



DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OUTCOME MEASURES PROJECT

Stephanie Riger, PhD
Christine C. George, PhD
Bill Byrnes, MA
Leah Durst-Lee, BA
Rannveig Sigurvinsdottir, PhD

Domestic Violence Outcome Measures Project

September 2016

**Submitted to
Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network**

**Prepared by
Loyola University Chicago Center for Urban Research and Learning (CURL)**

**Stephanie Riger, PhD
Christine C. George, PhD
Bill Byrnes, MA
Leah Durst-Lee, BA
Rannveig Sigurvinsdottir, PhD**

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to the recipients of domestic violence services who generously took the time to complete our survey. Our thanks also go to the Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network and the staff of 15 agencies who made this project possible. Thanks also to the Chicago Community Trust, the Michael Reese Health Trust, the Chicago Foundation for Women and the City of Chicago Department of Family Support Services for their generous support. In addition, we wish to thank the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority staff, in particular Jennifer Hiselman, for providing vital assistance with linkage to InfoNet data.

Table of Contents

Summary	6
Introduction	8
Research Methods	8
Procedure	8
Sample	9
Representativeness of the Survey Sample	10
Measures	11
Current Needs	11
Needs of the Whole Sample	12
Race/Ethnicity and Needs	12
Parenting Status and Needs	14
Socioeconomic Resources and Needs	15
Past Services Provided and Current Needs of Survivors	16
Relationship between Past Needs, Services Received, and Current Needs	18
Satisfaction with Past Services	20
Few Survivors Currently Living with Abusers	20
Outcomes of Services	21
Outcomes of the Whole Sample	21
Race/Ethnicity and Outcomes	22
Parenting Status and Outcomes	25
Socioeconomic Resources and Outcomes	25
Changes in Economic Status	26

Changes in Income Pre-Survey to Survey	27
Changes in Employment Status Pre-Survey to Survey	27
Changes in Welfare Receipt Pre-Survey to Survey	27
Sustaining Evaluation	28
Conclusion	29
Appendix	32
Table 1.0 - Comparison of Survey and InfoNet Data	32
Table 1.1 - Current Client Needs	33
Table 1.2 - Current Client Needs by Race	34
Table 1.3 - Current Client Needs by Parenting Status	35
Table 1.4 - Current Client Needs by Socioeconomic Resources	36
Table 2.1 - Relationship between Past Needs, Services Received, and Current Needs	37
Table 2.2 - Client Satisfaction with Past Services	38
Table 2.3 - Client Outcomes for People Currently Living with Abuser	40
Table 2.4 - Current Client Needs for People Currently Living with Abuser	41
Table 3.1 - Outcomes of the Whole Sample	42
Table 3.2 - Outcomes by Race	43
Table 3.3 - Outcomes by Parenting Status	45
Table 3.4 - Outcomes by Socioeconomic Resources	46
Table 4.1 - Total Yearly Income - Pre-Survey and Survey	48
Table 4.2 - Changes in Total Yearly Income	48

Table 4.3 - Average Total Yearly Incomes for Respondents Whose Incomes Decreased and Increased (Pre-Survey and Survey)	48
Table 4.4 - Change in Employment Status from Pre-Survey to Survey (General)	49
Table 4.5 - Change in Employment Status from Pre-Survey to Survey (Specific)	49
Table 4.6 - Differences in Welfare Usage Pre-Survey and at Time of Survey	49
Table 5.1 - Demographic Comparison of Survey, InfoNet Program Participants, and Cook County	50

Domestic Violence Outcome Project Summary

The Domestic Violence Outcome Project had a two-fold purpose: first, to identify the long-term outcomes and needs of those who receive services from domestic violence agencies, and second, to establish procedures for on-going evaluation within agencies. Working closely with 15 agencies that are members of the Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network, the researchers developed a survey to evaluate services and identify client needs. The services evaluated included court advocacy (e.g., assistance from an advocate in obtaining an order of protection), legal services (assistance from a licensed attorney with divorce or other court proceedings), emergency shelter, and counseling.

Development of the survey benefited greatly from extensive feedback from service providers and clients and from previous evaluation research. The Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network and the participating agencies administered the survey, which had both an on-line and paper option. Agency staff recruited participants, maintained contact with them over about 6 months, and then had them complete the survey. Here we present findings from analysis of data provided by 450 participants. We also include a discussion of the challenges encountered in sustaining ongoing evaluation in agencies.

