfaction with different aspects of the CJS. Interviews were conducted via telephone by trained interviewers.

WAVES covered victims and witnesses involved in cases where a defendant was charged, irrespective of the final outcome of the case. Therefore, victims and witnesses involved in dropped or written off cases, guilty plea cases, and contested trials at both magistrates' courts and the Crown Court were included, both those who did and who did not give evidence in court. Respondents were interviewed after their case was closed, that is, after a final outcome had been reached (be it a conviction, a not guilty verdict or charges dropped).

The survey covered the following offence categories: violence against the person (excluding crimes that resulted in a fatality, domestic violence and sexual offences), robbery, burglary, theft and handling stolen goods, and criminal damage. Victims and witnesses involved in cases of a very sensitive or serious nature, such as offences that involved a fatality, sexual offences, domestic violence and cases where the defendant was a member of the respondent's household, were excluded from the survey, largely because a telephone methodology was not deemed to be an appropriate way to approach or interview them.

The response rate for WAVES for cases closed in 2009–10 was 36 per cent. The profile of interviewed respondents matches the profile of the original sample on the information available, for example on case outcome, crime type and court type. The main reasons given for refusing to take part in the survey were not being interested in the survey or not having enough time to participate. See Appendix A for further details.

A total of 37,779 interviews were conducted for cases closed in 2009–10, 19,032 with victims and 18,747 with witnesses. The term victim refers to respondents who were victims of a crime, regardless of whether they gave evidence in court. Similarly, the term witness refers to respondents who witnessed a crime they were not a victim of, again regardless of whether they gave evidence in court. Further analysis of the demographic characteristics of the final sample interviewed can be found in Table 1.1. Analysis of the case characteristics can be found in Table 1.2, and the criminal justice process in Table 1.3.

Table 1.1: Demographic characteristics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10

	Number of respondents	Percentage
Gender		
Male	21,930	58
Female	15,843	42
Missing	6	-
Ethnicity		
White	33,347	88
Mixed	613	2
Black	1,015	3
Asian	1,888	5
Chinese/Other	634	2
Refused/Missing	282	1
Age		
18–24	6,796	18
25–34	8,183	22
35–44	9,077	24
45–54	7,693	20
55–64	4,209	11
65 and over	1,740	5
Missing	81	-
Disability		
No disability	32,434	86
Has disability which limits activities	3,494	9
Has disability which does not limit activities	1,722	5
Refused/Missing	129	-

Table 1.2: Case characteristics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10

	Number of respondents	Percentage
Victim/Witness status		
Victims	19,032	50
Witnesses	18,747	50
Crime type		
Criminal damage	5,256	14
Theft and handling	9,952	26
Burglary	5,225	14
Violence	17,206	46
Other/Missing	140	-
Case outcome		
Guilty plea	19,632	52
Dropped/ written off case	3,095	8
Contested trial – found not guilty	1,778	5
Contested trial – found guilty	11,466	30
Missing information	1,808	5

Table 1.2 shows that almost half (46 per cent) of WAVES respondents had been a victim or witness of violence offences (including robbery), a quarter (26 per cent) of theft and handling stolen goods offences, 14 per cent were victims or witnesses of criminal damage and 14 per cent of burglary. While five per cent were involved in cases resulting in a not guilty verdict, and eight per cent of cases were dropped or written off, 82 per cent of cases resulted in a conviction (both guilty pleas and contested trials resulting in a guilty verdict). This is broadly

similar to the national picture with 83 per cent of defendants proceeded against being convicted in 2010, (Ministry of Justice, 2011).

Table 1.3: Criminal justice process of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10

	Number of respondents	Percentage
Case progress		
Case proceeded to trial/hearing	33,880	90
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	3,899	10
Attending court		
Did attend court	9,008	24
Did not attend court	24,872	66
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	3,899	10
Giving evidence		
Called to give evidence and did	4,359	12
Called to give evidence but did not	9,419	25
Trial but not called to give evidence	20,102	53
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	3,899	10

¹ Includes 2,315 respondents who stated they did not know whether their case proceeded to trial/hearing or not.

Table 1.3 shows that a quarter (24 per cent) of WAVES respondents attended court in relation to their case. Approximately a third of respondents (36 per cent) were originally called to give evidence at court, but around only one in ten respondents (12 per cent) actually did so. The main reason for not giving evidence after originally being asked to was being told in advance that their evidence was no longer needed, for example, because the defendant had entered a guilty plea. It should be noted that not all of those who attended court were called to give evidence, and similarly, not all of those who were called to give evidence attended court.

Table 1.4: Case characteristics by crime type, WAVES 2009–10

	Weighted percentages				
	Criminal damage	Theft and handling stolen goods	Burglary	Violence	Other
Case outcome					
Dropped/ written off case	8	8	7	9	4
Guilty Plea	55	54	54	50	35
Contested trial – found not guilty	3	3	3	7	9
Contested trial – found guilty	29	30	30	30	25
Case progress					
Case proceeded to trial/hearing	89	86	90	90	76
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	11	14	10	10	24
Attending court					
Did attend court	14	15	11	35	19
Did not attend court	75	71	80	55	57
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	11	14	10	10	24
Giving evidence					
Called to give evidence and did	6	6	4	17	8
Called to give evidence but did not	19	21	23	30	19
Not called to give evidence	63	59	63	43	49
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	11	14	10	10	24
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>5,256</i>	<i>9,952</i>	<i>5,225</i>	<i>17,206</i>	<i>139</i>

¹ Includes respondents who stated they did not know whether their case proceeded to trial/hearing or not.

Table 1.4 shows how various case characteristics varied by crime type.

- The outcome of the case did not vary much by crime type. Violence cases were slightly more likely to result in a not guilty verdict, and slightly less likely to result in a guilty plea, than other crime types.
- Whether a case proceeded to trial or hearing did not differ markedly by crime type. Theft and handling stolen goods cases were slightly less likely to proceed to court than other crime types.
- Victims and witnesses of violence were more likely to attend court than victims and witnesses of other crime types.
- Victims and witnesses of violence were both more likely to give evidence and more likely to be called to give evidence but end up not doing so than victims and witnesses of other crime types.

See Appendix A for further information on the methodology of WAVES, including further details on the respondent profile, including breakdowns for victims and witnesses.

Information from the WAVES questionnaire and sample

The crime type and outcome of the case details were collected both from the information provided on the sample by Local Criminal Justice Boards (extracted from an administrative database) and from answers provided by respondents during the interview. In some cases, the information given by respondents differed from that provided in the administrative database. This could indicate that respondents were referring to a different incident than that for which they had been sampled, that respondents were unclear about the crime type or outcome of their case, or that an administrative error occurred.

A comparison was made between the questionnaire and administrative outcome and crime type information to assess whether the choice of one source over the other had an impact on the results. This indicated that the source used had little impact on the findings, with estimates typically changing by less than one percentage point.

Therefore, for the purposes of this report, the outcome and crime type provided by the respondents during their interview have been used (unless this information was missing, in which case the outcome and crime type as recorded on the administrative database have been used where available). This is because respondents' perceptions of the crime type and outcome of the case are likely to affect their perceptions of their CJS experience.

Comparison with British Crime Survey findings

WAVES covers victims (and witnesses) whose cases result in a defendant being charged. Their experiences and perceptions are likely to differ from those of victims who did not report a crime to the police, or reported a crime but it did not result in anyone being charged. The British Crime Survey (BCS) is a continuous survey of adults living in private households in England and Wales, measuring experiences of victimisation in relation to personal and household crimes against the population resident in England and Wales. The BCS excludes a number of types of crime, such as fraud, crimes against commercial premises, and homicide. The BCS covers victims who both have and have not reported a crime to the police. WAVES findings are compared to BCS findings where relevant (from a forthcoming MoJ report analysing 2007–08 and 2008–09 BCS data).

1.2 Outline of the report

- **Chapter 2** – victims' and witnesses' initial contact with the CJS.
- **Chapter 3** – victims' and witnesses' experiences relating to preparing for and attending court.
- **Chapter 4** – the support victims and witnesses received, relating to both the effects of the crime and help to participate in the justice process.
- **Chapter 5** – victims' and witnesses' perceptions of the case outcome and sentence
- **Chapter 6** – victims' and witnesses' satisfaction with the CJS, and the factors associated with satisfaction.
- **Chapter 7** – victims' and witnesses' willingness to engage with the CJS in future and the factors associated with this.
- **Chapter 8** – summary of the report findings.
- **Appendix A** – information on the WAVES methodology and respondent profile.
- **Appendix B** – tables showing the results from the multivariate analysis described in chapters 6 and 7.

Survey findings are subject to a margin of error as they are based on a sample. They are also subject to a number of potential limitations including non-response bias – that is, where those who do not participate differ systematically from those who do on measures of interest. Among those who do participate, willingness and ability to understand questions asked as intended, and to give accurate answers is important. Respondents are interviewed between four and six months after their case has closed, which itself may be some months after the crime occurred, meaning that recall periods will differ among respondents, and some respondents may not accurately recall their experiences.

Findings were statistically tested at the five per cent significance level, and only differences which were statistically significant at that level are referred to in the text. Design factors were used in statistical tests to correct for the fact that the survey design did not use a simple random sample.

2. Initial contact with the CJS

This chapter examines victims' and witnesses' experiences and perceptions of their initial contact with the CJS, and the extent to which they recalled being kept informed and offered relevant services. The results are based on respondents' recollections of their experiences, which may not necessarily reflect what was actually provided by CJS agencies. In some cases a service may have been provided but presented differently to the way the survey question is worded, or the respondent may simply not recall it. However, as this report is examining victims' and witnesses' satisfaction with their contact with the CJS, their perceptions of their experiences are of interest. Respondents are interviewed between four and six months after their case has closed or been finalised by the CJS, which itself may be some months after the actual crime occurred. As cases take differing amounts of time to progress through the system, this means that recall periods will differ among respondents.

Further breakdowns of each question by case type and demographic characteristics can be found in the supplementary volume of tables which accompanies this report.

2.1 Receiving information

Surveyed victims were asked whether they were aware that criminal justice agencies are obliged to meet minimum standards of service as set out in *The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime*. Approximately two fifths (42 per cent) of victims stated they were aware of the code, with just over half (52 per cent) stating they were not aware, (five per cent replied that they did not know). This compares with a fifth (19 per cent) of all victims (regardless of whether they reported their crime to the police) stating they were aware of the code (British Crime Survey (BCS) 2007–08 and 2008–09 analysis – BCS covers a wider range of crimes and victims than WAVES).

Victims and witnesses are entitled to complain about the service they have received from the criminal justice agencies. A third (34 per cent) of victims and witnesses in WAVES recalled being made aware of how to make a complaint should they wish to, with over half (55 per cent) reporting they were not made aware, and a tenth (11 per cent) stating they did not know whether or not they were told how to make a complaint.

Overall, awareness of the *Victims' Code* has risen from 37 per cent in 2007–08 to 42 per cent in 2009–10, and awareness of how to make a complaint rose from 28 per cent in 2007–08 to 34 per cent in 2009–10 (WAVES).

Under the *Victim's Code*, the police are obliged to ensure that victims can access information about local support services and contact details for those services as soon as possible after a crime is reported. At the time of the WAVES survey, this information was provided in the form of a *Victims of Crime* leaflet. The majority of victims (64 per cent) recalled receiving this leaflet. However, nearly a fifth (19 per cent) stated they did not receive it, and a sixth (17 per cent) stated they did not know. This varied by crime type, with victims of burglary significantly more likely to recall receiving the leaflet than victims of other crime types, and victims of theft and handling stolen goods significantly less likely to recall receiving it (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1: Proportion of victims who reported receiving a *Victims of Crime* leaflet, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10

Crime type	Percentage receiving leaflet	Unweighted base
Criminal damage	64	3,180
Theft and handling stolen goods	60	3,793
Burglary	68	3,489
Violence	64	8,537
All victims	64	19,032

2.2 Giving a statement

Almost all victims and witnesses (96 per cent) recalled giving a witness statement to the police. Of these, 61 per cent recalled receiving the *Giving a statement to the police – what happens next?* leaflet, a quarter (24 per cent) stated they did not receive it, and the remaining 15 per cent stated they did not know whether they had received it or not. Witnesses were more likely to recall receiving the leaflet than victims who had made a statement (64 per cent of witnesses compared with 58 per cent of victims). Also victims and witnesses who attended court were more likely to recall receiving the leaflet (66 per cent) than those who did not attend court (62 per cent).

The proportion of victims and witnesses stating that they had received the *Giving a statement* leaflet also varied by case outcome. Victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction were more likely to recall receiving a leaflet than those involved in cases which were dropped or written off, see Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Proportion of victims and witnesses who reported receiving a Giving a statement leaflet, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10

Case outcome	Percentage receiving leaflet	Unweighted base
Dropped/written off	57	2,951
Guilty plea	62	18,963
Contested trial – found guilty	64	11,073
Contested trial – found not guilty	58	1,744
All who gave a statement	61	36,443

Almost all victims and witnesses (96 per cent) were satisfied with the way they were treated when giving their statement, with only three per cent stating they were dissatisfied, and one per cent stating they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

2.3 Victim Personal Statements

All victims of crime should be offered the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement (VPS) to explain how the crime impacted on them financially, physically or emotionally, and enable their views to be taken account of in the criminal justice process. Overall, 43 per cent of victims recalled being offered the opportunity to make a VPS, with 44 per cent stating they were not offered the opportunity, and 12 per cent replying that they did not know. The proportion of victims recalling being offered a VPS has risen from 40 per cent in 2007–08. The VPS is usually offered and taken by the police at the same time and on the same form as the witness evidence statement, so some victims may not have realised that they had been offered it. This could indicate a need to better communicate the existence and purpose of the VPS scheme to victims when they are making their evidence statements so they realise they are being offered the opportunity to make a VPS.

The BCS shows that victims recalled being offered the opportunity to make a VPS in a tenth (nine per cent) of all incidents reported to the police (BCS 2007–08 and 2008–09 analysis – BCS covers a wider range of victims and crimes than WAVES). This lower level of recollection holds when examining the crime types similar to those included in WAVES. This may suggest that victims are less likely to recall being offered this opportunity if their case does not result in a charge or proceed to court.

The proportion of WAVES victims who recalled being offered a VPS differed by crime type, with significantly more victims of burglary and violence recalling being given the opportunity than victims of criminal damage and theft and handling stolen goods, (see Table 2.3). Burglary and violence are likely to have a greater impact on the victim than criminal damage and theft (see Ringham and Salisbury, 2004). The difference between victims of these crimes recalling being offered a VPS could indicate that victims who have been affected

more by the crime are more likely to remember being offered the opportunity to state the impact of the crime upon them, or potentially that CJS agencies stress the purpose and importance of a VPS more to victims who they perceive as being affected more by the crime.

Table 2.3: Proportion of victims who recalled being offered the opportunity to make a VPS, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10

Crime type	Percentage	Unweighted base
Criminal damage	40	3,180
Theft and handling stolen goods	37	3,793
Burglary	46	3,489
Violence	46	8,537
All victims	43	19,032

Victims who attended court were more likely to recall being offered a VPS (49 per cent) than victims who did not attend court (43 per cent). In conjunction with the differences found in those receiving a ‘Giving a statement’ leaflet, these results suggest that those who are more engaged with the CJS may receive a different service than those who do not attend court, or that victims and witnesses who have more engagement with the CJS are more likely to recall their experiences.

The proportion of victims who recalled being offered a VPS also differed by case outcome, with a higher proportion of victims involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – both guilty pleas (44 per cent) and guilty verdicts at contested trials (47 per cent) – stating they were offered the opportunity than victims in cases resulting in a not guilty verdict (36 per cent) or which were dropped or written off (34 per cent). See Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: Proportion of victims offered a VPS who recalled being offered the opportunity to make a VPS, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10

Case outcome	Percentage	Unweighted base
Dropped/written off	34	1,557
Guilty plea	44	10,101
Contested trial – found guilty	47	5,919
Contested trial – found not guilty	36	763
All victims	43	19,032

Just over half (55 per cent) of victims who recalled being offered a VPS said they made a VPS. This has remained stable since 2007–08 (also 55 per cent). The take-up rate varied by crime type, with victims of theft and handling stolen goods offences significantly less likely to recall having made a VPS compared with victims of burglary and violence. See Table 2.5.

Table 2.5: Proportion of victims who recalled making a VPS, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10

Crime type	Percentage	Unweighted base
Criminal damage	52	1,292
Theft and handling stolen goods	47	1,482
Burglary	56	1,623
Violence	58	4,009
Victims who were offered a VPS	55	8,417

Whether the victim recalled making a VPS also varied by whether the victim attended court and by case outcome. Of those who reported being offered a VPS, 64 per cent of victims who attended court said they made a VPS compared with 52 per cent of victims who did not attend court. Table 2.6 shows that victims involved in contested trials resulting in a not guilty verdict who were offered the opportunity to make a VPS were most likely to do so.

Table 2.6: Proportion of victims offered a VPS who recalled making a VPS, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10

Case outcome	Percentage	Unweighted base
Dropped/written off	55	539
Guilty plea	55	4,575
Contested trial – found guilty	54	2,798
Contested trial – found not guilty	67	290
Victims who were offered a VPS	55	8,417

The proportion of victims who made a VPS, having been offered the opportunity to do so, also varied by sex (59 per cent of females compared with 52 per cent of males) and disability status (65 per cent of victims who reported having a disability which limited their activities compared with 53 per cent of victims who reported having no disability).

Victims who had made a VPS were also asked whether they felt that their views as set out in the VPS were taken into account during the criminal justice process. Overall, two-thirds (68 per cent) of victims who made a VPS felt that their views were taken into account. This varied by case outcome. A far higher proportion of victims involved in cases which resulted in a conviction stated they felt their views were taken into account than victims involved in cases resulting in a not guilty verdict or which were dropped or written off (see Table 2.7). This indicates that victims whose outcomes are satisfactory to them are more likely to feel that their views have been taken into account than those whose cases do not result in a conviction.

Table 2.7: Proportion of victims who felt their views as set out in the VPS were taken into account during the criminal justice process, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10

Case outcome	Percentage	Unweighted base
Dropped/written off	58	295
Guilty plea	68	2,543
Contested trial – found guilty	72	1,554
Contested trial – found not guilty	47	193
Victims who made a VPS	68	4,693

Victims who reported having a disability which limited their activities were more likely to report feeling that their views as set out in the VPS were taken into account compared with victims who reported having no disability (68 per cent compared with 62 per cent).

The proportions of victims who felt their views as set out in their VPS were taken into account during the criminal justice process also varied by age. Almost four-fifths (78 per cent) of victims aged 18 to 24 who made a VPS felt that their views had been taken into account, significantly higher than all other age groups (62–68 per cent).

See Roberts and Manikis (2011) for further information and research on the VPS scheme.

2.4 Information about case progress

Both the *Victims’ Code* and the *Witness Charter* require criminal justice agencies to keep victims and witnesses informed of the progress of their case through the CJS. Victims and witnesses would most likely be kept informed by the police or a Witness Care Officer.

Approximately two-thirds (65 per cent) of victims and witnesses reported being re-contacted within a month about their case (31 per cent within a week, and a further 34 per cent between a week and a month). This varied according to whether the respondent was a victim or a witness, with victims being twice as likely to say they had been contacted within a week than witnesses (42 per cent compared with 22 per cent). See Table 2.8.

Table 2.8: Period between respondents' first contact with the police and when they next heard anything officially about the progress of the case, WAVES 2009–10

Period between first contact and next official contact:	Victims	Witnesses	All
Within a week	42	22	31
Over a week but within a month	32	36	34
Over a month but within two months	9	14	12
Over two months but within six months	8	13	11
Over six months	1	3	2
Did not hear anything else officially	3	5	5
Did not know	4	6	5
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>19,032</i>	<i>18,747</i>	<i>37,779</i>

Around three-fifths (61 per cent) of victims and witnesses reported being kept updated about the progress of their case on at least a monthly basis. Victims reported being kept updated more regularly than witnesses, with approximately a fifth (18 per cent) of victims updated on a weekly basis compared with ten per cent of witnesses. See Table 2.9.