One of the key findings of this report is that emergency safety needs (i.e., emergency shelter and getting an order of protection) are no longer the most prominent issues of concern for participants. Fewer than 5% of the sample reported currently needing shelter and fewer than 10% reported needing help getting an order of protection. In contrast, counseling/therapy is now the primary need reported by about 46% of participants. In addition, about a quarter of participants reported a need for help with those things that enable one to sustain a stable and independent household, which is critical to maintaining safety: economic assistance, either in the form of emergency cash, help with credit history, financial planning/literacy, food/clothing, health care, or work. Also, a sizeable minority of participants reported needs (both new and continuing from when they initially sought services) regarding divorce, child support, and visitation. These legal issues are likely to be related to the one outstanding safety concern reported by a substantial minority of survivors, managing contact with the abuser. Few differences among reported needs existed by race/ethnicity, parenting status, or level of socioeconomic resources.

This report begins with a brief introduction to how the project came about and a description of our research methods. Next we present the current needs reported by participants and consider whether there are differences in needs among participants by race/ethnicity, education and income resources, and whether or not they have children. We then examine the relationship of past services to current needs and satisfaction with past services. After that, we consider outcomes of receiving services (e.g., "As a result of receiving services, I feel safe from violence in my home"). Finally, we describe difficulties encountered in sustaining ongoing evaluation in agencies, such as high staff

turnover rates and the need for a program coordinator to maintain staff motivation. We conclude with a summary of the findings.

Introduction

Agencies in the metropolitan Chicago area that address domestic violence systematically collect information about services provided to survivors and their families through the InfoNet data base. However, there is a dearth of information about safety and needs over the long term. The Domestic Violence Outcome Project, initiated by the Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network (CMBWN), was designed to address this information gap. It grew out of discussions between the CMBWN and Chicago-area funders of domestic violence services. The goal is to institutionalize data collection on long-term needs and outcomes of services on an on-going basis, eventually linking that data to the InfoNet data system. InfoNet is a case level data base of service receipt and client characteristics maintained by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority for the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Linking the information obtained on long-term needs and services with InfoNet will enable more effective program planning and policy development on both a system wide and individual agency level.

The Domestic Violence Outcome project initiated a survey to assess long-term outcomes of services, satisfaction with past services, and current needs of survivors and their families. Fifteen agencies that are part of the Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network voluntarily participated in data collection. This report describes the methods used, presents the results of the survey, and discusses challenges to the collection of data over a long period of time.

Research Methods

Procedure

This study was a collaborative research partnership between the Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network (CMBWN), several member agencies of CMBWN that provide domestic violence services, and researchers from Loyola University and University of Illinois at Chicago. In 2013, CMBWN established an on-going survey of a sample of survivors who had received services at its member agencies. Fifteen agencies affiliated with CMBWN agreed to participate. The survey went through numerous iterations and benefited greatly from extensive feedback from agency clients and staff.

To recruit participants, agency staff informed clients about the purpose of the project, the procedures, and the remuneration participants would receive for their time to complete a survey (\$50 for participating in the project plus an additional \$5 for each of 5 monthly contacts). Clients who agreed to participate were given an information sheet about the project, signed a consent form, and identified contact people who would be helpful in finding them in 6 months, should that be necessary. Clients were informed that they need not participate in the project and that their refusal would not affect their relationship with the agency in any way.

Staff at each agency maintained monthly contact with those who had agreed to participate; participants returned to the agency about 6 months after they first received services to complete the survey. Staff began recruiting clients in March 2013 and the first surveys were completed in September of that year. Staff were to recruit new clients to the project according to the following schedule: after 6 days in shelter, 3 contacts in counseling, and at the first contact for court advocacy and legal services. In some cases, flexibility was needed. For example, first contact for court advocacy might be at the jail, not an optimal venue for recruitment. Such clients were recruited at a later contact when they met with an advocate in an office. Participants were given the option of completing the survey on-line or on paper.

Sample

A sample of 450 people participated in the survey. The survey data was then linked to InfoNet by the Illinois Criminal Information Authority using a de-identified common case ID. (The following demographic characteristics of the sample came from InfoNet and was collected when participants initially received services, about 6 months prior to completing the Life Experiences survey). Almost all of the participants were female (three men participated). Ages ranged from 16 to 73 years old ($M = 36.09$) with the typical participant (mode) being 38 years old. The largest racial/ethnic group was Latino (33.3%), followed by Black/African American (31.9%), White (27.7%), Asian (5.1%), and those from Indigenous or Mixed Race groups (2.1%).¹ Regarding employment status, 216 of the women had no employment (51.3%), 116 had full time employment (27.6%) and 89 had part time employment (21.1%). Regarding education, 54.4% had some college or were college graduates 24.3% had a high school diploma, and 21.4% did not graduate high school. Most commonly the participants had a partner and were either married, in a civil union, or not married (46.9%), single or widowed (36.6%) or divorced/separated, or married and not living together (16.5%). About 84% of participants had children. When asked about annual income, 30.6% reported having none; 27% had income under \$10,000; 27% had income below \$20,000, and 15.4% had income of \$20,000 or more.