Table 2.9: How often respondents were kept updated about the progress of their case, WAVES 2009–10

	Victims	Witnesses	All
At least weekly	18	10	14
Fortnightly	22	16	19
Monthly	27	30	29
Less frequently than monthly	20	27	24
Were not kept informed	9	12	11
Did not know	5	4	5
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>19,032</i>	<i>18,747</i>	<i>37,779</i>

Overall, 84 per cent of victims reported being informed that someone had been arrested in relation to the offence, with a further eight per cent stating that the offender was arrested at the scene of the crime (this question was not asked of witnesses). Almost nine out of ten (88 per cent) victims and witnesses reported being informed that someone had been charged with the offence.

The majority (79 per cent) of victims and witnesses recalled being given the name or telephone number of someone they could contact about the progress of their case. A slightly higher proportion of victims (82 per cent) reported this than witnesses (77 per cent).

The majority of victims and witnesses (81 per cent) were satisfied with the amount of contact they had about the progress of their case. Despite victims reporting being kept informed more regularly than witnesses, 83 per cent of witnesses reported being satisfied with the amount of contact they had compared with 78 per cent of victims. This may reflect that victims and witnesses have differing expectations. Satisfaction with amount of contact also

varied by case outcome, with a significantly higher proportion of respondents involved in cases which resulted in a conviction being satisfied (83 per cent of guilty plea cases and 85 per cent of contested trials that resulted in a guilty verdict) than respondents involved in cases which were dropped/written off or resulted in a not guilty verdict (both 70 per cent).

Overall, satisfaction with contact levels among victims and witnesses have risen from 77 per cent in 2007–08 to 81 per cent in 2009–10.

BCS findings covering a wider range of victims show that in 37 per cent of incidents reported to the police, the victim felt very or fairly well informed by the police about the progress of their investigation, the victim felt not very well or not at all informed in 34 per cent of incidents, and in the remaining 29 per cent of incidents the victim stated it was not necessary to be kept informed (BCS 2007–08 and 2008–09, MoJ report forthcoming).

2.5 Witness Care Officers

Witness Care Units, staffed jointly by the police and Crown Prosecution Service, provide a single point of contact for victims and witnesses, managing their care from when a defendant is charged with the offence to the point the case is closed. Witness Care Officers support victims and witnesses through the criminal justice process, keeping them informed of key developments, such as the dates of court hearings and the final outcome of the case.

Approximately two-fifths (43 per cent) of victims and witnesses whose cases proceeded to trial/hearing reported having contact with a Witness Care Officer in relation to their case. However, this varied significantly depending on whether they attended court, with two thirds (65 per cent) of those who attended court reporting having contact with a Witness Care Officer compared with one third (34 per cent) of those who did not attend court. This could reflect that those who attend court are more likely to recall having contact with Witness Care Officers as they usually inform a victim or witness of court hearing dates.

The proportion of victims and witnesses who reported having contact with a Witness Care Officer also varied by crime type, with those involved in criminal damage (34 per cent) and theft and handling stolen goods (35 per cent) cases significantly less likely to report having contact than those involved in burglary (43 per cent) or violence (50 per cent) cases (see Table 2.10). This partly reflects the relationship between crime type and whether a respondent attended court as those involved in violence cases are more likely to attend court (see Table 1.4). Table 2.10 shows that the proportions of victims and witnesses who attended court and recalled having contact with a Witness Care Officer did not differ

markedly by crime type. However, the proportions of victims and witnesses who did not attend court and recalled having contact with a Witness Care Officer did differ by crime type, with victims and witnesses of burglary and violence crimes significantly more likely to report having contact than those of criminal damage and theft and handling stolen goods crimes.

Table 2.10: Proportion of victims and witnesses who had contact with a Witness Care Officer, by crime type and whether attended court, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages and numbers				
	Criminal damage	Theft and handling stolen goods	Burglary	Violence	All crime types
Proportion of victims and witnesses who had contact with a Witness Care Officer:					
Attended court	64	63	66	66	65
<i>Unweighted base</i>	758	1,481	559	6,182	9,008
Did not attend court	28	29	39	39	34
<i>Unweighted base</i>	3,934	7,147	4,201	9,511	24,871
All victims and witnesses	34	35	43	50	43
<i>Unweighted base (all whose case proceeded to court)</i>	4,692	8,628	4,760	15,693	33,879

Victims and witnesses who recalled having contact with a Witness Care Officer were also asked what services they provided. Around four-fifths of victims and witnesses recalled their Witness Care Officer providing them with notification of court hearing dates, updates following court hearings, details of the final case outcome and a letter formally stating the final outcome and thanking the respondent for their involvement in the process (see Table 3.11). Half (51 per cent) of victims and witnesses recalled their Witness Care Officer providing them with details of the defendants’ bail conditions, although this is likely to reflect the fact that not all defendants would have been remanded on bail.

Table 2.11: Services provided by Witness Care Officers, WAVES 2009–10

	Whether respondent recalled receiving this		
	Yes	No	Don't know
Details of the defendants' bail conditions and any changes to it	51	42	8
Warning of trial/hearing dates	85	13	2
Updates following court hearings	77	20	4
Details of the final case outcome	84	15	2
A letter stating the final case outcome and thanks for the respondent's involvement	80	15	4
<i>Unweighted base: victims and witnesses who recalled having contact with a Witness Care Officer</i>			14,785

2.6 Summary

The findings above suggest that the CJS experiences of victims and witnesses differ in a number of respects. Victims and witnesses who attended court in relation to their case were more likely to recall receiving specific services. This suggests that those who attend court are more likely to receive these services from CJS agencies, or possibly that an increased engagement with the CJS process means that victims and witnesses are more likely to recall their experiences. Similarly, victims and witnesses involved in cases that resulted in a conviction were more likely to report receiving services than those involved in cases that were dropped or the defendant was acquitted. This could suggest that victims and witnesses whose outcomes are satisfactory to them are more likely to engage with the system and recall their experiences.

The findings also suggest that experiences vary by crime type, with victims and witnesses of violence and burglary more likely to recall receiving specific services than other crime types. This could reflect either that CJS agencies interact more with victims and witnesses of these crime types, perhaps because they are more likely to have been affected by the crime, or potentially that victims and witnesses involved in these types of crimes are more likely to be engaged with the system, and thus recall their experiences.

The findings suggest that there is a difference in how victims and witnesses are kept informed by CJS agencies, with victims reporting that they were kept informed more regularly and at an earlier stage than witnesses. Interestingly, despite reporting that they were kept informed more regularly, victims are slightly less likely to report being satisfied with the amount of the contact they had about the progress of the case, which indicates that victims and witnesses have different expectations of how they should be kept informed.

3. Preparing for and attending court

This chapter examines victims' and witnesses' perceptions and experiences relating to court – both the information and support they received to prepare for attending court, and their experiences and perceptions while at court, including their experiences of giving evidence for those that did so. It focuses on WAVES findings from victims and witnesses whose cases were closed in 2009–10, though high-level trend information is also presented.

3.1 Preparing for court

Overall, the majority (79 per cent) of victims and witnesses whose cases proceeded to court recalled being informed of the date of the trial or hearing, similar to the WAVES 2007–08 proportion (77 per cent). Two-fifths (41 per cent) said they had been asked to give evidence in the 2009–10 WAVES survey, a smaller proportion than that reported in the 2007–08 survey (48 per cent).

Not all those initially asked to give evidence actually do so. For cases closed in 2009–10, 57 per cent attended court, while the remainder did not attend court usually because they were told in advance that their evidence was no longer needed (56 per cent of those who did not attend court) or the defendant changed their plea (27 per cent).

Information to prepare for attending court

The CJS offers advice and support to victims and witnesses who are asked to give evidence at court. Almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence recalled their Witness Care Officer or another member of the CJS talking to them about going to court (2009–10). This is similar to the proportion found in the 2007–08 WAVES survey (71 per cent).

Both the *Victims' Code* and the *Witness Charter* state that victims and witnesses attending court to give evidence should receive information in advance to prepare them. Witness Care Units are obliged to provide victims and witnesses asked to give evidence in court with the *Witness in Court* leaflet which explains what to expect as a witness. The 'Going to court – a step by step guide to being a witness' DVD may also be provided, or victims and witnesses can collect a copy from the Witness Service based at court, or download it from the website.

Almost three quarters (74 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence recalled receiving the *Witness in Court* leaflet, with 14 per cent stating they did not receive the leaflet, and 12 per cent stating they did not know.

Overall, 13 per cent of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence watched the 'Going to court' DVD. A further 19 per cent recalled being given the opportunity to watch the DVD and choosing not to do so, while 65 per cent did not recall being given the opportunity to watch the DVD. The proportions being given the opportunity to watch the DVD did not vary greatly by any demographic or case characteristic, although the proportion who said they had watched the DVD did vary with age, with victims and witnesses aged 65 and over more likely to report they had watched the DVD than those aged between 25 and 54 (24 per cent compared with 11–12 per cent).

Victims and witnesses who are asked to give evidence in court are able to visit the court in advance of the trial or hearing to see what it is like and familiarise themselves with it. Approximately two thirds (67 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence recalled being offered the opportunity to visit the court before the trial or hearing. Women were more likely to recall being offered this than men (71 per cent of women reported being offered a pre-trial court visit compared with 64 per cent of men). A third (32 per cent) of those who recalled being offered the opportunity reported accepting the offer and visiting the court in advance of their trial or hearing.

Recollection of the provision of information in the form of the leaflet and DVD has risen since 2007–08, with 69 per cent of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence recalling receiving the leaflet (compared with 74 per cent in 2009–10), five per cent recalling watching the DVD, and six per cent recalling being given the opportunity to watch the DVD (compared with 13 and 19 per cent in 2009–10). The proportion of victims and witnesses who recalled being offered a pre-trial court visit in 2007–08 (65 per cent) was similar to that in 2009–10 (67 per cent).

Table 3.1 shows the types of information that victims and witnesses attending court to give evidence might have received in advance, and whether they recalled receiving it in the lead up to the trial or hearing. Almost all (98 per cent) of victims and witnesses were told what time to arrive at court. Around eight out of ten victims and witnesses were informed about what would happen in the court room and the possibility of waiting at court before being called to give evidence. Approximately six out of ten victims and witnesses were told that there was a possibility they would not have to give evidence and were given information on

how much time would be involved in being a witness at court. Around half of victims and witnesses were informed about what would happen if the defendant or other witnesses did not turn up.

Table 3.1: Information received prior to attending court to give evidence, WAVES 2009–10

Information about:	Percentages		
	Received	Did not receive	Don't know
What time to arrive at court	98	2	-
What would happen in the court room	83	15	2
How to get to court	81	17	2
The possibility of waiting at court before being called to give evidence	80	17	2
The possibility that they may not have to give evidence after all	63	33	4
How much time would be involved in being a witness in court	61	36	3
Availability of refreshments at court	61	34	4
What to bring to court	60	36	4
Parking facilities at court	52	42	6
What would happen if the defendant or other witnesses did not turn up	47	47	6

Base: Victims and witnesses who attended court expecting to give evidence, n=7,701

Almost nine out of ten (87 per cent) victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence were satisfied with the information they received to prepare them for being a witness in court. However, this varied by the outcome of the case, with victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction (either by a guilty plea or found guilty at a contested trial – both 90 per cent) significantly more likely to report being satisfied than respondents involved in contested trials which resulted in a not guilty verdict (80 per cent) or cases that were dropped or written off (82 per cent).

Similar findings emerged when examining whether victims and witnesses were satisfied with how they were dealt with prior to attending court. Overall 86 per cent said they were satisfied, with victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – guilty plea (89 per cent) or contested trial (88 per cent) – more likely to report being satisfied than respondents involved in trials resulting in a not guilty verdict (77 per cent) or dropped or written off cases (78 per cent). This suggests that case outcomes could affect victims' and witnesses' perceptions, with those whose outcomes are satisfactory to them being more likely to recall their experiences.

Levels of satisfaction with the information received to prepare for being a witness in court and with how they were dealt with prior to attending court have not changed since 2007–08 (both 86 per cent).

Concerns about attending court

WAVES asked victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence (regardless of whether they ended up doing so) whether they had any worries or concerns about attending court. Table 3.2 shows that almost half of victims and witnesses reported being concerned about coming into contact with the defendant and their supporters, a third were concerned about being cross-examined, approximately a quarter were concerned about having time off work and loss of personal time, and a fifth were concerned about the expenses involved.

Table 3.2: Concerns about attending court, WAVES 2009–10

Concerned about:	Percentages		
	Victims	Witnesses	All
Coming into contact with the defendant and their supporters	56	40	45
Being cross-examined	36	30	32
Having time off work	33	23	26
Loss of personal time	30	21	24
Expenses involved	26	17	20
Other dependants	15	8	10
Feeling pressured by the police or other officials	11	8	9
How to get to court	11	8	9
Medical conditions or physical disabilities	12	4	7
Childcare	7	5	6
Language, communication or reading difficulties	5	3	4
Religious or cultural needs	3	1	2
Other	5	3	4
<i>Unweighted base: Victims and witnesses who attended court expecting to give evidence</i>			7,701

- Levels of concern varied among victims and witnesses, with victims more likely to report being concerned than witnesses, particularly about coming into contact with the defendant and their supporters (56 per cent of victims compared with 40 per cent of witnesses).
- A significantly higher proportion of female victims and witnesses reported being concerned about coming into contact with the defendant and their supporters than males (61 per cent compared with 35 per cent) and being cross-examined (48 per cent compared with 21 per cent). This suggests that women may feel more vulnerable than men, or it could reflect a reluctance of male respondents to report their concerns to an interviewer rather than an actual difference in the level of concern between men and women.

- Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were generally more likely to report being concerned than those with no disability, particularly about coming into contact with the defendant and their supporters (60 per cent compared with 44 per cent). This could be partially driven by the types of cases they are involved in, as those with a disability were more likely to be victims or be involved in violence cases than those with no disability. As expected, victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were more likely to report being concerned about medical conditions or physical disabilities than those with no disability (35 per cent compared with three per cent).
- Older respondents were generally less likely to report being concerned than younger respondents. This could reflect the fact that younger victims and witnesses were more likely to be involved in violence cases, and therefore felt more vulnerable, or it could reflect a greater willingness among younger respondents to disclose their concerns to an interviewer, or, in the cases of concerns about time off work and loss of personal time, could reflect that older respondents are less likely to work.

Over half (57 per cent) of those who reported having concerns said they had told someone about their concerns.

- This again significantly varied by sex, with two-thirds of concerned women (66 per cent) stating that they had told someone of their concerns, compared with half of men (50 per cent).
- Concerned victims and witnesses with a disability or illness which limited their activities were significantly more likely to report telling someone of their concerns than those with no disability or illness (66 per cent compared with 56 per cent).
- Victims were slightly more likely to report telling someone of their concerns than witnesses (60 per cent of victims compared with 55 per cent of witnesses).

A third (33 per cent) of victims and witnesses told their Witness Care Officer of their concerns about attending court, 29 per cent told the police, and almost a quarter of respondents (23 per cent) told their friends or family.

Table 3.3: Who victims and witnesses told about their concerns, WAVES 2009–10

Who told about concerns:	Percentages		
	Victims	Witnesses	All
Witness Care Officer	28	36	33
Police	34	25	29
Friends or family	27	21	23
Witness Service	13	15	14
Court staff	12	14	13
Prosecution (CPS) lawyer	7	6	6
Victim Support	8	3	5
Other	3	2	3
Did not know	1	1	1
<i>Unweighted base: those who reported having concerns</i>			3,161

Respondents could choose more than one answer

Of those victims and witnesses who told a CJS official about their concerns, almost three-quarters (72 per cent) felt that they had been given enough help about how to access services to address these concerns.

3.2 Attending court

Feeling safe at court can be important in enabling victims and witnesses to participate in the CJS. Almost all (93 per cent) reported that they felt safe in the waiting room. Overall there was little variation, other than victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities being slightly less likely to report feeling safe than those with no disability (86 per cent compared with 94 per cent).

Overall, 79 per cent of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence waited in a separate waiting room from the defence witnesses, with 13 per cent reporting waiting in the same area as defence witnesses, and nine per cent stating this was not applicable or they did not know. Of those who were in the same waiting area as the defence witnesses, over half (53 per cent) reported that prosecution and defence witnesses were kept apart in the waiting area.

Almost nine out of ten (87 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence (regardless of whether they ended up giving evidence) reported being satisfied with the facilities at court (such as public toilets and refreshment facilities). Eighty-seven per cent of victims and witnesses also felt that court staff (such as receptionists and ushers) were helpful, (with eight per cent stating some were helpful and some were not, and two per cent feeling court staff were unhelpful).

Victims and witnesses who attend court to give evidence are entitled to be paid expenses (regardless of whether they end up giving evidence). The majority (84 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence recalled being given a witness expenses claim form, with a further one per cent reporting that they were not given a form but did get hold of one. Approximately a tenth (11 per cent) reported they had not received a witness expenses claim form.

3.3 Giving evidence

Just over half (55 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence ended up giving evidence. This equates to 11 per cent of all victims and witnesses surveyed actually giving evidence in court. Over a third (37 per cent) of court attendees who expected to give evidence were told their evidence was no longer needed, and eight per cent did not give evidence for another reason.

Table 3.4 shows that a significantly higher proportion of victims and witnesses involved in contested trials gave evidence than those involved in guilty plea cases or dropped or written off cases. The majority of those involved in guilty plea cases who did not give evidence were told that it was not needed (presumably as the defendant had changed their plea to guilty), whereas for those involved in dropped or written off cases who did not give evidence, there was a more even split between those who were told it was not needed and another reason.

Table 3.4: Proportion of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence who actually gave evidence, by case outcome, WAVES 2009–10

Case outcome	Percentages			Unweighted base (=100%)
	Gave evidence	Did not give evidence as:		
		told it was not needed	other reason	
Dropped/written off	22	40	38	407
Guilty plea	15	73	12	2,648
Contested trial – found guilty	80	17	3	3,313
Contested trial – found not guilty	91	6	3	1,178
All victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence	55	37	8	7,692

The proportions of victims and witnesses attending court to give evidence who actually gave evidence also varied slightly by crime type, with those asked to give evidence in violence cases significantly more likely to give evidence (57 per cent) than those in cases of theft and handling stolen goods (51 per cent), and burglary (45 per cent). The proportion of victims and witnesses of criminal damage offences who gave evidence was 52 per cent, but this was not statistically significantly different from the violence figure. This could reflect the case profile,

as violence cases were slightly more likely to be contested than other crime types (see Appendix A).

Victims and witnesses who gave evidence in court were asked how long they waited at court before giving evidence. Approximately a quarter (27 per cent) reported waiting less than an hour, with the same proportion reporting waiting between one and two hours, and between two and four hours (both 27 per cent). Approximately a fifth (18 per cent) reported waiting more than four hours to give evidence at court.

Victims and witnesses who gave evidence were also asked how often they were kept informed of what was going on while they were waiting. Half (52 per cent) were either not waiting long enough to need an update, or were kept informed more than once an hour, with a further quarter (26 per cent) of those who gave evidence reporting being kept informed about once an hour (See Table 3.5).

Table 3.5: How often victims and witnesses were kept informed while they waited to give evidence, WAVES 2009–10

How often kept informed	Percentages		
	Victims	Witnesses	All
Not waiting long enough to need an update	9	9	9
More than once an hour	43	44	43
About once an hour	24	27	26
Less than once an hour	11	11	11
Given no information	11	9	10
Did not know	3	1	2
<i>Unweighted base: those who gave evidence</i>	<i>1,992</i>	<i>2,366</i>	<i>4,358</i>

Almost all (91 per cent) of victims and witnesses who gave evidence reported being satisfied with the consideration shown to them before giving evidence in court. This has not changed since 2007–08 (90 per cent).

Court witnesses are entitled to use the holy book of their religion or choose to affirm (a non-religious process) when taking the oath before giving evidence. Almost nine out of ten (87 per cent) of victims and witnesses who gave evidence recalled a member of court staff asking them how they wanted to give their oath.

Over four-fifths (84 per cent) of victims and witnesses who gave evidence were satisfied with the way they were treated by the prosecution lawyer at court. Witnesses were slightly more likely to report being satisfied than victims (86 per cent of witnesses compared with 80 per

cent of victims). Three-fifths (60 per cent) of victims and witnesses who gave evidence met the prosecution lawyer before entering the courtroom to give evidence.

Special measures

Special measures are available to help victims and witnesses give evidence during a trial or hearing. These include the use of screens to prevent the victim or witness from seeing the defendant, giving evidence via a video link, and an intermediary to sit with the victim or witness while they were giving evidence to ensure they understood what was being asked of them, and that their answers were being understood. Table 3.6 shows the proportions of those who gave evidence who used each of the special measures, and whether those who used them found that the measure helped them to give their best evidence.

Table 3.6: Special measures to give evidence, WAVES 2009–10

Special measure	Percentage who used the special measure	Of those who used special measure, whether they felt it helped them to give evidence			Unweighted base
		Yes	No	Don't know	
Screens to prevent them seeing the accused	6	75	18	7	256
A video link to give evidence from another location	2	79	16	5	95
The opportunity to give evidence in private	6	64	28	8	260
A video recording of an interview used as evidence	4	70	24	6	177
An interpreter or signer	3	56	33	12	161
An intermediary	8	82	14	4	355
Communication aids such as an electro-larynx or alphabet board	2	72	27	2	77
<i>Unweighted base: those who gave evidence</i>	<i>4,358</i>				

Table 3.6 indicates that the proportion of victims and witnesses taking up special measures were low, but that where they were used, the majority of those using them felt that they helped them to give their evidence. It should be noted that the base numbers of those using the measures are small, and therefore these percentages are subject to large sampling errors and should be interpreted with caution.

Feelings of intimidation

Victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence (whether they ended up giving evidence or not) were asked whether they (or their family) felt intimidated by an individual at any point during the CJS process. It should be noted that the survey did not probe the nature

of the perceived intimidation, and some respondents may have felt intimidated by the position or authority of an individual, rather than by their actions.

Overall almost a quarter of victims and witnesses (24 per cent) reported they had felt intimidated (similar to 2007–08, when 26 per cent of victims and witnesses reported feeling intimidated). However, this varied significantly by various characteristics. For example, the proportion of victims reporting feeling intimidated was almost twice as high as the proportion of witnesses (35 per cent of victims compared with 18 per cent of witnesses).

Victims and witnesses who gave evidence during the trial (28 per cent) were significantly more likely to report feeling intimidated than those who were originally asked to but ended up not giving evidence (18 per cent).

Feeling intimidated also varied by crime type, with victims and witnesses of theft and handling stolen goods offences significantly less likely to report feeling intimidated (13 per cent) than victims and witnesses of violence (27 per cent) and criminal damage (25 per cent).

Table 3.7 shows how feeling intimidated varied according to both crime type and whether victims and witnesses gave evidence, with those who gave evidence more likely to report feeling intimidated across all crime types, though base numbers are small so differences are not statistically significant other than for violence cases. Among victims and witnesses of violence crimes who gave evidence, 31 per cent felt intimidated compared with 21 per cent of those who did not give evidence.

Table 3.7: Proportion of victims and witnesses who felt intimidated during the CJS process, by crime type and whether they gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10

Crime type	Percentages					
	Gave evidence	Unweighted base	Did not give evidence	Unweighted base	All	Unweighted base
Criminal damage	33	329	16	285	25	614
Theft and handling stolen goods	14	638	11	600	13	1,238
Burglary	24	209	15	234	19	443
Violence	31	3,169	21	2,214	27	5,383
All¹	28	4,358	18	3,343	24	7,701

¹ Includes cases where crime type was missing

The proportions of victims and witnesses reporting feeling intimidated also varied by the outcome of the case, with those involved in guilty plea cases (18 per cent) significantly less likely to report feeling intimidated than those involved in dropped/written off cases (28 per

cent), contested trials resulting in a guilty verdict (25 per cent), and a not guilty verdict (31 per cent).

Feeling intimidated also varied by some demographic characteristics.

- Female victims and witnesses were significantly more likely to report feeling intimidated by an individual during the CJS process than males (31 per cent of women compared with 19 per cent of men). This could reflect that women feel more vulnerable than men, or possibly reflect a greater willingness by women to disclose feelings of intimidation to an interviewer.
- The proportion of victims and witnesses who had a disability which limited their activities who reported feeling intimidated was almost twice as high as those with no disability (38 per cent compared with 22 per cent).

WAVES asked those who reported feeling intimidated by an individual who they felt intimidated by. The most common responses were the defendant and their friends and family, with almost three-quarters (71 per cent) reporting feeling intimidated by the defendant, and a third (33 per cent) reporting feeling intimidated by the defendant’s friends or family (see Table 3.8).

Table 3.8: Who respondents felt intimidated by, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentage
Defendant	71
Family/friends of the defendant	33
Lawyer	5
Opposition witness	3
Just general feeling	3
Police	2
Other witnesses	1
Court staff	1
Other	3
<hr/>	
<i>Unweighted base: victims and witnesses who felt intimidated by an individual</i>	<i>1,973</i>

The most common place for intimidation to occur was in the community, as reported by over half (59 per cent) of victims and witnesses who felt intimidated. Approximately a third (32 per cent) felt intimidated in the court building but outside the courtroom, and almost a quarter (22 per cent) reported feeling intimidated in the courtroom. Unsurprisingly, victims and witnesses who gave evidence were significantly more likely to feel intimidated in the court room than those who did not give evidence (29 per cent of those who felt intimidated and gave evidence compared with nine per cent of those who felt intimidated but did not give evidence).

Almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of those who felt intimidated during the CJS process reported telling someone that they felt intimidated, with the most common person told being the police, followed by the Witness Care Unit, friends or family, and court staff (see Table 3.9).

Table 3.9: Who respondents told about feelings of intimidation, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentage
Police	45
Witness Care Unit	10
Friends or family	10
Court staff	9
Witness Service	6
CPS lawyer	5
Victim Support	1
Work colleagues	1
Other	3
Did not tell anyone	28
<i>Unweighted base: victims and witnesses who felt intimidated by an individual</i>	<i>1,973</i>

Percentages do not add to 100 as respondents could tell more than one person/organisation about their feelings of intimidation

Of those victims and witnesses who told a CJS official about their feelings of intimidation, almost three-fifths (58 per cent) felt that their concerns were addressed. It should be noted that not knowing the nature of the perceived intimidation raises issues over how to interpret these findings.

3.4 Summary

The majority of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence recalled receiving information to help them prepare for attending court, such as speaking to their Witness Care Officer or another member of the CJS, receiving the *Witness in Court* leaflet, and being offered a pre-trial court familiarisation visit.

The majority of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence were satisfied with the information they received, although satisfaction levels varied by the outcome of the case, with victims and witnesses whose outcomes were satisfactory to them more positive.

Some victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence reported having concerns, such as about coming into contact with the defendant and their supporters and being cross-examined. Levels of concern varied among victims and witnesses, with victims, female respondents and younger respondents more likely to report concerns than witnesses, male

respondents and older respondents respectively. The majority of victims and witnesses who told a CJS official about their concerns felt that they had been given enough help about how to access services to address these concerns.

Just over half of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence ended up giving evidence in court, with over a third of court attendees being told that their evidence was no longer needed. This varied by case outcome, with those involved in contested trials more likely to end up giving evidence than those involved in cases which resulted in a guilty plea or were dropped or written off.

Almost a quarter of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence reported feeling intimidated by an individual during the criminal justice process. This varied by victim/witness status, case outcome and crime type, as well as by some demographic characteristics. The majority of those who felt intimidated stated that they felt intimidated by the defendant.

Almost three-quarters of those who felt intimidated reported telling someone that they felt intimidated. Three-fifths of victims and witnesses who told a CJS official about their feelings of intimidation felt that their concerns were addressed. Further research may be required to examine why the remaining two-fifths did not feel their concerns were addressed.

4. Support

Victims and witnesses can expect to receive support both to help them participate in the criminal justice process and to help them cope with and recover from the effects of the crime. This chapter examines the contact victims and witnesses had with the Witness Service, whether they had needs resulting from the crime, the contact victims had with Victim Support, whether victims had injuries as a result of the crime and whether they applied for compensation.

4.1 The Witness Service

The Witness Service is run by Victim Support and funded through a grant from the Ministry of Justice. It is available in every criminal court in England and Wales and provides practical help, information and emotional support during the trial to witnesses and victims who attend court. The Witness Service provides information on what to expect at court, including arranging court familiarisation visits before the trial or hearing, and can offer someone to accompany victims and witnesses in the courtroom to make them feel more at ease. It also offers support and people to talk to confidentially about any concerns, and can offer practical help with filling in forms.

The BCS shows that two-fifths (41 per cent) of victims had heard about the Witness Service (BCS 2007–08 and 2008–09, MoJ report forthcoming, including victims who both did and did not report their crimes to the police. BCS covers a wider range of crimes than WAVES).

WAVES 2009–10 findings show that almost two-thirds (63 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court to give evidence (regardless of whether they ended up giving evidence) recalled having contact with the Witness Service in relation to their case. Approximately two-fifths (41 per cent) of victims and witnesses who had contact with the Witness Service recalled having contact with them before the trial, with a higher proportion of victims (48 per cent) reporting this than witnesses (38 per cent). Approximately four-fifths (81 per cent) of victims and witnesses who had contact with the Witness Service recalled having contact with them on the day of the trial, but in this case a slightly higher proportion of witnesses (83 per cent) reported having contact than victims (77 per cent). A sixth (16 per cent) of victims and witnesses who had contact with the Witness Service recalled having contact with them after the trial. This again varied for victims and witnesses, with 20 per cent of victims having contact with the Witness Service after the trial compared with 14 per cent of witnesses (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Contact with the Witness Service, WAVES 2009–10

	Victims	Witnesses	All
Proportion who had contact with the Witness Service	64	62	63
<i>Unweighted base: those who attended court expecting to give evidence</i>	3,435	4,266	7,701
Of which, had contact with the Witness Service:			
Before the trial	48	38	41
On the day of the trial	77	83	81
After the trial	20	14	16
<i>Unweighted base: those who had contact with the Witness Service</i>	2,231	2,664	4,895

This suggests that victims who are due to give evidence are more likely than witnesses to recall having contact with the Witness Service before and after the trial, perhaps because they are more likely to feel they need support than witnesses. Almost all (96 per cent) of those who recall having contact with the Witness Service report being satisfied with the support that the Witness Service provided to them.

The levels of contact and levels of satisfaction with the Witness Service in 2009–10 are similar to those reported in WAVES 2007–08 (when 60 per cent reported having contact and 96 per cent reported being satisfied).

4.2 Needs resulting from the crime

Victims and witnesses can have various needs following a crime, such as for advice on insurance or security, or emotional or practical help. Overall almost a tenth (nine per cent) of victims and witnesses reported having such needs following their crime, though victims were much more likely to report this (16 per cent) than witnesses (three per cent).

Victims and witnesses of burglary offences were significantly more likely than the other crime types covered by WAVES to report having needs as a result of the crime, and victims and witnesses of theft and handling stolen goods offences significantly less likely than the other crime types covered (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Proportion of respondents who had needs resulting from the crime, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10

Crime type	Percentage	Unweighted base
Criminal damage	9	5,256
Theft and handling stolen goods	4	9,952
Burglary	19	5,225
Violence	8	17,206
All victims and witnesses	9	37,779

BCS findings (covering a wider range of victims than WAVES) show that victims wanted some form of information, advice or support in a fifth (21 per cent) of incidents. This varied by crime type with victims of burglary and violent incidents more likely to want support (37 per cent and 28 per cent of incidents respectively) than victims of other crime types (BCS 2007–08 and 2008–09, MoJ report forthcoming). The BCS figure includes victims who said they wanted information from the police on the progress of the case, or help in reporting the crime to the police, which may explain why the BCS figures are higher than the corresponding WAVES figures which did not include these types of information.

WAVES findings show that victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were more than twice as likely to report having needs as a result of the crime than those without a disability (17 per cent compared with eight per cent).

Overall, almost three-quarters (71 per cent) of WAVES victims and witnesses who reported having needs as a result of the crime felt that they had received the help they required to address those needs. This again varied by crime type, with significantly more victims and witnesses of burglary offences who reported having needs stating they received the help required (80 per cent) than victims and witnesses of theft and handling stolen goods (69 per cent), violence (68 per cent) and criminal damage (66 per cent) offences.

4.3 Victim Support

Victim Support is a national charity which offers information, advice and support to victims of crime, such as someone to talk to in confidence, information on the CJS, compensation and insurance, help in dealing with other organisations and links to other sources of help and support. Victim Support aim to contact all victims who have reported a crime to the police, excluding victims who have opted out of the process (at the police reporting stage) and victims of certain crime types such as domestic violence.

Around a quarter of victims surveyed by WAVES (27 per cent) recalled having contact with Victim Support during the criminal justice process (compared with five per cent of incidents recorded by the BCS, BCS 2007–08 and 2008–09, MoJ report forthcoming). The BCS covers a wider range of crimes than WAVES, and includes victims who both did and did not report their crimes to the police.

The WAVES figures varied by crime type with significantly more victims of violence crimes (37 per cent) reporting having contact than victims of burglary crimes (29 per cent), criminal damage crimes (17 per cent) and theft and handling stolen goods crimes (15 per cent).

Around two-fifths (42 per cent) of victims who attended court reported having contact with Victim Support, compared with a quarter (24 per cent) of victims who did not attend court. Similarly, victims who gave evidence in court were more likely to report having contact (44 per cent) than those who were asked to give evidence but ended up not giving evidence (33 per cent) and those who were not asked to give evidence (23 per cent). This suggests that victims who are more involved with their case are more likely to want or need information (for example, about the court and trial process) and support. Alternatively, it may also be possible that victims who are more involved with their case are more likely to recall their experiences, or that they were thinking of their contact with the Witness Service when answering this question.

Almost nine out of ten (87 per cent) of victims who had contact with Victim Support reported being satisfied with the contact. The BCS also indicates high levels of satisfaction with contact with Victim Support (victims were satisfied in 83 per cent of incidents).

Levels of contact with Victim Support have risen slightly since 2007–08 (from 22 per cent to 27 per cent in 2009–10), as have levels of satisfaction (from 80 per cent to 87 per cent in 2009–10).

4.4 Injuries resulting from the crime and the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme

The Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme pays compensation to eligible victims who have been injured as a result of a violent crime (subject to certain conditions). WAVES asked all victims whether they had been injured as a result of the crime, with almost a third (29 per cent) reporting that they had been injured. Overall, almost two-thirds (63 per cent) of victims of violence offences reported being injured as a result of the crime. Some victims of other crime types also reported being injured (four per cent of both criminal damage and theft and handling stolen goods offences, and three per cent of burglary offences).

Approximately half (52 per cent) of victims who reported having an injury as a result of the crime recalled being told about the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme. It is possible that CJS officials did not inform ineligible victims of the scheme. Of those told about the scheme, just over half (56 per cent) reported applying for compensation. The most common reason given by victims for not applying for compensation was that they felt their injury was not serious enough.

4.5 Summary

The majority of victims and witnesses (96 per cent) who had contact with the Witness Service were satisfied with the support the Witness Service provided to them. Similarly, the majority of victims (87 per cent) who had contact with Victim Support were satisfied with their contact.

Whether victims and witnesses had needs following their crime varied by whether they were a victim or witness, and by the type of crime they were involved in. The majority of victims and witnesses who reported having needs as a result of their crime felt that they had received the help they required to address those needs.

A Ministry of Justice research report analysing BCS 2007–08 and 2008–09 data examining the support wanted and received by victims of crime is forthcoming.

5. Perceptions of the case outcome and sentence

This chapter examines victims' and witnesses' perceptions of the outcome of the case and the sentence given to the offender where relevant. It should be noted that respondents' own definition of case outcome has been used in this chapter (as with the whole report), as their own perception of the outcome is more likely to affect their opinion of the outcome and the CJS in general.

5.1 Perceptions of the case outcome

Victims and witnesses were asked whether they thought the outcome of their case and where relevant, the sentence, were fair. Overall, nine out of ten (91 per cent) victims and witnesses were aware of the outcome, either being in court to hear it (five per cent), or informed of the outcome by a CJS official (85 per cent). This varied by what the outcome of the case was, with victims and witnesses involved in a contested case which resulted in a guilty verdict most likely to report that they knew the outcome (98 per cent), and those involved in a case which was dropped or written off least likely to know (84 per cent). See Table 5.1.

The majority (83 per cent) of victims and witnesses who knew what the case outcome was thought it was fair. As expected, this varied greatly by what the outcome was, with around 90 per cent of victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction (88 per cent of guilty plea cases, and 90 per cent of contested trials with a guilty verdict) reporting they thought the outcome was fair compared with a third (31 per cent) of victims and witnesses involved in dropped or written off cases and a fifth (20 per cent) of victims and witnesses involved in contested trials with not guilty verdicts. Some respondents may have been thinking of the sentence as well as the outcome when answering this question. See Table 5.1.

The proportion of victims and witnesses who knew what the outcome was has risen from 87 per cent in 2007–08. The proportion who thought the outcome was fair has also risen since 2007–08, when it was 77 per cent.

Table 5.1: Perceptions of case outcome, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages		Percentages	
	Knew case outcome	Unweighted base (all)	Thought case outcome was fair	Unweighted base (knew outcome)
Case outcome:				
Dropped/written off	84	1,308	31	1,098
Guilty plea	90	18,108	88	16,376
Contested trial – found guilty	98	11,383	90	11,185
Contested trial – found not guilty	91	1,698	20	1,533
All	91	33,607	83	30,526

Overall, victims and witnesses who attended court were less likely to think the outcome was fair than those who did not attend court (74 per cent compared with 86 per cent). Victims and witnesses who gave evidence were also less likely to think the outcome was fair (69 per cent) compared with those who were not asked to give evidence (87 per cent) and those who were asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so (82 per cent). Court attendance and giving evidence are both associated with case outcome, and this may therefore explain the association with perceptions of fairness. Table 5.2 shows that when controlling for case outcome, there are still differences by court attendance and giving evidence, but these are smaller. For example, those involved in contested not guilty trials are more likely to attend court and give evidence, and less likely to think the outcome is fair, than those involved in cases resulting in other outcomes. So victims and witnesses who participate more in the criminal justice process appear to be slightly less likely to think the outcome is fair regardless of the outcome (though sample sizes are small), perhaps because they have different expectations having spent more time dealing with the case.

Table 5.2: Proportions of victims and witnesses who thought case outcome was fair, by case outcome and whether attended court and gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages				
	Attended court	Did not attend court	Gave evidence	Asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so	Not asked to give evidence
Case outcome:					
Dropped/written off	31	31	25	33	28
Guilty plea	84	89	83	87	89
Contested trial – found guilty	87	91	88	88	91
Contested trial – found not guilty	19	24	17	25	26
All¹	74	86	69	82	87
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>8,371</i>	<i>22,155</i>	<i>4,038</i>	<i>8,448</i>	<i>18,040</i>

¹ Includes respondents who stated they did not know the case outcome

In terms of socio-demographic characteristics, victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were slightly less likely to think the outcome was fair than those without a disability (76 per cent compared with 84 per cent).

5.2 Perceptions of the sentence

The majority (84 per cent) of victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction reported knowing the sentence that the offender received. Significantly more victims (88 per cent) reported knowing the sentence than witnesses (81 per cent).

Overall, three-fifths (60 per cent) of victims and witnesses who knew what the sentence was thought it was fair. Victims were less likely to think the sentence was fair than witnesses (56 per cent of victims compared with 63 per cent of witnesses). See Table 5.3.

The proportion of victims and witnesses who knew the sentence was 83 per cent in 2007–08. The proportion who thought it was fair has risen slightly since 2007–08, from 56 per cent to 60 per cent.

Table 5.3: Perceptions of the sentence, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages		Percentages	
	Knew sentence	<i>Unweighted base (cases resulting in convictions)</i>	Thought sentence was fair	<i>Unweighted base (all who knew sentence)</i>
Victims	88	14,086	56	12,445
Witnesses	81	12,501	63	10,098
All	84	26,587	60	22,543

Victims and witnesses who attended court were less likely to think the sentence was fair than those who did not attend court (55 per cent compared with 61 per cent), in line with the findings for whether they thought the outcome was fair, above. Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were also less likely to think the sentence was fair than those without a disability (50 per cent compared with 61 per cent), again similar to what was found when examining the fairness of the outcome above.