The Life Experiences survey gathered some additional demographic information about participants living circumstances at the time of their completion of the survey. The largest percentage (46.2% of the 421 who responded to this question) were living in a rented residence, either a room, apartment, or house, while 18.4% were staying with family. 13.3% were living in a condo or house that they owned. The remaining participants were distributed across numerous types of housing; with 2% (9 people) were living in a domestic violence shelter. The survey also asked participants about the level of dangerousness of their neighborhood; 5.8% described their neighborhood as either extremely or very dangerous, 24.9% said it was somewhat dangerous, and 68.2% said it was hardly or not dangerous at all.

¹ In InfoNet, most clients from Arab American Family Services were coded as “White.”

Representativeness of the Survey Sample

To determine the extent to which the survey sample represented those who receive domestic violence services, we made two comparisons, first with clients from the 15 domestic violence programs that participated in this study, and second with those from all domestic violence services agencies in Cook County participating in InfoNet during the years of our survey. Information about people in these two comparison groups comes from InfoNet data recorded when participants first received services from an agency. In order to make these comparisons, we needed to combine certain race/ethnicity categories in the survey so that they reflect those categories listed in InfoNet. See table 5.1 for comparisons of the sample with those who participants in the 15 programs and those who receive services from all the programs in Cook County that participate in InfoNet.

As the table indicates, the survey sample has somewhat more females (96.4%) than either the 15 programs (91.2%) or the Cook County programs (90.5%). The average age of the survey sample was about 36 years; the mode (the most frequently mentioned) age for all three groups was between 30-39 years. The survey sample has somewhat more American Indian or Alaska Natives (3.6%) and more Asians (4.9%) than either the 15 programs (1.7% and 2.8% respectively) or the Cook County programs (1.5% and 3.7%). Compared to the 15 programs who had 37.5% Black/African American participants and the Cook County programs with 38.1%, the survey sample had fewer at 31.1%; 51.8% of the survey sample self-identified as White, a higher percentage than the 15 programs (44.9%) or the Cook County total (46.1%). The survey sample had 33.8% Hispanic/Latino participants while the 15 programs had 38.8% and the Cook County programs had 36.1%. The Non-Hispanic Latino percentages are quite similar: The survey sample at 61.8%, the 15 programs at 59.7%, and the Cook County programs at 62.5%.

With respect to employment, the percentages are fairly similar: 26% of the survey sample worked full-time, 29.8% of the 15 programs' participants and 30.1% of the Cook County participants did likewise, while 48.9% of the survey sample was unemployed, 46.1% of the 15 program participants and 45.8% of the Cook County participants also were unemployed. The education background of those in the survey sample was slightly higher than the other 2 groups: 43.4% of the survey sample were high school graduates or less while 49.4% of the 15 program participants and 49.7% of the Cook County participants were likewise, while those with some college or college graduates constituted 49.8% of the survey sample, 42.3% of the 15 programs and 42.5% of the Cook County program participants.

The greatest disparities appeared in income. 35.1% of the survey sample had less than or equal to \$500 in monthly income, while 56.9% of the 15 program participants and the same percentage of those in the Cook County programs had incomes at that level. The percentage of those with incomes between \$500-1,000 was more similar in the three groups: 19.1% of those in the survey sample compared to 16.5% of those in the 15 programs and 16.1% of those in the Cook County programs. Those with more than \$1,000 monthly income constituted 28% of the survey sample, 26.55 of the 15 program

participants, and 27% of the Cook County programs. The discrepancy among those with the lowest income may be due to the fact that 17.8% of those in the survey sample did not report their income.

Finally, the percentage of those with children was similar among the 3 groups: 80% of the survey sample, 76.3% of the 15 program participants, and 84.8% of the Cook County participants. A somewhat larger percentage of those in our survey were married and fewer single than those in the other two groups.

Overall, the three groups are reasonably similar. The survey sample had somewhat fewer Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino participants and fewer of those with the lowest income and education and who were single, while containing a somewhat higher percentage of female and White, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian and college educated participants and those who were married, compared to those in the 15 programs and Cook County programs. Participants were fairly similar in other demographic categories.

Measures

The survey, administered 6 months after initial service receipt, asked participants how survivors had changed as a result of receiving services. They were given a list of possible outcomes labeled the Services Outcome Measure (some items were adapted, with permission, from Sullivan, Baptista, O'Halloran, Okroj, Morton, & Stewart, 2008; others were developed for this survey). For example, participants indicated whether they are safer, are more protected from partner/ex-partner's abuse, are better able to get what they need for themselves, understand more about how domestic abuse affects their children, and so forth. Responses were given on a three-point scale ("a lot," "some," and "none") with a fourth category of "does not apply." In addition, participants were asked about their past and current service needs and their satisfaction with past services.