Victims and witnesses who had been provided with an explanation of what the sentence meant were more likely to think the sentence was fair than those who had not received an explanation (65 per cent compared with 55 per cent). Although victims and witnesses who attended court were less likely to think the sentence was fair than those who did not attend

court (see above), those who were provided with an explanation were more likely to think the sentence was fair than those who were not, (see Table 5.4). This suggests that explanations from CJS officials are helpful in clarifying the sentence and possibly in making clear why a particular sentence has been given.

Table 5.4: Proportions of victims and witnesses who thought sentence was fair, by whether provided with an explanation and whether attended court, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages provided with an explanation	<i>Unweighted base</i>	Percentages not provided with an explanation	<i>Unweighted base</i>
Attended court	60	3,001	48	2,610
Did not attend court	67	6,624	56	9,256
All	65	9,625	55	11,866

Overall, under half (42 per cent) of victims and witnesses who knew what the sentence was in their case recalled being provided with an explanation of what the sentence meant by a CJS official. Victims were slightly more likely to recall being provided with an explanation than witnesses (44 per cent compared with 40 per cent). This also varied by crime type, with victims and witnesses of violent crimes significantly more likely to report being provided with an explanation than victims and witnesses of other crimes (45 per cent compared with 40 per cent of victims and witnesses for criminal damage, 39 per cent for theft and handling stolen goods and 38 per cent for burglary).

This also varied by how involved victims and witnesses were with the case. Over half (52 per cent) of victims and witnesses who attended court recalled a CJS official providing them with an explanation of what the sentence meant, compared with 39 per cent of those who did not attend court. Victims and witnesses who were asked to give evidence were more likely to report being provided with an explanation of the sentence (46 per cent of those who gave evidence, 48 per cent of those asked to give evidence but who did not do so) than those who were not asked to give evidence (38 per cent).

Younger victims and witnesses were more likely to report being provided with an explanation of what the sentence meant than older victims and witnesses. For example, half (50 per cent) of those aged 18–24 reported this compared with a third (33 per cent) of those aged 65 and over. This could reflect the different types of cases that younger and older victims and witnesses are involved in, as younger victims and witnesses are more likely to be involved in violent crime cases.

5.3 Summary

Overall, the victims and witnesses interviewed for WAVES are generally positive about their experiences, with the majority reporting that they felt the outcome and sentence were fair, although two-fifths of victims and witnesses felt the sentence was not fair. Victims and witnesses who had been provided with an explanation of what the sentence meant were more likely to think it fair than those who received no explanation.

Perceptions about fairness vary for different types of victims and witnesses, most notably by case outcome. Those involved in cases which resulted in a conviction generally reported more positive views than those involved in cases which did not result in a conviction.

Victims and witnesses who had a greater level of participation in their case (either by attending court or giving evidence) were slightly less likely to report thinking the outcome or sentence in the case were fair, although this is likely to be partly driven by case outcome.

Victims' and witnesses' perceptions varied by their socio-demographic characteristics too, most notably by whether they had a disability which limited their activities. Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were less likely to think the outcome and sentence of the case was fair. This may partly reflect the case profile of respondents with a disability, as they are more likely to be victims than witnesses, and more likely to be involved in violence cases than those without a disability, and victims generally report less positive views than witnesses, as do those involved in cases of violence.

6. Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

This chapter examines victims' and witnesses' satisfaction with the CJS. It should be noted that respondents' own definition of case outcome has been used in this chapter (as with the whole report), as their own perception of the outcome is more likely to affect their opinion of the CJS.

6.1 Satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

Surveyed victims and witnesses were asked how satisfied they were with various aspects of their CJS experience (see Table 6.1). Respondents rated their satisfaction or dissatisfaction as 'completely', 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied or dissatisfied. For the purposes of this analysis, completely, very and fairly responses have been aggregated into 'satisfied' or 'dissatisfied'. See Table A6 in Appendix A for the 'completely', 'very', 'fairly' breakdown.

Table 6.1: Victim and witness satisfaction with different aspects of their CJS experience, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages		
	Victims	Witnesses	All
Whether satisfied with information given about the CJS process			
Satisfied	81	87	85
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	2	2
Dissatisfied	16	10	12
Whether satisfied with how well kept informed of case progress			
Satisfied	77	81	79
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	2	2
Dissatisfied	21	16	18
Whether satisfied with way treated by CJS staff			
Satisfied	88	93	91
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	1	2
Dissatisfied	9	4	6
Whether satisfied with their contact with the CJS			
Satisfied	80	87	84
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	2	2
Dissatisfied	17	11	13
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>19,032</i>	<i>18,747</i>	<i>37,779</i>

Respondents who answered 'don't know' are not shown in this table.

Satisfaction with information given about the CJS process

Victims and witnesses were asked whether they were satisfied with the information they were given about the CJS process. Overall, the majority (85 per cent) of victims and witnesses were satisfied (12 per cent were dissatisfied and two per cent were neither satisfied nor

dissatisfied). However, witnesses were more likely to be satisfied than victims (87 per cent compared with 81 per cent).

Satisfaction with information received about the CJS process varied by the outcome of the case, with victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – guilty pleas (86 per cent); contested trials with a guilty verdict (89 per cent) – more likely to be satisfied than those involved in trials with a not guilty verdict (78 per cent) or dropped or written off cases (73 per cent).

Satisfaction with information given also varied by some demographic characteristics, namely disability status and ethnicity. Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were less likely to be satisfied than those with no disability (76 per cent compared with 86 per cent). White victims and witnesses were more likely to be satisfied (85 per cent) than Mixed (78 per cent), Black (79 per cent) and Asian (82 per cent) victims and witnesses.

Levels of satisfaction with the information given about the CJS process have risen over time, from 80 per cent in 2007–08 to 85 per cent in 2009–10.

Satisfaction with how well victims and witnesses were kept informed of case progress

Overall, four-fifths (79 per cent) of victims and witnesses were satisfied with how well they were kept informed of the progress of their case (18 per cent were dissatisfied and two per cent were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied). Witnesses were again more likely to be satisfied than victims (81 per cent compared with 77 per cent).

Victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – guilty pleas (81 per cent), contested trials with a guilty verdict (85 per cent) – were more likely to be satisfied than those involved in trials with a not guilty verdict (67 per cent) or dropped or written off cases (66 per cent).

Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were less likely to be satisfied with how well they were kept informed of case progress than those with no disability (70 per cent compared with 80 per cent).

Levels of satisfaction with how well victims and witnesses were kept informed of the progress of their case have risen over time, from 75 per cent in 2007–08 to 79 per cent in 2009–10.

Satisfaction with the way treated by CJS staff

Almost all (91 per cent) victims and witnesses were satisfied with the way they were treated by staff in the CJS. In line with the satisfaction findings above, witnesses were more likely to be satisfied than victims (93 per cent compared with 88 per cent), and victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – guilty pleas (92 per cent), contested trials with a guilty verdict (93 per cent) – were more likely to be satisfied than those involved in trials with a not guilty verdict (87 per cent) or dropped or written off cases (83 per cent).

Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were less likely to be satisfied with the way they were treated by CJS staff than those with no disability (84 per cent compared with 92 per cent).

Levels of satisfaction with the way victims and witnesses were treated by CJS staff have risen slightly over time, from 89 per cent in 2007–08 to 91 per cent in 2009–10.

Satisfaction with contact with the CJS

Victims and witnesses were asked whether they were satisfied with the contact they had with the CJS. This question provides an overall measure for victim and witness satisfaction with the CJS, and is the measure analysed using logistic regression methods later in this chapter. Overall, the majority (84 per cent) of victims and witnesses were satisfied with their contact with the CJS, (13 per cent were dissatisfied and two per cent were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied).

In line with the results for the other satisfaction measures, this also varied by victim/witness status, the outcome of the case and disability status. Victims were less likely to be satisfied than witnesses (80 per cent compared with 87 per cent). Victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – guilty pleas (85 per cent), contested trials with a guilty verdict (89 per cent) – were more likely to say they were satisfied than those involved in trials with a not guilty verdict (75 per cent) or dropped or written off cases (72 per cent).

Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were less likely to report being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than those with no disability (75 per cent compared with 85 per cent).

Victims and witnesses who thought the outcome of their case was fair were significantly more likely to be satisfied with their contact with the CJS than those who did not think the outcome of their case was fair (91 per cent compared with 72 per cent).

Levels of victim and witness satisfaction with their contact with the CJS have risen slightly over time, from 80 per cent in 2007–08 to 84 per cent in 2009–10.

6.2 Factors associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Criminal Justice System

The analyses above show that satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System (CJS) varies among victims and witnesses, depending on various characteristics such as whether they were a victim or witness, whether they were disabled, and the outcome of their case. However, these characteristics may not be the key factors that are associated with satisfaction, as different groups may have different experiences of the CJS, and some characteristics can co-vary. That is, some groups are more likely to have certain experiences than others. For example, disabled respondents were more likely to be victims, more likely to be involved in violence cases, and more likely to attend court, than non-disabled respondents (see Appendix A).

Logistic regression analyses were carried out to explore which factors were independently associated with respondents' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their contact with the CJS. The other satisfaction questions were excluded from these analyses, as they are likely to be measuring the same thing as the dependent satisfaction variable. It should be noted that these analyses explore associations between different factors and characteristics, but these do not necessarily imply causal relationships between them.

Factors associated with both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the CJS were examined to explore if there were differences between the two. That is, for example, when a service being provided would not be associated with higher levels of satisfaction but it not being provided would be associated with higher levels of dissatisfaction.

Separate analyses were carried out for victims and witnesses, due to their differing satisfaction levels, and the possible differing natures of their experiences and expectations, as victims are eligible for different services than witnesses. Analyses were also carried out for those who attended court to give evidence, to assess the factors associated with satisfaction for this distinct group who had more contact with the CJS. However, the attended court models were not run separately for victims and witnesses due to the smaller numbers of respondents who attended court. There may be further factors that are associated with satisfaction or dissatisfaction that are not included in these analyses or the WAVES questionnaire.

For more information on the methodology used and variables included in the models, see Appendix B.

Factors associated with Victim Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

The survey asked 19,032 victims how satisfied they were with their contact with the CJS, with 80 per cent reporting that they were satisfied, compared with 17 per cent stating they were dissatisfied.

The findings indicated that the factors that are strongly independently associated with **victims' satisfaction** with their contact with the CJS were:

- **Leaflet:** Receiving the leaflet explaining what happens following reporting a crime.
- **Contact details:** Being given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case.
- **Kept informed:** How long after first contact with the police before the victim heard anything further about the progress of their case – the sooner a victim heard something, the higher the odds of them being satisfied.
- **Charge:** Being informed that someone had been charged with the offence.
- **Complaints procedure:** Being made aware of how to complain if they were dissatisfied with the service they received from the CJS.
- **Case outcome:** Victims whose cases resulted in a conviction had higher odds of being satisfied than victims in cases where the charges were dropped.

Other variables were also, to a lesser extent, associated with satisfaction (see Table B1 in Appendix B).

This indicates that keeping victims informed of the progress of their case is strongly associated with satisfaction, with most of the key factors relating to information provision. Although some demographic factors had a weak association with satisfaction, none were strongly associated with satisfaction indicating that information and service provision are more significant than demographics in explaining variations in satisfaction levels.

The analysis shows that the factors that contributed most to explaining **victims' dissatisfaction** with their contact with the CJS were:

- **Contact details:** Not being given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case.
- **Kept informed:** The longer before a victim heard something about the progress of their case, the higher the odds of them being dissatisfied, with those who heard nothing further most likely to be dissatisfied.
- **Charge:** Not being informed that someone had been charged with the offence.
- **Complaints procedure:** Not being made aware of how to complain if they were unhappy with the service they received.
- **Victim Personal Statement:** Not recalling being offered the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement.

Other variables were also, to a lesser extent, associated with dissatisfaction (see Table B2).

The four strongest factors associated with dissatisfaction reflect those associated with satisfaction. In addition, victims who said they could not recall being offered the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement (VPS) had higher odds of being dissatisfied with their contact with the CJS than those victims who were offered the opportunity. Being offered the opportunity to make a VPS was weakly associated with satisfaction, but its stronger association with dissatisfaction could reflect a survey effect, in that some victims may not have been aware of the VPS scheme prior to the interview, and discovering that they should have been offered this opportunity but were not may have negatively affected their assessment of their CJS experience.

The outcome of the case, which was strongly associated with levels of satisfaction, is only weakly associated with levels of dissatisfaction. This indicates that all the key factors associated with victims being dissatisfied with their contact with the CJS are related to information and service provision.

Factors associated with Witness Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

The survey asked 18,747 witnesses how satisfied they were with their contact with the CJS, with 87 per cent reporting that they were satisfied, compared with 11 per cent stating they were dissatisfied.

The analysis shows that the same five factors contributed most to explaining both **witnesses' satisfaction and dissatisfaction** with their contact with the CJS. These were as follows:

- **Contact details:** Witnesses who were given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case had higher odds of being satisfied than those who were not, and vice versa.
- **Kept informed:** The sooner a witness heard something further about the progress of their case, the higher the odds of them being satisfied, and conversely, the longer it took before a witness heard something further, the higher the odds of dissatisfaction.
- **Charge:** Witnesses who were informed that someone had been charged with the offence had higher odds of being satisfied than those who were not informed, and vice versa.
- **Complaints procedure:** Witnesses who were made aware of how to complain if they were unhappy with the service they received had higher odds of being satisfied than those who were not, and vice versa.
- **Case outcome:** Witnesses whose cases resulted in a conviction (both guilty pleas and contested trials where the defendant was found guilty) had higher odds of being satisfied than witnesses in cases where the charges were dropped. Conversely, witnesses involved in cases which were dropped, contested and resulting in a not guilty verdict or resulted in a guilty plea had higher odds of being dissatisfied than witnesses whose cases were contested and resulted in a guilty verdict.

Other variables were also associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction to a lesser extent (see Tables B3 and B4).

Comparison between victims and witnesses

The analysis shows that being kept informed of developments in their case was strongly associated with higher levels of satisfaction for both victims and witnesses, with not being informed strongly associated with dissatisfaction for both groups. However, the models showed the most strongly associated factor differed for victims and witnesses. The length of time between the first contact with the police and when they next heard anything official about their case was the strongest factor for victims' satisfaction and dissatisfaction, whereas being informed that someone had been charged with the offence was the strongest factor for witnesses.

None of the demographic characteristics were strongly associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction, indicating that the differences highlighted in satisfaction between different demographic groups in the bivariate analysis may be due to other factors such as the information or services they received throughout their case. This could arise if different demographic groups receive different levels of service, or have different expectations, or their perceptions of their experience differ. As noted in previous chapters, many apparent differences may also be due to the differing types of cases that different groups are involved in. Some differences may be due to other characteristics not covered by the survey, such as the severity of the crime or the nature and outcome of any previous experience of the CJS.

It should be noted that the analyses above explain around a third of the variance (see Tables B1 to B4), and that therefore there are other factors associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction which are not included in the analyses, or not covered by the survey.

Factors associated with the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of those who attended court to give evidence

Overall, 20 per cent of WAVES respondents attended court to give evidence (n=7,701). They were asked questions about their experiences of preparing for and attending court.

The findings indicate that the eight factors most strongly associated with both the **satisfaction and dissatisfaction of victims and witnesses who attended court** to give evidence were as follows:

- **Leaflet:** Those who recalled being given the *Witness in Court* leaflet had higher odds of being satisfied than those who did not, and vice versa.
- **Charge:** Those who were informed that someone had been charged with the offence had higher odds of being satisfied than those who were not, and vice versa.
- **Complaints procedure:** Those who were made aware of how to complain if they were dissatisfied with the service they received had higher odds of being satisfied than those who were not, and vice versa.
- **Witness Care Officer:** Those who had spoken with a Witness Care Officer about going to court had higher odds of being satisfied than those who had not, and vice versa.
- **Intimidated:** Those who felt intimidated by an individual during the criminal justice process had higher odds of being dissatisfied than those who did not feel intimidated, and vice versa.

- **Felt safe:** Those who felt safe in the court waiting room had higher odds of being satisfied than those who felt unsafe, and vice versa.
- **Court staff:** Those who thought the court staff were helpful had higher odds of being satisfied than those who thought the court staff were unhelpful, and vice versa.
- **Case outcome:** Those whose cases resulted in a conviction (both guilty pleas and contested trials where the defendant was found guilty) had higher odds of being satisfied than those in cases where the charges were dropped. Conversely, those involved in cases which were dropped or resulted in a not guilty verdict had higher odds of being dissatisfied than those whose cases resulted in a guilty plea.

In addition, one further factor was strongly associated with satisfaction (although not with dissatisfaction): **contact details**. Those who were given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case had higher odds of being satisfied than those who were not.

Other variables were also associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction to a lesser extent (see Tables B5 and B6).

The findings indicate that factors related to preparing victims and witnesses for going to court, feeling safe at court and feeling intimidated by an individual during the justice process were all strongly associated with levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, along with information provision and case outcome factors which also appeared in the overall victims and witnesses models.

This suggests that processes are more strongly related to satisfaction and dissatisfaction than demographic characteristics for those victims and witnesses who attend court to give evidence (many of whom do not actually end up giving evidence). The outcome of the case was also strongly associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction, but not as strongly associated as the processes. A respondent's disability status (that is, whether or not they had a long-standing illness or disability which limited their activities) had a weak association with satisfaction and dissatisfaction, while the other demographic characteristics were not independently associated at all.

6.3 Summary

Overall, the victims and witnesses interviewed for WAVES are generally positive about their experiences, with the majority reporting that they are satisfied with various aspects of their experience.

Levels of satisfaction vary for different types of victims and witnesses, most notably whether they were a victim or witness, and by case outcome. Those involved in cases which resulted in a conviction generally reported more positive views than those involved in cases which did not result in a conviction. Victims' and witnesses' perceptions varied by their demographic characteristics too, most notably by whether they had a disability which limited their activities. Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were less likely to report being satisfied with various aspects of the CJS. This may partly reflect the case profile of respondents with a disability, as they are more likely to be victims than witnesses and victims generally report less positive views than witnesses.

The findings from the logistic regression analyses suggest that keeping victims and witnesses informed of the progress of their case and of what to expect throughout the justice process may result in increased levels of satisfaction with their contact with the CJS. The strongest factors that are independently associated with higher levels of victim and witness satisfaction (and dissatisfaction) with their contact with the CJS relate to provision of information. In addition, feeling safe at court and not feeling intimidated are also strongly associated with the satisfaction of victims and witnesses who attend court to give evidence. The outcome of the case was also strongly associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction in five of the six models, although in each of these other factors were more strongly associated than it.

No demographic characteristics were strongly associated with satisfaction or dissatisfaction, indicating that the differences found in the bivariate analysis between disabled and non-disabled victims and witnesses are likely due to other underlying factors.

It is possible that some respondents who said they had not received information had actually done so. This might indicate that the way the information was provided was not clear, accessible or memorable. This suggests that the way in which information is provided is important. Some respondents who had concerns about the CJS process or about attending court may not have been receptive to information they were given.

7. Willingness to engage with the CJS

This chapter examines whether victims and witnesses are willing to engage with the CJS in future if they were a victim or witness of a similar crime again. Willingness to engage with the CJS in future may be influenced by experiences and perceptions covered elsewhere in this report, such as satisfaction and perceptions of the fairness of the outcome. Whether those who have come into contact with the CJS would engage with it again in future is important as engaging with the system is vital for the delivery of justice.

The previous chapter showed that the strongest factors which are independently associated with victim and witness satisfaction with the CJS relate to provision of information. Victims and witnesses are more likely to state they would report a future incident to the police than state they are satisfied with their contact with the CJS. Logistic regression analyses were carried out to explore whether similar factors were independently strongly associated with whether respondents were willing to report a future incident to the police. As before, separate analyses were carried out for victims and witnesses. Analyses were also carried out to examine the factors associated with victims and witnesses who gave evidence in court stating that they would be likely to give evidence again if asked.

Satisfaction with the CJS was included in these analyses, as willingness to engage with the CJS in future is likely to be strongly associated with respondents' satisfaction with their contact with the system. However, analyses were run both including and excluding satisfaction with CJS contact to examine the effect that including satisfaction had on the models. There may be further factors that are associated with willingness to engage in future that are not included in these analyses or the WAVES questionnaire. For more information on the methodology used and variables included in the models, see Appendix B.

Table 7.1 shows the proportion of victims and witnesses who stated they would report a future crime to the police, and the proportion of those who gave evidence who stated they would be willing to be a court witness again.

Table 7.1: Willingness to engage with the CJS in future, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentage	Unweighted base
Victims who would report a future crime to the police	90	19,032
Witnesses who would report a future crime to the police	92	18,747
All who gave evidence who would be a court witness again in future	67	4,358

Levels of future engagement in 2009–10 are broadly similar to those in WAVES 2007–08, when 89 per cent of victims and 91 per cent of witnesses stated they would report a future crime to the police and 68 per cent of those who gave evidence stated they would agree to be a court witness again in future.

7.1 Victims

WAVES asked victims whether they would report an incident to the police if they became the victim of a similar crime again. Overall, 90 per cent of victims replied that they would, with six per cent stating they would not, and three per cent replying that it would depend on the circumstances.

This varied by crime type, with victims of burglary and theft and handling stolen goods offences more likely to say they would report a future crime to the police than victims of criminal damage or violence offences (see Table 7.2).

Table 7.2: Proportion of victims who would report a future crime to the police, by crime type, WAVES 2009–10

Crime type	Percentage	Unweighted base
Criminal damage	89	3,180
Theft and handling stolen goods	91	3,793
Burglary	94	3,489
Violence	87	8,537

This also varied by the outcome of the case, with victims involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – both guilty pleas (92 per cent) and contested trials with a guilty verdict (93 per cent) – more likely to say they would report a future incident to the police than victims involved in contested trials with a not guilty verdict (70 per cent) or dropped or written off cases (75 per cent).

Victims who attended court were less likely to say they would report a future incident to the police than those who did not attend court (85 per cent compared with 92 per cent), and victims who gave evidence were less likely (83 per cent) to report a future incident than those who were asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so (90 per cent) or were not asked to give evidence (92 per cent). In line with perceptions of whether the outcome was fair (see

Chapter 5), this difference is also partly driven by the outcome of the case. Table 7.3 shows that for cases which resulted in a conviction, the difference in the proportions who said they would report a future crime for those who did and did not attend court or give evidence is small. However, victims who attended court or gave evidence in a trial resulting in a not guilty verdict were much less likely to say they would report a future crime than those who did not participate as fully in their case. This suggests that victims who participate are more likely to perceive the process to be burdensome and not want to repeat it if the outcome of the case is unsatisfactory to them.

Table 7.3: Proportions of victims who would report a future crime to the police, by case outcome and whether attended court and gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages				
	Attended court	Did not attend court	Gave evidence	Asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so	Not asked to give evidence
Case outcome:					
Dropped/written off	69	77	71	73	76
Guilty plea	88	93	87	91	93
Contested trial – found guilty	90	94	91	92	94
Contested trial – found not guilty	65	83	62	81	83
All¹	85	92	83	89	92
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>4,099</i>	<i>13,294</i>	<i>1,992</i>	<i>4,337</i>	<i>11,064</i>

¹ Includes respondents who stated they did not know the case outcome

Victims with a disability which limited their activities were slightly less likely to say they would report a future incident to the police than those with no disability (85 per cent compared with 90 per cent). However, this is likely to be driven by other factors, as the following analysis shows that disability status is not strongly independently associated with whether victims stated they would report a future crime to the police.

Factors associated with whether victims would report a future crime to the police

The survey asked 19,032 victims whether they would report a similar crime to the police in future, with 90 per cent reporting that they would.

The findings indicated that the factors that are strongly independently associated with whether victims would report a future crime to the police were:

- **Satisfaction:** Being satisfied with their contact with the CJS.

- **Case outcome:** Victims whose cases resulted in a conviction had higher odds of stating they would report a future crime than victims in contested trials where the defendant was acquitted.
- **Crime type:** Victims of burglary and theft and handling stolen goods had higher odds of stating they would report a future crime than victims of violence, and victims of criminal damage had lower odds of stating they would report a future crime than victims of violence.

Other variables were also, to a lesser extent, associated with reporting a future crime (see Appendix B, Table B7). It should be noted that this analysis explained approximately a quarter of the variance, and that therefore there are other factors which are not included in the analysis or not covered by the survey.

This shows that satisfaction was the strongest factor associated with willingness to report a crime in future. The other two factors which were strongly associated with whether victims stated they would report a future crime to the police were both case characteristic variables, not process factors. However, as process factors are strongly associated with satisfaction, it is likely that this is why they have not come up separately as strong associations in this model.

In the model which did not include the satisfaction variable, three information provision variables were strongly associated with whether victims were willing to report a future crime to the police, along with case outcome and crime type (although case outcome had the strongest association). These were:

- how long after first contact with the police before the victim heard anything further about the progress of their case.
- being given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case .
- being made aware of how to complain about the service they received.

As these were strongly associated with satisfaction, the inclusion of the satisfaction variable in the model leads to these no longer being strongly associated with willingness to engage with the CJS in future.

7.2 Witnesses

Overall, almost all (92 per cent) witnesses said that if they witnessed the same type of crime in future they would report it to the police, with four per cent stating they would not, and three per cent replying that it would depend on the circumstances.

This varied by the outcome of the case, with witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction – both guilty pleas and contested trials with a guilty verdict (both 94 per cent) – more likely to report a future incident to the police than witnesses involved in contested trials with a not guilty verdict (80 per cent) or dropped or written off cases (84 per cent).

Witnesses who attended court were slightly less likely to say they would report a future incident to the police than witnesses who had not attended court (88 per cent compared with 94 per cent). Also, witnesses who were asked to give evidence – both those who gave evidence (88 per cent) and those who did not (89 per cent) – were slightly less likely to say they would report a future incident to the police than witnesses who were not asked to give evidence in court (95 per cent). As for victims, this is again likely to be partly driven by the outcome of case (see Table 7.4).

Table 7.4: Proportions of witnesses who would report a future crime to the police, by case outcome and whether attended court and gave evidence, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages				
	Attended court	Did not attend court	Gave evidence	Asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so	Not asked to give evidence
Case outcome:					
Dropped/written off	74	84	83	77	85
Guilty plea	90	95	94	91	96
Contested trial – found guilty	91	96	91	92	96
Contested trial – found not guilty	77	85	77	75	89
All¹	88	94	87	90	95
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>4,909</i>	<i>11,578</i>	<i>2,367</i>	<i>5,082</i>	<i>9,038</i>

¹ Includes respondents who stated they did not know the case outcome

Witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were slightly less likely to say they would report a future incident to the police than those with no disability (86 per cent compared with 93 per cent). However, this is likely to be driven by other factors, as the following analysis shows that disability status is not strongly independently associated with whether witnesses stated they would report a future crime to the police.

Factors associated with whether witnesses were willing to report a future crime to the police

The survey asked 18,747 witnesses whether they would report a future crime to the police, with 92 per cent reporting that they would.

The findings indicated that the factors that are strongly independently associated with whether witnesses were willing to report a future crime to the police were:

- **Satisfaction:** Being satisfied with their contact with the CJS.
- **Case outcome:** Witnesses whose cases resulted in a conviction had higher odds of stating they would report a future crime than witnesses in contested trials where the defendant was acquitted.
- **Giving evidence:** Witnesses who were originally asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so had lower odds of stating they would report a future crime than witnesses who gave evidence in court.

Other variables were also associated with willingness to report a future crime to a lesser extent (see Appendix B, Table B8). It should be noted that this analysis explained approximately a fifth of the variance, and that therefore there are other factors which are not included in the analysis or not covered by the survey.

Reflecting the victims' analysis, satisfaction and case outcome were both strongly associated with whether a witness said they would report a future crime to the police. Interestingly, giving evidence is also associated with willingness to report in future for witnesses. This could be because many witnesses who were asked to give evidence but end up not doing so, attend court expecting to give evidence, and are only told on the day that their evidence is no longer needed. This could lead to them not being willing to participate in this way in future. Again, process factors were not strongly associated with willingness to engage with the CJS in future.

In the model which did not include the satisfaction variable, two information provision variables were strongly associated with whether witnesses said they would report a future crime to the police, along with case outcome and giving evidence (although case outcome had the strongest association). These were:

- how long after first contact with the police before the witness heard anything further about the progress of their case.
- being made aware of how to complain about the service they received.

However, as these were strongly associated with satisfaction, the inclusion of the satisfaction variable in the model leads to these no longer being strongly associated with willingness to report a future crime.

7.3 Giving evidence again

WAVES asked all those who gave evidence in relation to their case whether they would agree to be a court witness again if they were asked. Overall, two thirds (67 per cent) of victims and witnesses who gave evidence said that they were likely to agree to give evidence again in future, with a sixth (16 per cent) replying they were not likely to do so, and a sixth (16 per cent) replying that it would depend on the circumstances of the case.

Victims and witnesses who gave evidence in theft and handling stolen goods cases (80 per cent) were significantly more likely to agree to give evidence again than those involved in violence (64 per cent) and criminal damage (66 per cent) cases. Sixty-five per cent of victims and witnesses involved in burglary cases reported that they would give evidence again in future if asked, but this was not statistically significantly different from the theft proportion.

This also varied by the outcome of the case with victims and witnesses who gave evidence in a case which resulted in a conviction more likely to agree to give evidence again than those whose cases did not result in a conviction. Three-quarters (74 per cent) of victims and witnesses whose cases resulted in a conviction stated that they would agree to give evidence again in future compared with half (49 per cent) of victims and witnesses whose cases were dropped, written off, or contested trials which resulted in a not guilty verdict.

Male victims and witnesses were slightly more likely to state that they would agree to evidence again in a future trial than females (70 per cent compared with 63 per cent). Also, victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were slightly less likely to say they would agree to give evidence again than those with no disability (56 per cent compared with 68 per cent).

Factors associated with whether victims and witnesses stated they would give evidence again

The survey asked all those who gave evidence in court (n=4,358) whether they would agree to be a court witness again in future, with 67 per cent reporting that they would.

The findings indicated that the factors that are strongly independently associated with whether victims and witnesses said they would give evidence again were:

- **Satisfaction:** Being satisfied with their contact with the CJS.
- **Case outcome:** Those whose cases resulted in a conviction had higher odds of stating they would give evidence again than those whose cases were dropped or written off.
- **Intimidation:** Those who did not feel intimidated by an individual during the criminal justice process had higher odds of stating they would give evidence again than those who did feel intimidated.
- **Social grade:** Those in Group E (casual/low grade workers, pensioners, unemployed, etc) have lower odds of stating they would give evidence again than victims and witnesses in all other social grades except Group C2 (skilled manual workers).
- **Crime type:** Those involved in theft cases had higher odds of stating they would give evidence again than those involved in burglary cases.
- **Ethnicity:** White, Mixed and Chinese/other ethnicity victims and witnesses had higher odds of stating they would give evidence again in future than Asian victims and witnesses.

Other variables were also associated with willingness to give evidence again to a lesser extent (see Appendix B, Table B9). It should be noted that this analysis explained approximately a quarter of the variance.

In line with the previous victims and witnesses analyses, satisfaction and case outcome were both strongly associated with whether those who gave evidence in court were willing to give evidence again in future. Not feeling intimidated by an individual, and crime type, were also strongly associated. However, differing from all previous analyses, two socio-demographic variables – social grade and ethnicity – were also strongly associated with willingness to give evidence again in future. However the addition of social grade increased the variance explained by the model by less than two per cent, and the addition of ethnicity increased it by just over one per cent.

In the model which did not include the satisfaction variable, two further variables were strongly associated with being willing to give evidence again, along with case outcome, feeling intimidated, crime type, social grade and ethnicity. These were:

- Receiving the *Witness in Court* leaflet: Those who recalled receiving a leaflet had higher odds of stating they would give evidence again than those who stated they did not receive a leaflet.
- Thinking court staff were helpful: Those who thought the court staff were helpful had higher odds of stating they would give evidence again than those who stated they thought the court staff were unhelpful.

Receiving the *Witness in Court* leaflet and thinking court staff were helpful were both strongly associated with satisfaction with the CJS of those who attended court, which explains why the inclusion of the satisfaction variable in the model leads to them no longer being strongly associated with willingness to give evidence again.

The analysis shows that the factors that are strongly independently associated with whether victims and witnesses state they would not give evidence again were:

- **Satisfaction:** Being dissatisfied with their contact with the CJS.
- **Case outcome:** Those whose cases did not result in a conviction (both cases which were dropped or written off and contested trials where the defendant was acquitted) had higher odds of stating they would not give evidence again than those in contested trials where the defendant was convicted.
- **Intimidation:** Feeling intimidated by an individual during the criminal justice process.
- **Ethnicity:** Asian victims and witnesses had higher odds of stating they would not give evidence again in future than White victims and witnesses.
- **Leaflet:** Not receiving the *Witness in Court* leaflet.

Other variables were also associated with willingness to give evidence again in future to a lesser extent, (see Appendix B, Table B10). It should be noted that this analysis explained approximately a quarter of the variance.

Reflecting the model examining whether victims and witnesses who gave evidence in court stated they would give evidence again in future, satisfaction, case outcome, feeling intimidated and ethnicity were also strongly associated with whether victims and witnesses stated they would not give evidence again in future. Not receiving the witness in court leaflet was also strongly associated in this model, reflecting the previous model which did not include the satisfaction variable.

Excluding the satisfaction variable in this model led to one further variable being strongly associated with not being willing to give evidence again in future, along with case outcome, feeling intimidated, ethnicity and not receiving the leaflet. This was thinking the court staff were unhelpful.

7.4 Summary

Overall, the victims and witnesses interviewed for WAVES are generally positive about their experiences, with the majority reporting that they would participate in the CJS process again in future, if necessary.

Willingness to engage in future varies for different types of victims and witnesses, most notably by case outcome with those involved in cases which resulted in a conviction more likely to say they would engage with the CJS again.

Victims and witnesses who had a greater level of participation in their case (either by attending court or giving evidence) were slightly less likely to say they would engage with the CJS again in future, although this is likely to be partly driven by case outcome. They were no less satisfied with their contact with the CJS and information provision.

Victims and witnesses with a disability which limited their activities were less likely to say they would engage with the CJS in future. As disability was not strongly associated with future engagement in the multivariate analysis, this suggests that the apparent differences found in the bivariate analysis are due to other underlying factors such as the case profile of respondents with a disability. For example, they are more likely to be victims than witnesses, and more likely to be involved in violence cases than those without a disability, and victims generally report less positive views than witnesses, as do those involved in cases of violence.

The findings from the logistic regression analyses suggest that keeping victims and witnesses satisfied with their contact with the CJS is likely to encourage them to participate with the CJS in future. The previous chapter showed that providing information to victims and witnesses was strongly associated with higher levels of satisfaction, suggesting that information provision is again important. However, case characteristics appeared to have a stronger association with future engagement than they did with satisfaction. In addition, some socio-demographic variables had a strong association with whether victims and witnesses stated they would give evidence again in future. This indicates that whether victims and witnesses are willing to engage with the CJS in future is at least in part related to factors

outside the control of CJS agencies and staff. However, as stated above, as satisfaction is the strongest factor associated with willingness to engage with the CJS in future, and satisfaction itself is strongly associated with the information and service a victim or witness received during the case, then receiving a good service is likely to encourage them to participate with the CJS in future.

It should be noted that these future engagement models explained only a quarter or a fifth of the variance (see above and Appendix tables), indicating that there are other factors which are not included in the analysis or not covered by the survey which may be important.

8. Conclusions

The Witness and Victim Experience Survey (WAVES) provides detailed information on the experiences and perceptions of victims and prosecution witnesses involved in cases of violence, burglary, criminal damage and theft and handling stolen goods, which resulted in a criminal charge. WAVES does not include all crime types and excludes victims and witnesses aged under 18.

Overall, a large majority of victims and witnesses taking part in WAVES 2009–10 said they were satisfied with various aspects of their CJS experience, as follows:

- 84 per cent were satisfied with their overall contact with the CJS.
- 85 per cent were satisfied with the information they were given about the criminal justice process.
- 79 per cent were satisfied with how well they were kept informed of the progress of their case.
- 91 per cent were satisfied with the way they were treated by CJS staff.

There has been a slight, steady increase in these figures since the WAVES survey began, with satisfaction with overall CJS contact increasing from 81 per cent in 2007–08.

Satisfaction varied by case characteristics, with victims and those involved in cases which resulted in an acquittal or were dropped or written off slightly less likely to report being satisfied than witnesses and those involved in cases which resulted in a conviction.

Demographic factors were on the whole not related to differing perceptions of satisfaction, other than disability status. Respondents who reported having a disability which limited their activities were more likely to be victims, and to be involved in violence crimes than respondents with no disability. This suggests that some of the differences between disabled and non-disabled victims and witnesses may be partly explained by the types of cases that they are involved in.

Multivariate analysis was conducted to examine what were the key factors associated with satisfaction. This suggested that the strongest factors associated with satisfaction were related to processes, namely keeping victims and witnesses informed. The outcome of the case was also strongly associated with satisfaction. No demographic variables were strongly

associated with satisfaction, suggesting that the apparent differences between disabled and non-disabled respondents are due to other factors.

Victims and witnesses had differing experiences and perceptions of processes, that is the services and information they received from the CJS, such as receiving leaflets and having contact with a Witness Care Officer, dependent on whether they were a victim or a witness, case outcome and crime type. For example:

- Victims and witnesses of theft and handling stolen goods crimes were somewhat less likely to recall certain experiences (for example, receiving leaflets, making a Victim Personal Statement) than victims and witnesses of other crime types covered by WAVES.
- Victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in an acquittal or were dropped or written off generally had less positive experiences and perceptions than victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction. For example, they were less likely to recall receiving certain services or information, such as leaflets or the opportunity to make Victim Personal Statements.

Again, some experiences and perceptions also varied by disability status. However, these apparent differences are likely to be due, at least in part, to underlying case characteristics.

The majority (83 per cent) of victims and witnesses who knew what the case outcome was thought it was fair. This varied by what the outcome was, with victims and witnesses involved in cases which resulted in a conviction far more likely to think the outcome was fair than those involved in cases resulting in an acquittal, or dropped or written off cases.

A large majority of victims and witnesses stated that they would report a future incident to the police if a similar crime occurred (90 per cent of victims and 92 per cent of witnesses). Of those who gave evidence, two-thirds (67 per cent) said that they would agree to give evidence again in future, with a sixth reporting that it would depend on the circumstances of the case. A sixth (16 per cent) said they were not likely to agree to give evidence again in future, suggesting that more could be done to support victims and witnesses who give evidence, and manage their expectations.

Willingness to engage with the CJS in future varied by case characteristics, such as crime type, case outcome and level of participation in the case. For example, victims and witnesses of violence and criminal damage crimes were slightly less likely to say that they would report a future crime or give evidence again than other crime types. Those involved in cases which

resulted in a conviction were more likely to say they would engage with the CJS again in future. Among victims and witnesses whose cases resulted in an acquittal or were dropped or written off, those who had attended court or given evidence were less likely to say they would engage with the CJS in future than those who had not. This suggests that victims and witnesses may regard participating in the process as too burdensome if the outcome is not satisfactory to them, and consideration should be given to how outcomes are explained to victims and witnesses.

Multivariate analysis was conducted to examine the key factors associated with willingness to engage with the CJS in future. This suggested that the strongest factors associated with willingness to engage with the CJS in future were satisfaction with contact with the CJS and case outcome. As satisfaction itself is strongly associated with process factors, this suggests that information provision should be considered as important to willingness to participate in the CJS in future as it is to satisfaction. The results indicate that case outcome may have a greater influence on willingness to engage in future than it does on satisfaction.

These findings confirm previous research in showing that different groups of victims and witnesses have different experiences and different levels of satisfaction (particularly that victims are less likely to be satisfied or report a future crime to the police), and that processes are strongly associated with satisfaction with the CJS. However, the association between process factors and willingness to engage with the CJS in future does not appear to be as strong.

8.1 Recommendations

Overall, this research suggests that the current high levels of victim and witness satisfaction can be maintained by CJS agencies continuing to provide a good service to victims and witnesses, particularly in relation to information provision. The findings also suggest that more could be done to manage victims' and witnesses' expectations and to explain outcomes to them.

- Although the outcome of the case is important in how victims and witnesses felt about their experiences of the CJS, process factors are more important, particularly in relation to information provision. CJS agencies should therefore continue to provide information and support to victims and witnesses to ensure they are satisfied with their contact with the CJS, regardless of the outcome of the case.

- However, as the outcome of the case is important, particularly in relation to willingness to engage with the CJS in future, CJS agencies should continue providing explanations of the outcome, and where relevant the sentence, to victims and witnesses, and consider how to manage victims' and witnesses' expectations.
- Although case and demographic characteristics, such as crime type and disability status, do not appear to directly affect levels of satisfaction, they can enable CJS practitioners to identify groups of victims and witnesses who may benefit from additional support. For example, disabled victims and witnesses and victims and witnesses of violence crimes could benefit from additional support, as they are often involved in cases which require them to attend court or give evidence.
- The existence and purpose of the Victim Personal Statement (VPS) scheme should be better communicated to victims when they are making their evidence statements, so they realise they are being offered the opportunity to make a VPS to explain the impact that the crime had on them. Currently less than half of victims (43 per cent) recall being offered this opportunity.

References

Angle, H., Malam, S. and Carey, C. (2003) *Witness Satisfaction: findings from the Witness Satisfaction Survey 2002*. Home Office Online Report 19/03. London: Crown.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100418065544/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/onlinepubs1.html>

Hamlyn, B., Phelps, A., Turtle, J. and Sattar, G. (2004) *Are special measures working? Evidence from surveys of vulnerable and intimidated witnesses*. Home Office Research Study 283. London: Crown.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100418065544/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/hors2004.html>

Ipsos MORI (unpublished) *Witness and Victim Experience Survey Technical Report: cases closed in 2009–10*.

Ministry of Justice (2011) *Criminal Justice Statistics: Quarterly update to December 2010*. Ministry of Justice Statistics bulletin. London: Crown.

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/statistics-and-data/criminal-justice/criminal-justice-statistics.htm>

Moore, L. and Blakeborough, L. (2008) *Early findings from WAVES: information and service provision*. Ministry of Justice Research Series 11/08. London: Crown.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/witness-victim-experience-survey.htm>

Moorhead, R., Sefton, M. and Scanlan, L. (2008) *Just Satisfaction? What drives public and participant satisfaction with courts and tribunals*. Ministry of Justice Research Series 5/08. London: Crown.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/research270308.htm>

Office for Criminal Justice Reform (2005) *The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime*.

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+www.direct.gov.uk/en/CrimeJusticeAndTheLaw/TheJudicialSystem/DG_066863

Office for Criminal Justice Reform (2007) *The Witness Charter: Our promise to you*.

<http://www.norfolk.police.uk/safetyadvice/victimandwitnesssupport/witnesscharter.aspx>

Ringham, L. and Salisbury, H. (2004) *Support for victims of crime: findings from the 2002/2003 British Crime Survey*. Home Office Online Report 31/04. London: Crown.

<http://library.npia.police.uk/docs/hordsolr/rdsolr3104.pdf>

Roberts, J.V. and Manikis M (2011) *Victim Personal Statements: A Review of Empirical Research*.

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/press-releases/victims-com/vc-pressrelease311011a.htm>

Tyler, T.R. and Huo, Y.J. (2002) *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Whitehead, E. (2001) *Witness satisfaction: findings from the Witness Satisfaction Survey 2000*. Home Office Research Study 230. London: Crown.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100418065544/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/hors2001.html>

Appendix A

Survey methodology and respondent profile

Survey coverage

The Witness and Victim Experience Survey (WAVES) was introduced in 2004. Its purpose was to provide data at both a national (England and Wales) level and Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) level about victims' and witnesses' experiences of the Criminal Justice System (CJS), the services they receive, and their satisfaction with different aspects of the system, in cases that resulted in a defendant being charged.

Victims and prosecution witnesses (aged 18 and over) in England and Wales were asked about different aspects of their experience with the CJS – from their first contact with the police to their experience at court. Questions covered giving a statement to the police, information on case progression, experience at court and of giving evidence where relevant, and perceptions of and satisfaction with different aspects of the CJS. Interviews were conducted via telephone by trained interviewers.

WAVES covered victims and witnesses involved in cases where a defendant was charged, irrespective of the final outcome of the case. Therefore, victims and witnesses involved in dropped or written off cases, guilty plea cases, and contested trials at both magistrates' courts and the Crown Court were included – both those who did, and who did not, attend or give evidence in court. Respondents were interviewed after their case was closed, that is, after a final outcome had been reached (be it a conviction, a not guilty verdict or charges dropped).

The survey covered the following offence categories: violence against the person (excluding crimes that resulted in a fatality and domestic violence), robbery, burglary, theft and handling stolen goods, and criminal damage. Victims and witnesses involved in cases of a very sensitive or serious nature, such as offences that involved a fatality, sexual offences, domestic violence, and cases where the defendant was a member of the respondent's household, were excluded from the survey, largely because a telephone methodology was not deemed to be an appropriate way to approach or interview them. Police officers and other CJS officials assaulted in the line of duty were excluded, as were all police or other expert witnesses.

Sampling

As there is no national database of victims and witnesses, the sampling frame was compiled quarterly by aggregating local data held by LCJBs. In most areas, this involved LCJBs extracting details of eligible victims and witnesses from the Witness Management System, an administrative database, and cleaning the extracted details, removing invalid cases and adding contact details where missing. The few LCJBs who did not use the Witness Management System instead extracted this information from other local systems. Both methods produced lists which contained the total population of eligible victims and witnesses in an area (that is, those aged over 18 in the included offence categories as outlined above). LCJBs then securely submitted their lists of victims and witnesses to the contractor. The contractors then selected a sample for each area. This process was repeated each quarter, to cover cases closed by the CJS in the preceding quarter.

Interviewing

Victims and witnesses who had been selected from the sampling frame were sent an opt-out letter explaining the aims of the survey, what the interview would involve, and giving them the opportunity to opt out of the survey at that point before an interviewer contacted them.

Victims and witnesses who did not have a telephone number listed on the sampling frame were sent an opt-in letter instead, enabling them to provide their telephone number if they wished to take part in the survey. Victims and witnesses who opted out, or did not reply to the opt-in letter, were removed from the selected samples before fieldwork began. Telephone interviewers then attempted to contact the remaining victims and witnesses on the samples.

Weighting

WAVES was designed to provide robust national and local data for both victims and witnesses. In order to gain robust local data, approximately 800 victims and witnesses were interviewed in most LCJBs each year (with victims and witnesses being interviewed in approximately equal numbers). However, a greater number of victims and witnesses were interviewed in four LCJBs, to reflect the higher caseloads of these areas. These were:

- London (approximately 4,000 victims and witnesses interviewed each year).
- Greater Manchester and West Midlands (approximately 1,600 victims and witnesses interviewed each year).
- West Yorkshire (approximately 1,200 victims and witnesses interviewed each year).

As victims and witnesses were not interviewed in their correct proportions within and across LCJBs, design weights were used to correct for this and enable findings to reflect victim and witness proportions both within each LCJB and across England and Wales. For example, Merseyside has a greater caseload, and therefore a greater number of victims and witnesses than Gloucestershire, and its results are therefore given a greater weight. The weighting process ensures that the weighted distribution of respondents matches the known distribution of victims and witnesses.

Response rates

Table A1 shows a detailed breakdown of the response rates for WAVES for cases closed in 2009–10.

Table A1: WAVES response rates for cases closed in 2009–10

Pre-fieldwork stage	
Proportion opting out prior to fieldwork	7%
Proportion that did not opt out	93%
Fieldwork stage	
Sampled leads (uploaded by telephone centre)	115,291
Unknown eligibility (due to no contact, etc)	42,349
Total screened (i.e, total contacted by telephone centre) (total sampled leads – unknown eligibility) of which:	72,942
Ineligible	10,456
Eligible	62,486
of which:	
Total refusals	24,707
Total interviews	37,779
Response rates	
Unadjusted response rate (interviews/total sampled leads)	33%
Eligibility rate (total eligible/total screened)	86%
Adjusted response rate (interviews/(total sampled leads and assumed to be eligible))*proportion not opting out	36%

The unadjusted response rate shows how many successful interviews were obtained as a proportion of all sampled leads uploaded (and therefore exhausted) by the telephone centre. This response rate is 33 per cent. It does not take into account whether leads were eligible to take part in WAVES, and as such, a high proportion of ineligible leads sent by LCJB areas

(but not picked up and excluded at the sample cleaning process) results in a lower response rate.

The adjusted response rate corrects for the fact that some leads uploaded to the telephone centre are not eligible to take part in WAVES and that some leads opt out of the survey at the opt-out stage. As the eligibility of some of the sampled leads is unknown (due to them not being contacted during the fieldwork period), the total number of eligible cases is estimated based on the eligibility rate of cases which were contacted. The eligibility rate is calculated as the number of leads known to be eligible (refusals, abandoned interviews, broken appointments and successful interviews), as a proportion of all leads whose eligibility is known (all eligible cases as well as cases screened out as ineligible). The unadjusted response rate is amended to take account of the eligibility rate. In addition, those who opted out before the fieldwork period should be classed as refusals and the response rate is also amended to take account of them. Overall the adjusted response rate is 36 per cent.

Non-response bias

Comparing the profile of the original sample with the profile of interviewed respondents suggests that there is a good match on the available information (other than the proportion of victims compared with witnesses, which differs deliberately due to the survey design). That is, the types of victims and witnesses who did respond to the survey are similar to those who did not respond to the survey in terms of case outcome, court type and crime type (see Table A2).

Table A2: Comparison of original sample profile and profile of interviewed respondents, WAVES 2009–10

Cases closed in:	Percentages							
	Apr–Jun 2009		Jul–Sep 2009		Oct–Dec 2009		Jan–Mar 2010	
	Sample profile	Inter-viewed	Sample profile	Inter-viewed	Sample profile	Inter-viewed	Sample profile	Inter-viewed
Victim/Witness status:								
Victim leads	32	51	32	52	32	50	32	48
Witness leads	68	49	68	48	68	50	68	52
Case outcome:								
Dropped case	8	6	10	7	9	7	9	7
Guilty plea	71	74	71	74	72	75	72	77
Contested – not guilty	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	5
Contested – guilty	7	8	8	8	8	10	8	8
Other/missing	8	7	6	5	6	3	5	3
Court type:								
Magistrates court	70	70	69	68	68	67	69	66
Crown court	29	30	30	31	29	33	30	33
Youth court	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	*
Offence type:								
Violence	42	41	43	42	44	42	45	42
Burglary	12	14	12	15	13	16	12	16
Criminal damage	14	15	14	14	13	13	13	13
Theft and handling	32	30	30	30	30	29	31	30

Source: Ipsos MORI.

Those who were contacted and refused to take part in the survey (non-respondents) were asked why they were unwilling to take part. The main reasons given were not being interested in the survey or not having enough time to participate, with over half of non-respondents stating these reasons. A further sixth of non-respondents stated that their experience was minimal or that they did not recall being a victim or witness recently. Only four per cent stated that they were unwilling to take part because they were unhappy with the police/CJS.

This suggests that non-respondents are similar to respondents. There is no evidence to suggest respondents and non-respondents would differ markedly in terms of their satisfaction with the CJS.

Respondent profile

The following tables give a further breakdown of the respondent profile.

Table A3: Case characteristics by demographics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed in 2009–10

	Weighted percentages								Unweighted base
	Gender		Age						
	Male	Female	18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+	
Victim/witness status									
Victims	44	39	39	38	42	43	47	54	19,032
Witnesses	56	61	61	62	58	57	53	46	18,747
Crime type									
Criminal damage	13	13	8	11	14	15	17	18	5,256
Theft and handling stolen goods	29	28	26	30	29	28	29	26	9,952
Burglary	13	15	6	10	14	16	20	26	5,225
Violence	45	44	59	48	42	41	34	30	17,206
Case outcome									
Dropped/written off case	8	9	9	9	8	8	6	6	19,632
Guilty plea	52	52	51	51	53	53	54	53	3,095
Contested trial – found not guilty	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	1,778
Contested trial – found guilty	30	30	30	30	30	30	31	30	11,466
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>21,930</i>	<i>15,843</i>	<i>6,796</i>	<i>8,183</i>	<i>9,077</i>	<i>7,693</i>	<i>4,209</i>	<i>1,740</i>	<i>37,779</i>

Excludes respondents where demographic or case characteristic information was missing/refused.

Table A3 (continued)

	Weighted percentages								Unweighted base
	Ethnicity					Disability status			
	White	Mixed	Black	Asian	Chinese /other	Non-disabled	Has disability which limits activities	Has disability which does not limit activities	
Victim/witness status									
Victims	41	45	47	47	51	40	56	44	19,032
Witnesses	59	55	53	53	49	60	44	56	18,747
Crime type									
Criminal damage	13	10	10	12	11	13	16	15	5,256
Theft and handling stolen goods	29	21	27	27	26	30	17	25	9,952
Burglary	14	11	10	9	14	13	14	14	5,225
Violence	44	58	52	50	48	44	52	46	17,206
Case outcome									
Dropped/written off case	8	10	10	11	8	8	9	8	19,632
Guilty plea	53	48	44	46	44	52	50	54	3,095
Contested trial – found not guilty	4	5	5	5	7	4	6	4	1,778
Contested trial – found guilty	30	31	34	31	34	30	30	29	11,466
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>33,347</i>	<i>613</i>	<i>1,015</i>	<i>1,888</i>	<i>634</i>	<i>32,434</i>	<i>3,494</i>	<i>1,722</i>	<i>37,779</i>

Excludes respondents where demographic or case characteristic information was missing/refused.

Table A3 shows that victim/witness status varied by demographic characteristics. For example:

- Male respondents were more likely to be victims than female respondents.
- White respondents were less likely to be victims than respondents in other ethnic groups.
- Older respondents were more likely to be victims than younger respondents.
- Respondents with a disability which limited their activities were more likely to be victims than non-disabled respondents and respondents with a disability which did not limit their activities.

The crime type also varied by some demographic characteristics, as follows:

- White respondents were less likely to be victims or witnesses of violence cases than respondents in other ethnic groups, and more likely to be victims or witnesses of burglary cases.
- Younger respondents were more likely to be victims or witnesses of violence, and less likely to be victims or witnesses of criminal damage and burglary cases, than older respondents.
- Respondents with a disability which limited their activities were more likely to be victims or witnesses of violence crimes, and less likely to be victims or witnesses of theft and handling stolen goods crimes than respondents without a disability which limited their activities.

The outcome of the case (as reported by respondents) did not vary markedly by demographic characteristics, other than White respondents were slightly more likely to be involved in cases which resulted in a guilty plea than other ethnic groups.

Table A4: Criminal Justice Process by Case Characteristics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed 2009–10

	Weighted percentages						Unweighted base
	Victim/witness status		Case outcome				
	Victims	Witnesses	Dropped/ written off case	Guilty plea	Contested trial – found not guilty	Contested trial – found guilty	
Case progress							
Case proceeded to trial/hearing	91	88	42	92	95	99	33,880
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	9	12	58	8	5	1	3,899
Court attendance							
Attended court	21	25	17	15	69	32	9,008
Did not attend court	70	62	75	27	26	67	24,872
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	9	12	8	58	5	1	3,899
Giving evidence							
Gave evidence	10	12	2	3	58	23	4,359
Asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so	23	27	31	22	16	20	9,419
Not asked to give evidence	58	49	60	17	22	57	20,102
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	9	12	8	58	5	1	3,899
Unweighted base	19,032	18,747	19,632	3,095	1,778	11,466	37,779

¹ Includes respondents who stated they did not know whether their case proceeded to trial/hearing or not.

Percentages exclude respondents where information is missing. These respondents are included in the unweighted bases.

Table A4 shows that whether a case proceeded to trial or hearing, or was dropped before reaching court, did not differ markedly by whether the respondent was a victim or witness. It did differ by the outcome of the case, with two-fifths (42 per cent) of respondents involved in dropped or written off cases reporting that their case was dropped or written off after it had proceeded to court for an initial hearing. A small proportion of cases which were not dropped or written off are listed in the table as having not proceeded to court. This is most likely due to administrative information on the case outcome being available for respondents who did not know whether their case proceeded to court.

Court attendance and giving evidence did vary by case characteristics, as follows:

- Witnesses were more likely to attend court and give evidence, or be called to give evidence but end up not doing so, than victims.
- Victims and witnesses involved in contested cases which resulted in a not guilty verdict were far more likely to attend court than others.

- Victims and witnesses involved in contested cases (particularly those which resulted in a not guilty verdict) were more likely to give evidence than those involved in dropped or written off cases, or cases which resulted in a guilty plea.

Table A5: Criminal justice process by demographics of those interviewed for WAVES in cases closed 2009–10

	Weighted percentages								<i>Unweighted base</i>
	Gender		Age						
	Male	Female	18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+	
Case progress									
Case proceeded to trial/hearing	88	89	88	87	89	90	91	92	33,880
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	12	11	12	13	11	10	9	8	3,899
Court attendance									
Attended court	24	23	26	24	24	24	20	18	9,008
Did not attend court	65	67	62	63	65	66	71	74	24,872
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	12	11	12	13	11	10	9	8	3,899
Giving evidence									
Gave evidence	12	10	12	11	12	11	9	9	4,359
Asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so	25	25	25	25	25	27	25	25	9,419
Not asked to give evidence	52	54	51	51	53	52	57	58	20,102
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	12	11	12	13	11	10	9	8	3,899
<i>Unweighted base</i>	<i>21,930</i>	<i>15,843</i>	<i>6,796</i>	<i>8,183</i>	<i>9,077</i>	<i>7,693</i>	<i>4,209</i>	<i>1,740</i>	<i>37,779</i>

¹ Includes respondents who stated they did not know whether their case proceeded to trial/hearing or not.

Excludes respondents where demographic or case characteristic information was missing/refused.

Table A5 (continued)

	Weighted percentages								<i>Unweighted base</i>
	Ethnicity					Disability status			
	White	Mixed	Black	Asian	Chinese /other	Non-disabled	Has disability which limits activities	Has disability which does not limit activities	
Case progress									
Case proceeded to trial/hearing	89	88	86	85	85	89	91	90	33,880
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	11	12	14	15	15	11	9	10	3,899
Court attendance									
Attended court	23	28	32	30	26	23	29	26	9,008
Did not attend court	67	60	54	55	60	66	62	65	24,872
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	11	12	14	15	15	11	9	10	3,899
Giving evidence									
Gave evidence	10	14	17	15	14	11	14	11	4,359
Asked to give evidence but ended up not doing so	25	25	25	26	23	25	29	27	9,419
Not asked to give evidence	54	49	45	44	48	53	48	52	20,102
Case did not proceed to trial/hearing ¹	11	12	14	15	15	11	9	10	3,899
<i>Unweighted base</i>	33,347	613	1,015	1,888	634	32,434	3,494	1,722	37,779

¹ Includes respondents who stated they did not know whether their case proceeded to trial/hearing or not.

Excludes respondents where demographic or case characteristic information was missing/refused

Table A5 shows that attendance at court varied by some demographic characteristics:

- Mixed, Black and Asian respondents were more likely to attend court than other ethnic groups. This is likely to be associated with the crime type of the case, as Mixed, Black and Asian respondents are more likely to be victims and witnesses of violence cases (Table A3 above) who in turn are more likely to attend court (Table A4 above).
- Younger respondents were more likely to attend court than older respondents. This again is likely to be associated with crime type.
- Respondents with a disability which limited their activities were more likely to attend court than respondents without a disability, again likely related to the crime type of the case.

Related to court attendance, Mixed, Black and Asian respondents, and younger respondents, were also more likely to give evidence at court.

Table A6 shows the proportion of victims and witnesses who were ‘completely’, ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ satisfied or dissatisfied with various aspects of their CJS experience.

Table A6: Victim and witness satisfaction with different aspects of their CJS experience, WAVES 2009–10

	Percentages							<i>Unweighted base</i>	
	Satisfied			Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied				
	Completely	Very	Fairly			Fairly	Very	Completely	
Whether satisfied with information given about the CJS process									
Victims	28	23	30	2	7	3	6	19,032	
Witnesses	34	26	28	2	5	2	3	18,747	
All	31	25	29	2	6	2	4	37,779	
Whether satisfied with how well kept informed of case progress									
Victims	28	25	23	2	8	5	8	19,032	
Witnesses	33	26	23	2	8	4	5	18,747	
All	31	25	23	2	8	4	6	37,779	
Whether satisfied with way treated by CJS staff									
Victims	36	31	21	2	3	2	4	19,032	
Witnesses	44	32	18	1	2	1	2	18,747	
All	41	31	19	2	2	1	3	37,779	
Whether satisfied with their contact with the CJS									
Victims	29	25	26	2	7	4	7	19,032	
Witnesses	36	27	23	2	5	2	3	18,747	
All	33	27	24	2	6	3	5	37,779	

Respondents who answered ‘don’t know’ are not shown in this table.

Appendix B

Multivariate analysis

Analysis

All analysis was conducted using weighted data. Unweighted bases – the number of respondents who answered each question – are shown in tables. Survey findings are subject to a margin of error. Findings were statistically tested at the five per cent significance level, and only differences which were statistically significant differences are referred to in the text. Design factors were calculated and used in statistical tests to correct for the fact that the survey design did not use a simple random sample.

Logistic regression analysis

Logistic regression analyses were carried out to explore which factors were independently associated with victim and witness satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their contact with the CJS, and with whether they would engage with the CJS again in future. This was to examine which factors had an independent relationship with the variables of interest, taking into account the effect of other variables/factors.

Forward stepwise logistic regression methods were used, as the analysis was exploratory rather than testing a theory. Six models were run to explore satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the CJS:

- Victim satisfaction with CJS contact
- Victim dissatisfaction with CJS contact
- Witness satisfaction with CJS contact
- Witness dissatisfaction with CJS contact
- Satisfaction with their contact with the CJS of those who attended court
- Dissatisfaction with their contact with the CJS of those who attended court

In addition, four models were run to explore willingness to engage with the CJS in future.

- Whether victims would report a future crime to the police
- Whether witnesses would report a future crime to the police
- Whether those who gave evidence would agree to give evidence again in future
- Whether those who gave evidence would not agree to give evidence again in future

Only questions which were asked of all respondents in the model were included in that model. That is, for example, the models of those who attended court included questions which were asked of all those who attended court. Many of these questions were not included in the victims and witnesses model, as they had not attended court, and therefore were not asked questions relating to court experience. There may be further factors that are associated with satisfaction or dissatisfaction, or future engagement, that are not included in these analyses or the WAVES questionnaire.

Data preparation

Prior to running the regression analyses, the data were prepared and many variables were recoded. The dependent variables for each model were recoded into binary variables. In addition, 'don't knows' and refusals were coded as missing (and therefore excluded from the analyses) unless they formed five per cent or more of the responses, in which case they were recoded into a single dump category.

The relationships between the dependent variable and the explanatory, independent variables were then explored (using crosstabs), and reference categories for each variable were selected such that the reference category was the least associated with the dependent variable. Correlations were then run, and multicollinearity tested for, to ensure that the independent variables were not highly correlated (none had an absolute correlation score greater than 0.4). NB: The other satisfaction questions asked in WAVES were excluded from these analyses, as it was felt that they were likely to be measuring the same thing as the dependent satisfaction variable.

The following tables show the models that were produced. Variables are listed in order of the strength of their association with the dependent variable (that is, in the order that they were included in the model). Variables which were found to be strongly associated with the dependent variable (that is, they explained more than one per cent of the total variance) are listed in a footnote to each table. Variables which were included in the analysis, but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable, are also listed in a footnote.

Table B1: Factors associated with victim satisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ^b	Confidence interval	Significance ^b
How long before victim heard anything further about their case progress			
Within a week	6.22	4.82 - 8.01	*
Between one week and a month	4.63	3.60 - 5.96	*
Between one and two months	2.44	1.86 - 3.21	*
Between two and six months	1.69	1.28 - 2.22	*
Over six months	1.33	0.90 - 1.98	
Don't know	3.26	2.33 - 4.57	*
<i>Heard nothing</i>	1.00		
Whether victim was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Not aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Aware of how to complain	2.99	2.61 - 3.42	*
Don't know	2.21	1.80 - 2.71	*
Whether victim was informed that someone had been charged with the offence			
<i>Not informed someone charged</i>	1.00		
Informed someone charged	2.20	1.84 - 2.62	*
Whether victim given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
<i>Not given name or number</i>	1.00		
Given name or number	2.38	2.11 - 2.67	*
Whether victim had been given a leaflet explaining what happens following reporting a crime			
<i>Not given leaflet</i>	1.00		
Given leaflet	1.58	1.40 - 1.77	*
Did not know	1.55	1.33 - 1.81	*
The outcome of the case			
<i>Charges dropped or written off</i>	1.00		
Guilty plea	1.84	1.53 - 2.22	*
Contested trial, found not guilty	1.01	0.75 - 1.35	
Contested trial, found guilty	2.06	1.67 - 2.53	*
Did not know	1.06	0.81 - 1.39	
Whether victim aware of <i>The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime</i>			
<i>Not aware of Code of Practice</i>	1.00		
Aware of Code of Practice	1.58	1.41 - 1.76	*
Did not know	1.19	0.94 - 1.52	
Disability			
Does not have a disability which limits activities	1.49	1.29 - 1.73	*
<i>Has a disability which limits activities</i>	1.00		
Whether victim recalled being offered the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement (VPS)			
<i>Not offered opportunity to make a VPS</i>	1.00		
Offered opportunity to make a VPS	1.45	1.30 - 1.62	*
Did not know	1.47	1.23 - 1.75	*
Whether victim had ever been a victim of crime before this incident			
Had not been a victim before	1.34	1.21 - 1.48	*
<i>Had been a victim before</i>	1.00		
Whether victim was informed that someone had been arrested for the offence			
<i>Not informed someone arrested</i>	1.00		
Informed someone arrested	1.45	1.21 - 1.72	*
Someone arrested at the scene	1.05	0.83 - 1.32	
Whether victim had special needs as a result of the crime			
<i>Did not have special needs</i>	1.00		
Had special needs	0.74	0.65 - 0.85	*

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Sex			
<i>Male</i>	1.00		
Female	1.29	1.16 - 1.43	*
Crime type			
<i>Criminal damage</i>	1.00		
Theft and handling stolen goods	1.35	1.15 - 1.58	*
Burglary	1.31	1.10 - 1.55	*
Violence	1.05	0.91 - 1.21	
Age			
18–24	1.44	1.22 - 1.70	*
25–34	1.10	0.95 - 1.26	
<i>35–44</i>	1.00		
45–54	1.07	0.93 - 1.23	
55–64	1.22	1.02 - 1.45	*
65 and over	1.32	1.03 - 1.69	*
Ethnicity			
White	0.96	0.73 - 1.25	
Asian	1.51	1.08 - 2.09	*
<i>Black</i>	1.00		
Mixed	1.10	0.71 - 1.71	
Chinese or other	0.97	0.62 - 1.50	
Whether victim perceived crime was motivated by an equality characteristic			
<i>Not motivated by an equality characteristic</i>	1.00		
Motivated by an equality characteristic	0.79	0.67 - 0.92	*
Did not know	0.65	0.48 - 0.90	*
Whether victim gave evidence in court			
<i>Case did not go to court</i>	1.00		
Case went to court but not called to give evidence	0.96	0.78 - 1.17	
Called to give evidence and gave evidence	1.21	0.93 - 1.57	
Called to give evidence but did not give evidence	1.10	0.89 - 1.36	
Constant	0.02		
Unweighted base	16,862		
Nagelkerke R square⁷	0.34		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (satisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): how long before heard anything further about case progress; whether made aware of how to complain; whether informed that someone had been charged; whether given the name or number of someone to contact; whether given a leaflet about what happens after reporting a crime; and case outcome.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: social grade; working status; whether attended court; and contact with Victim Support.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 34 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B2: Factors associated with victim dissatisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
How long before victim heard anything further about their case progress			
<i>Within a week</i>	1.00		
Between one week and a month	1.46	1.28 - 1.66	*
Between one and two months	2.63	2.22 - 3.12	*
Between two and six months	3.85	3.24 - 4.57	*
Over six months	4.94	3.56 - 6.87	*
Heard nothing further	5.90	4.61 - 7.55	*
Don't know	1.71	1.30 - 2.26	*
Whether victim given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
Not given name or number	2.37	2.10 - 2.67	*
<i>Given name or number</i>	1.00		
Whether victim was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Not aware of how to complain	2.84	2.46 - 3.28	*
Don't know	1.23	0.95 - 1.58	
Whether victim was informed that someone had been charged with the offence			
Not informed someone charged	2.00	1.68 - 2.37	*
<i>Informed someone charged</i>	1.00		
Whether victim recalled being offered the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement (VPS)			
<i>Offered opportunity to make a VPS</i>	1.00		
Not offered opportunity to make a VPS	1.53	1.36 - 1.72	*
Did not know	0.96	0.79 - 1.17	
Whether victim had been given a leaflet explaining what happens following reporting a crime			
<i>Given leaflet</i>	1.00		
Not given leaflet	1.58	1.40 - 1.79	*
Did not know	1.06	0.92 - 1.23	
The outcome of the case			
Charges dropped or written off	2.09	1.74 - 2.51	*
Guilty plea	1.22	1.07 - 1.38	*
Contested trial, found not guilty	1.88	1.47 - 2.40	*
<i>Contested trial, found guilty</i>	1.00		
Did not know	1.82	1.41 - 2.34	*
Whether victim aware of <i>The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime</i>			
<i>Aware of Code of Practice</i>	1.00		
Not aware of Code of Practice	1.59	1.41 - 1.79	*
Did not know	1.18	0.90 - 1.55	
Disability			
<i>Does not have a disability which limits activities</i>	1.00		
Has a disability which limits activities	1.45	1.25 - 1.69	*
Whether victim had ever been a victim of crime before this incident			
<i>Had not been a victim before</i>	1.00		
Had been a victim before	1.31	1.18 - 1.45	*
Whether victim was informed that someone had been arrested for the offence			
<i>Informed someone arrested</i>	1.00		
Not informed someone arrested	1.46	1.23 - 1.74	*
Someone arrested at the scene	1.31	1.09 - 1.58	*
Sex			
Male	1.28	1.15 - 1.42	*
<i>Female</i>	1.00		

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether victim had special needs as a result of the crime			
Did not have special needs	0.79	0.69 - 0.90	*
<i>Had special needs</i>	<i>1.00</i>		
Crime type			
Criminal damage	1.27	1.06 - 1.52	*
Theft and handling stolen goods	0.94	0.79 - 1.12	
<i>Burglary</i>	<i>1.00</i>		
Violence	1.20	1.03 - 1.40	*
Age			
18–24	0.98	0.74 - 1.30	
25–34	1.18	0.90 - 1.55	
35–44	1.34	1.03 - 1.75	*
45–54	1.26	0.96 - 1.64	
55–64	1.17	0.88 - 1.55	
<i>65 and over</i>	<i>1.00</i>		
Whether victim perceived crime was motivated by an equality characteristic			
Not motivated by an equality characteristic	0.73	0.52 - 1.01	
Motivated by an equality characteristic	0.92	0.64 - 1.32	
<i>Did not know</i>	<i>1.00</i>		
Ethnicity			
<i>White</i>	<i>1.00</i>		
Asian	0.68	0.54 - 0.85	*
Black	0.98	0.74 - 1.29	
Mixed	0.90	0.62 - 1.31	
Chinese or other	1.03	0.70 - 1.51	
Constant	0.02		
Unweighted base	16,862		
Nagelkerke R square⁷	0.33		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (dissatisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): how long before heard anything further about case progress; whether given the name or number of someone to contact; whether made aware of how to complain; whether informed that someone had been charged; whether offered the opportunity to make a VPS.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: social grade; working status; whether attended court; whether gave evidence; and contact with Victim Support.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being dissatisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 33 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B3: Factors associated with witness satisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether witness was informed that someone had been charged with the offence			
<i>Not informed someone charged</i>	1.00		
Informed someone charged	2.68	2.37 - 3.03	*
Whether witness given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
<i>Not given name or number</i>	1.00		
Given name or number	2.88	2.60 - 3.19	*
Whether witness was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Not aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Aware of how to complain	3.35	2.95 - 3.80	*
Don't know	3.24	2.63 - 4.00	*
How long before witness heard anything further about their case progress			
Within a week	3.77	3.07 - 4.63	*
Between one week and a month	2.53	2.11 - 3.05	*
Between one and two months	1.69	1.39 - 2.05	*
Between two and six months	1.28	1.06 - 1.55	*
Over six months	0.96	0.74 - 1.26	
Don't know	1.64	1.28 - 2.11	*
<i>Heard nothing</i>	1.00		
The outcome of the case			
<i>Charges dropped or written off</i>	1.00		
Guilty plea	1.67	1.42 - 1.97	*
Contested trial, found not guilty	1.05	0.82 - 1.35	
Contested trial, found guilty	2.03	1.69 - 2.45	*
Did not know	1.04	0.85 - 1.29	
Disability			
Does not have a disability which limits activities	1.70	1.42 - 2.03	*
<i>Has a disability which limits activities</i>	1.00		
Crime type			
Criminal damage	1.21	1.02 - 1.42	*
Theft and handling stolen goods	1.53	1.36 - 1.71	*
Burglary	1.14	0.96 - 1.36	
<i>Violence</i>	1.00		
Age			
18–24	1.32	1.13 - 1.53	*
25–34	1.42	1.23 - 1.64	*
35–44	1.01	0.88 - 1.16	
<i>45–54</i>	1.00		
55–64	1.23	1.02 - 1.48	*
65 and over	1.57	1.16 - 2.11	*
Whether witness had special needs as a result of the crime			
<i>Did not have special needs</i>	1.00		
Had special needs	0.73	0.57 - 0.92	*
Ethnicity			
White	1.64	1.20 - 2.26	*
Asian	1.60	1.09 - 2.33	*
Black	1.61	1.06 - 2.45	*
<i>Mixed</i>	1.00		
Chinese or other	1.88	1.13 - 3.14	*

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether victim gave evidence in court			
<i>Case did not go to court</i>	1.00		
Case went to court but not called to give evidence	1.24	1.06 - 1.45	*
Called to give evidence and gave evidence	1.27	1.02 - 1.59	*
Called to give evidence but did not give evidence	1.26	0.95 - 1.33	
Social grade			
A	0.92	0.38 - 1.21	
B	1.15	0.94 - 1.41	
C1	1.06	0.88 - 1.27	
C2	1.21	0.99 - 1.47	
D	1.22	0.99 - 1.50	
E	1.00		
Constant	0.07		
Unweighted base	16,826		
Nagelkerke R square⁷	0.29		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (satisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): whether informed that someone had been charged; whether given the name or number of someone to contact; whether made aware of how to complain; how long before heard anything further about case progress; and case outcome.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex; working status; and whether attended court.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 29 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B4: Factors associated with witness dissatisfaction with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether witness was informed that someone had been charged with the offence			
<i>Informed someone charged</i>	1.00		
Not informed someone charged	2.79	2.46 - 3.16	*
Whether witness given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
<i>Given name or number</i>	1.00		
Not given name or number	2.79	2.50 - 3.11	*
Whether witness was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Not aware of how to complain	3.40	2.95 - 3.92	*
Don't know	0.93	0.71 - 1.22	
How long before witness heard anything further about their case progress			
<i>Within a week</i>	1.00		
Between one week and a month	1.57	1.31 - 1.88	*
Between one and two months	2.42	1.99 - 2.94	*
Between two and six months	3.24	2.68 - 3.92	*
Over six months	4.33	3.31 - 5.67	*
Heard nothing	3.24	2.60 - 4.05	*
Don't know	2.30	1.77 - 2.99	*
The outcome of the case			
Charges dropped or written off	2.13	1.78 - 2.56	*
Guilty plea	1.21	1.06 - 1.38	*
Contested trial, found not guilty	2.09	1.69 - 2.58	*
<i>Contested trial, found guilty</i>	1.00		
Did not know	2.06	1.68 - 2.52	*
Disability			
<i>Does not have a disability which limits activities</i>	1.00		
Has a disability which limits activities	1.85	1.55 - 2.21	*
Crime type			
Criminal damage	1.21	1.00 - 1.46	*
<i>Theft and handling stolen goods</i>	1.00		
Burglary	1.33	1.09 - 1.62	*
Violence against the person	1.65	1.46 - 1.86	*
Age			
18–24	1.18	0.84 - 1.64	
25–34	1.05	0.76 - 1.46	
35–44	1.49	1.08 - 2.06	*
45–54	1.60	1.16 - 2.21	*
55–64	1.35	0.95 - 1.90	
<i>65 and over</i>	1.00		
Whether witness had special needs as a result of the crime			
<i>Had special needs</i>	1.00		
Did not have special needs	0.64	0.50 - 0.82	*

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Ethnicity			
<i>White</i>	1.00		
Asian	1.03	0.81 - 1.31	
Black	1.26	0.95 - 1.68	
Mixed	1.73	1.24 - 2.42	*
Chinese or other	0.72	0.45 - 1.15	
Constant	0.01		
Unweighted base	16,826		
Nagelkerke R square⁷	0.28		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (dissatisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): whether informed that someone had been charged; whether given the name or number of someone to contact; whether made aware of how to complain; how long before heard anything further about case progress; and case outcome.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex; social grade; and working status.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being dissatisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 28 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B5: Factors associated with satisfaction of those who attended court to give evidence with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether given a leaflet on giving evidence in court			
<i>Not given leaflet</i>	1.00		
Given leaflet	1.91	1.53 - 2.39	*
Did not know	1.30	0.96 - 1.76	
Whether was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Not aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Aware of how to complain	3.15	2.48 - 4.02	*
Don't know	2.78	1.76 - 4.39	*
Whether felt safe in the court waiting room			
Felt safe	2.67	1.99 - 3.59	*
Neither felt safe or unsafe	0.77	0.42 - 1.41	
<i>Felt unsafe</i>	1.00		
Whether was informed that someone had been charged with the offence			
<i>Not informed someone charged</i>	1.00		
Informed someone charged	2.41	1.85 - 3.15	*
Whether felt intimidated by an individual during the process			
<i>Felt intimidated</i>	1.00		
Did not feel intimidated	1.97	1.63 - 2.40	*
Whether Witness Care Officer talked to them about going to court			
Witness Care Officer did talk to them	1.53	1.26 - 1.87	*
<i>Witness Care Officer did not talk to them</i>	1.00		
The outcome of the case			
<i>Charges dropped or written off</i>	1.00		
Guilty plea	2.17	1.51 - 3.10	*
Contested trial, found not guilty	1.23	0.85 - 1.78	
Contested trial, found guilty	2.20	1.55 - 3.12	*
Did not know	1.48	0.80 - 2.75	
Whether thought court staff were helpful			
Thought court staff were helpful	2.08	1.25 - 3.46	*
Mixed – thought some helpful, some not	0.94	0.54 - 1.64	
<i>Thought court staff were unhelpful</i>	1.00		
Whether given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
<i>Not given name or number</i>	1.00		
Given name or number	1.74	1.41 - 2.16	*
Whether was a victim or a witness			
<i>Victim</i>	1.00		
Witness	1.69	1.39 - 2.04	*
How long before heard anything further about their case progress			
Within a week	2.05	1.04 - 4.04	*
Between one week and a month	1.46	0.76 - 2.82	
Between one and two months	1.22	0.63 - 2.39	
Between two and six months	0.88	0.46 - 1.71	
Over six months	0.76	0.37 - 1.55	
Don't know	1.07	0.51 - 2.24	
<i>Heard nothing</i>	1.00		
Crime type			
Criminal damage	1.46	1.03 - 2.07	*
Theft and handling stolen goods	1.60	1.22 - 2.09	*
Burglary	1.99	1.25 - 3.17	*
<i>Violence</i>	1.00		

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether informed of the outcome of the case			
Informed of outcome/in court to hear verdict	1.87	1.36 - 2.58	*
<i>Not informed of outcome</i>	1.00		
Disability			
Does not have a disability which limits activities	1.69	1.28 - 2.22	*
<i>Has a disability which limits activities</i>	1.00		
Whether offered a court familiarisation visit before the trial			
Offered a visit	1.29	1.06 - 1.56	*
<i>Not offered a visit</i>	1.00		
Social grade			
A	0.76	0.44 - 1.32	
B	0.74	0.52 - 1.04	
C1	0.66	0.48 - 0.90	*
C2	0.86	0.62 - 1.21	
D	1.14	0.79 - 1.64	
E	1.00		
Whether given a witness expenses claim form			
Given expenses form	1.30	1.03 - 1.65	*
<i>Not given expenses form</i>	1.00		
Whether had contact with Witness Care Officer			
<i>Did not have contact</i>	1.00		
Had contact	1.19	0.98 - 1.45	
Did not know	0.76	0.50 - 1.16	
Whether watched the 'Going to Court' DVD			
Watched the DVD	1.45	1.06 - 1.98	*
Given opportunity to watch DVD but chose not to	0.94	0.74 - 1.19	
<i>Was not given opportunity to watch DVD</i>	1.00		
Constant			
	0.01		
Unweighted base			
	5,910		
Nagelkerke R square⁷			
	0.36		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (satisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): whether given *Witness in Court* leaflet; whether made aware of how to complain; whether felt safe in the waiting room; whether informed that someone had been charged; whether felt intimidated by an individual during the process; whether Witness Care Officer spoke to them about going to court; case outcome; whether thought court staff were helpful; and whether given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex; age; ethnicity; working status; whether had special needs as a result of the crime; whether actually gave evidence in court; whether informed of court date; whether had contact with the Witness Service; and whether waited in a separate room to the defence witnesses.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 36 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

**Table B6: Factors associated with dissatisfaction of those who attended court to give evidence with their contact with the CJS (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4}
WAVES 2009–10**

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether given a leaflet on giving evidence in court			
<i>Given leaflet</i>	1.00		
Not given leaflet	2.06	1.64 - 2.58	*
Did not know	1.47	1.11 - 1.95	*
Whether was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Not aware of how to complain	3.45	2.65 - 4.49	*
Don't know	1.09	0.62 - 1.92	
Whether felt safe in the court waiting room			
<i>Felt safe</i>	1.00		
Neither felt safe or unsafe	2.58	1.46 - 4.57	*
Felt unsafe	2.94	2.18 - 3.97	*
Whether was informed that someone had been charged with the offence			
<i>Informed someone charged</i>	1.00		
Not informed someone charged	2.31	1.76 - 3.04	*
Whether felt intimidated by an individual during the process			
Felt intimidated	2.08	1.71 - 2.54	*
<i>Did not feel intimidated</i>	1.00		
Whether Witness Care Officer talked to them about going to court			
<i>Witness Care Officer did talk to them</i>	1.00		
Witness Care Officer did not talk to them	1.59	1.30 - 1.96	*
The outcome of the case			
Charges dropped or written off	1.92	1.32 - 2.80	*
<i>Guilty plea</i>	1.00		
Contested trial, found not guilty	1.72	1.33 - 2.23	*
Contested trial, found guilty	0.94	0.75 - 1.19	
Did not know	1.57	0.89 - 2.79	
Whether thought court staff were helpful			
<i>Thought court staff were helpful</i>	1.00		
Mixed – thought some helpful, some not	2.17	1.66 - 2.84	*
Thought court staff were unhelpful	1.88	1.13 - 3.15	*
Whether given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
<i>Given name or number</i>	1.00		
Not given name or number	1.66	1.33 - 2.08	*
How long before heard anything further about their case progress			
<i>Within a week</i>	1.00		
Between one week and a month	1.49	1.11 - 2.00	*
Between one and two months	1.72	1.24 - 2.40	*
Between two and six months	2.55	1.86 - 3.49	*
Over six months	2.88	1.88 - 4.43	*
Heard nothing	2.23	1.11 - 4.44	*
Don't know	1.91	1.20 - 3.06	*
Whether was a victim or a witness			
Victim	1.61	1.32 - 1.97	*
<i>Witness</i>	1.00		
Crime type			
Criminal damage	1.15	0.73 - 1.80	
<i>Theft and handling stolen goods</i>	1.00		
Burglary	0.97	0.57 - 1.67	
Violence	1.72	1.29 - 2.30	*

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether offered a court familiarisation visit before the trial			
<i>Offered a visit</i>	1.00		
Not offered a visit	1.42	1.17 - 1.73	*
Whether informed of the outcome of the case			
<i>Informed of outcome/in court to hear verdict</i>	1.00		
Not informed of outcome	1.75	1.26 - 2.44	*
Disability			
Has a disability which limits activities	1.39	1.06 - 1.83	*
<i>Does not have a disability which limits activities</i>	1.00		
Whether had contact with Witness Care Officer			
<i>Had contact</i>	1.00		
Did not have contact	1.27	1.04 - 1.57	*
Did not know	1.44	0.92 - 2.24	
Constant	0.00		
Unweighted base	5,910		
Nagelkerke R square⁷	0.36		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (satisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): whether given *Witness in Court* leaflet; whether made aware of how to complain; whether felt safe in the waiting room; whether informed that someone had been charged; whether felt intimidated by an individual during the process; whether Witness Care Officer spoke to them about going to court; case outcome and whether thought court staff were helpful.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex; age; ethnicity; social grade; working status; whether had special needs as a result of the crime; whether actually gave evidence in court; whether informed of date of trial/hearing; whether watched 'Going to Court' DVD; whether had contact with the Witness Service; whether given witnesses expenses claim form; and whether waited in a separate room to the defence witnesses.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 36 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B7: Factors associated with whether a victim would report a future crime to the police (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether victim was satisfied with their contact with the CJS			
Satisfied	4.14	3.59 - 4.78	*
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1.61	1.14 - 2.25	*
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	1.00		
The outcome of the case			
Charges dropped or written off	1.09	0.82 - 1.45	
Guilty plea	3.22	2.54 - 4.09	*
<i>Contested trial, found not guilty</i>	1.00		
Contested trial, found guilty	3.79	2.96 - 4.87	*
Did not know	2.42	1.69 - 3.47	*
Crime type			
Criminal damage	0.78	0.66 - 0.92	*
Theft and handling stolen goods	1.22	1.03 - 1.46	*
Burglary	1.52	1.24 - 1.86	*
<i>Violence</i>	1.00		
How long before victim heard anything further about their case progress			
Within a week	1.59	1.21 - 2.10	*
Between one week and a month	1.32	1.01 - 1.73	*
Between one and two months	1.13	0.84 - 1.53	
Between two and six months	1.14	0.85 - 1.53	
Over six months	0.87	0.56 - 1.33	
Don't know	1.18	0.79 - 1.74	
<i>Heard nothing</i>	1.00		
Whether victim attended court			
<i>Case did not go to court</i>	1.00		
Victim attended court	0.55	0.43 - 0.71	*
Victim did not attend court	0.88	0.71 - 1.10	
Whether victim recalled being offered the opportunity to make a Victim Personal Statement (VPS)			
<i>Not offered opportunity to make a VPS</i>	1.00		
Offered opportunity to make a VPS	1.27	1.10 - 1.46	*
Did not know	0.91	0.74 - 1.12	
Whether victim was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Not aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Aware of how to complain	1.40	1.20 - 1.64	*
Don't know	1.16	0.90 - 1.49	
Sex			
<i>Male</i>	1.00		
Female	1.41	1.23 - 1.62	*
Whether victim was informed that someone had been arrested for the offence			
<i>Not informed someone arrested</i>	1.00		
Informed someone arrested	1.45	1.21 - 1.75	*
Someone arrested at the scene	1.40	1.07 - 1.83	*
Working status			
Full time	1.25	1.02 - 1.53	
Part time	1.08	0.84 - 1.40	
<i>Unemployed</i>	1.00		
Retired	2.21	1.55 - 313	*
Looking after house/children	0.90	0.63 - 1.29	
Student	1.26	0.87 - 1.82	
Invalid/disabled	1.52	1.07 - 2.16	*

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether victim had been given a leaflet explaining what happens following reporting a crime			
<i>Not given leaflet</i>	1.00		
Given leaflet	1.30	1.13 - 1.51	*
Did not know	1.21	1.00 - 1.47	
Disability			
Does not have a disability which limits activities	1.34	1.10 - 1.64	*
<i>Has a disability which limits activities</i>	1.00		
Whether victim given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
<i>Not given name or number</i>	1.00		
Given name or number	1.24	1.07 - 1.44	*
Whether victim perceived crime to be motivated by an equality characteristic			
Not motivated by an equality characteristic	1.25	1.04 - 1.49	*
<i>Motivated by an equality characteristic</i>	1.00		
Did not know	1.03	0.68 - 1.58	
Constant	0.22		
Unweighted base Nagelkerke R square⁷	16,748	0.23	

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (would report a future crime to the police). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): satisfaction with contact with CJS; case outcome and crime type.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: age; ethnicity; social grade; whether actually gave evidence in court; whether informed someone had been charged; whether had special needs as a result of the crime; whether had been a victim before, whether aware of the *Victims' Code*, and whether had contact with Victim Support.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 23 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B8: Factors associated with whether a witness would report a future crime to the police (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether witness was satisfied with their contact with the CJS			
Satisfied	4.85	4.24 - 5.55	*
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1.82	1.33 - 2.49	*
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	1.00		
The outcome of the case			
Charges dropped or written off	1.02	0.79 - 1.33	
Guilty plea	2.48	1.99 - 3.09	*
<i>Contested trial, found not guilty</i>	1.00		
Contested trial, found guilty	2.48	2.00 - 3.06	*
Did not know	1.86	1.38 - 2.51	*
Whether witness gave evidence in court			
Called to give evidence but did not give evidence	0.71	0.58 - 0.87	*
Case did not go to court	1.59	1.22 - 2.06	*
Case went to court but not called to give evidence	1.25	0.98 - 1.59	
<i>Called to give evidence and gave evidence</i>	1.00		
Whether witness was made aware of how to complain about the service they received			
<i>Not aware of how to complain</i>	1.00		
Aware of how to complain	1.76	1.53 - 2.03	*
Don't know	1.40	1.13 - 1.74	*
How long before witness heard anything further about their case progress			
Within a week	2.20	1.64 - 2.94	*
Between one week and a month	1.67	1.28 - 2.18	*
Between one and two months	1.26	0.95 - 1.66	
Between two and six months	1.19	0.90 - 1.56	
<i>Over six months</i>	1.00		
Heard nothing	1.69	1.20 - 2.38	*
Don't know	1.06	0.76 - 1.47	
Social Grade			
A	2.24	1.56 - 3.22	*
B	1.58	1.25 - 1.94	*
C1	1.63	1.33 - 1.99	*
C2	1.23	1.00 - 1.51	
D	1.12	0.90 - 1.40	
E	1.00		
Crime type			
Criminal damage	0.90	0.75 - 1.09	
Theft and handling stolen goods	1.43	1.24 - 1.65	*
Burglary	0.85	0.70 - 1.04	
<i>Violence</i>	1.00		
Whether witness attended court			
Witness did not attend court	1.54	1.30 - 1.82	*
<i>Witness attended court</i>	1.00		

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Ethnicity			
White	1.06	0.71 - 1.60	
Asian	0.88	0.55 - 1.41	
Black	0.92	0.55 - 1.54	
<i>Mixed</i>	<i>1.00</i>		
Chinese or other	0.99	0.53 - 1.86	
Constant	0.48		
Unweighted base	16,733		
Nagelkerke R square⁷	0.18		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (would report a future crime to the police). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): satisfaction with contact with CJS; case outcome and whether the witness gave evidence in court.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex; age; disability; working status; whether given name or number of someone to contact about case progress; whether informed someone had been charged; and whether had special needs as a result of the crime.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ ** denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 18 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B9: Factors associated with whether those who gave evidence would agree to give evidence again in future (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether satisfied with their contact with the CJS			
Satisfied	3.22	2.51 - 4.12	*
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1.51	0.80 - 2.86	
<i>Dissatisfied</i>	1.00		
The outcome of the case			
<i>Charges dropped or written off</i>	1.00		
Guilty plea	2.72	1.51 - 4.90	*
Contested trial, found not guilty	1.03	0.60 - 1.78	
Contested trial, found guilty	2.76	1.62 - 4.69	*
Don't know	1.35	0.62 - 2.96	
Whether felt intimidated by an individual during the process			
<i>Felt intimidated</i>	1.00		
Did not feel intimidated	1.76	1.46 - 2.11	*
Social grade			
A	2.59	1.53 - 4.39	*
B	2.26	1.65 - 3.10	*
C1	1.55	1.17 - 2.05	*
C2	1.25	0.94 - 1.66	
D	1.72	1.26 - 2.35	*
E	1.00		
Crime type			
Criminal damage	1.28	0.78 - 2.08	
Theft and handling stolen goods	2.08	1.33 - 3.26	*
<i>Burglary</i>	1.00		
Violence	1.04	0.70 - 1.53	
Ethnicity			
White	2.21	1.64 - 2.98	*
<i>Asian</i>	1.00		
Black	1.30	0.82 - 2.08	
Mixed	1.98	1.06 - 3.71	*
Chinese or other	2.57	1.30 - 5.06	*
Whether given a leaflet on giving evidence in court			
<i>Not given leaflet</i>	1.00		
Given leaflet	1.23	0.96 - 1.57	
Don't know	0.74	0.53 - 1.04	
Whether thought court staff were helpful			
Thought court staff were helpful	2.36	1.20 - 4.62	*
Mixed – thought some helpful, some not	1.59	0.78 - 3.25	
<i>Thought court staff were unhelpful</i>	1.00		
Sex			
Male	1.35	1.13 - 1.61	*
<i>Female</i>	1.00		
Whether had special needs as a result of the crime			
<i>Had special needs</i>	1.00		
Did not have special needs	1.58	1.18 - 2.10	*
Whether given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
<i>Not given name or number</i>	1.00		
Given name or number	1.30	1.03 - 1.64	*

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether given a witness expenses claim form			
Given expenses form	1.30	1.01 - 1.68	*
<i>Not given expenses form</i>	1.00		
Whether had contact with Witness Care Officer			
<i>Did not have contact</i>	1.00		
Had contact	1.07	0.88 - 1.30	
Don't know	0.57	0.38 - 0.88	*
Constant	0.01		
Unweighted base	3,407		
Nagelkerke R square⁷	0.24		

¹ Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (satisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): whether satisfied with CJS contact; case outcome; whether felt intimidated; social grade, crime type and ethnicity.

² Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: age; disability status; working status; victim/witness status; how long before heard anything about case progress; whether informed someone had been charged; made aware of how to make a complaint; whether informed of the trial/hearing date; whether informed of the case outcome; whether given the opportunity to watch the 'Going to Court' DVD; whether a Witness Care Officer spoke to them about going to court; whether offered a court familiarisation visit; whether had contact with the Witness Service; whether waited in a separate waiting room; and whether felt safe in waiting room.

³ Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.

⁴ The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.

⁵ Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.

⁶ '**' denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).

⁷ The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 24 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Table B10: Factors associated with whether those who gave evidence would not agree to give evidence again in future (using logistic regression),^{1,2,3,4} WAVES 2009–10

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether satisfied with their contact with the CJS			
<i>Satisfied</i>	1.00		
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2.00	0.98 - 4.08	
Dissatisfied	3.35	2.56 - 4.38	*
The outcome of the case			
Charges dropped or written off	3.82	2.15 - 6.77	*
Guilty plea	1.13	0.75 - 1.70	
Contested trial, found not guilty	3.31	2.63 - 4.16	*
<i>Contested trial, found guilty</i>	1.00		
Don't know	2.15	1.06 - 4.33	*
Whether felt intimidated by an individual during the process			
Felt intimidated	1.97	1.57 - 2.47	*
<i>Did not feel intimidated</i>	1.00		
Ethnicity			
<i>White</i>	1.00		
Asian	2.61	1.85 - 3.67	*
Black	1.22	0.75 - 2.00	
Mixed	0.59	0.25 - 1.37	
Chinese or other	0.99	0.46 - 2.15	
Whether given a leaflet on giving evidence in court			
<i>Given leaflet</i>	1.00		
Not given leaflet	1.60	1.21 - 2.11	*
Don't know	1.77	1.28 - 2.45	*
Whether thought court staff were helpful			
<i>Thought court staff were helpful</i>	1.00		
Mixed – thought some helpful, some not	1.04	0.74 - 1.47	
Thought court staff were unhelpful	2.88	1.48 - 5.58	*
Whether had special needs as a result of the crime			
Had special needs	1.53	1.10 - 2.14	*
<i>Did not have special needs</i>	1.00		
Social grade			
<i>A</i>	1.00		
B	1.36	0.68 - 2.74	
C1	1.62	0.83 - 3.17	
C2	2.00	1.02 - 3.92	*
D	2.01	1.01 - 4.00	*
E	2.56	1.27 - 5.15	*
Whether felt safe in the court waiting room			
<i>Felt safe</i>	1.00		
Neither felt safe or unsafe	0.58	0.24 - 1.42	
Felt unsafe	1.70	1.16 - 2.48	*
Crime type			
Criminal damage	1.58	0.95 - 2.61	
<i>Theft and handling stolen goods</i>	1.00		
Burglary	2.21	1.27 - 3.83	*
Violence	1.53	1.08 - 2.17	*

	Odds ratio ⁵	Confidence interval	Significance ⁶
Whether given the name or telephone number of someone they could ask about the progress of their case			
Not given name or number	1.34	1.02 - 1.76	*
<i>Given name or number</i>	1.00		
Constant	0.02		
Unweighted base Nagelkerke R square⁷	3,407		
	0.25		

- 1 Variables are listed in order of strength of association with the dependent variable (satisfaction with contact with the CJS). The following variables were strongly associated (i.e. contributed one per cent or more to the variance explained by the model): whether satisfied with CJS contact; case outcome; whether felt intimidated; ethnicity; and whether received the *Witness in Court* leaflet.
- 2 Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex; age; disability status; working status; victim/witness status; how long before heard anything about case progress; whether informed someone had been charged; whether made aware of how to complain about service; whether informed of the trial/hearing date; whether informed of the case outcome; whether had contact with Witness Care Officer; whether given the opportunity to watch the 'Going to Court' DVD; whether a Witness Care Officer spoke to them about going to court; whether offered a court familiarisation visit; whether had contact with the Witness Service; whether given a witness expenses claim form; and whether waited in separate room to defence witnesses at court.
- 3 Categories in italics are those which were used as reference categories.
- 4 The logistic regression was carried out using the Forward Stepwise method in SPSS.
- 5 Odds ratios of greater than one indicate relatively higher odds of being satisfied with their contact with the CJS than the reference category in that variable; less than one indicate relatively lower odds.
- 6 '**' denotes a statistically significant impact of that variable on the dependent variable (at the 5 per cent level).
- 7 The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case, 25 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

Ministry of Justice Research Series 1/12

Satisfaction and willingness to engage with the Criminal Justice System: Findings from the Witness and Victim Experience Survey 2009–10

The Witness and Victim Experience Survey provides detailed information on the experiences and perceptions of a subset of victims and prosecution witnesses of certain crime types involved in cases which resulted in a criminal charge. This report examines the experiences and perceptions of victims and witnesses, and the factors most strongly associated with their satisfaction with the Criminal Justice System (CJS) and their willingness to engage with it again in future. Findings show that the majority of victims and witnesses are satisfied with their contact with the CJS, and are willing to engage with it again in future. The strongest factors associated with satisfaction were related to processes, namely keeping victims and witnesses informed. The strongest factors associated with willingness to engage with the CJS in future were satisfaction and case outcome.

ISBN 978-1-84099-519-0

© Crown copyright
Produced by the Ministry of Justice

Alternative format versions of this report are available on request.

Email: research@justice.gsi.gov.uk

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/research.htm>