Service providers and selected clients offered numerous thoughtful suggestions for revisions of multiple iterations of the survey and procedures. The survey was then pilot tested with clients currently receiving services from participating agencies, and revised based on their feedback. Once measures were finalized, they were translated into Spanish, French, Tagalog, Urdu, and Arabic. Data from the survey was linked to information on demographics and service receipt obtained from the InfoNet data base. Agencies that did not participate in InfoNet collected demographic information from participants on a paper form; this data was then entered into the survey data base.

Current Needs

Research Question 1: What are current needs of victims of domestic violence who previously received services from domestic violence agencies?

- a. What are current needs of the whole sample?
- b. How do current needs vary by race/ethnicity?
- c. How do current needs vary whether or not victims have children?

d. How do they vary by socioeconomic resources?

Sources of data for this question come from the section of the survey that stated: “Now we’d like you to think about your current situation. Below is a list of things people may need help with. Which of these do you need help with **now**? Please check “yes” or “no” for each item.” The list of items included help with housing/shelter, getting benefits finances, therapy/counseling, parenting, legal services, personal safety, transportation, language/translating, food/clothing, getting work, health care, and substance abuse treatment.

Needs of the Whole Sample

Table 1.1 presents responses to questions about current needs (see Table 1.1 in the appendix for client needs in the whole sample). The number of participants responding to each need is listed in the column headed Valid N. The number of those who responded to each item may vary because of missing data.

Needs referring to safety: Most participants did not report emergency safety concerns as a current need. Only 4.8% reported a need for emergency shelter while 9.8% indicated a need for legal advocacy to get an order of protection. However, 16.7% of participants reported a need for help developing a safety plan and 17.5% reported needing help managing contact with a partner/ex-partner.

Needs referring to therapy/counseling: The largest group of participants indicated a need for therapy/counseling: 45.8% of participants endorsed this need. About a quarter also indicated a need for family therapy.

Needs referring to economic/material issues: Over a quarter of participants reported a need for help in economic areas: credit history (29.3%), financial planning/literacy (28%); help with food (28.6%), clothing (29.9%) and getting work (24.9%). Help finding permanent housing also was reported by 30.8% of participants.

Needs referring to legal issues: About 16% of the sample mentioned a need for help with immigration, while a higher percentage, almost 23%, mentioned needing help with divorce. Child custody and visitation were mentioned by about 17% and 13% respectively.

Needs referring to children: Help with parenting was mentioned by about 14% of the sample, while about 16% mentioned child care.

The least frequently reported need was help with substance abuse treatment (0.9%), while transportation needs also received infrequent mentions.

In sum, participants’ needs focus on emotional help (therapy/counseling) and financial/material concerns and much less frequently on safety.

Race/Ethnicity and Needs

Differences among participants in their life situations and experiences may affect their current needs. Therefore we examine the needs reported among groups delineated

by three demographic variables: race/ethnicity; those with or without children; and social and economic resources.

Table 1.2 presents information on current needs by participants of the following racial/ethnic groups: Black/African American, White, Latina, Asian, and Indigenous or Mixed Race, who said “yes” in response to whether or not they had a particular need (see Table 1.2 in the appendix for client needs by race). The Indigenous/Mixed Race category included only 9 people, while the Asian group included about 20 people, so conclusions about these groups should be considered tentative. Nevertheless, they do give indications of possible directions for future services so we include them in the table.

Black/African American participants most frequently reported needing therapy/counseling (39.4%), while 23.4% mentioned family counseling. A small percentage (4.5%) mentioned needing emergency shelter, while 9.7% needed help developing a safety plan. Permanent housing was mentioned by 28.3% of Black/African American participants, while help with credit history and financial planning were mentioned by 38% and about 32% respectively. Other economic concerns, TANF/Food stamps and emergency cash, were mentioned less frequently, but help with clothing was mentioned by 31.6% of participants. Very few Black/African American participants mentioned immigration and help with language/translation. Help with parenting was mentioned by only 8% of participants, but 18.2% did mention needing help with childcare.

White participants mentioned therapy/counseling slightly more often than Black/African American participants (43.6% compared to 39.4%) but family therapy less often (19.1% compared to 23.4%). About twice as many White as Black/African American participants mentioned help with legal advocacy to get an order of protection and having an advocate go with you to court. About a quarter of White participants mentioned needing help with divorce and about 20% with child custody. Emergency shelter was mentioned by less than 2% of this group, but 19.3% mentioned needing help developing a safety plan and 24.3% mentioned managing contact with a partner/ex-partner. About a quarter of this group mentioned getting help with food and clothing and getting work.

Latina participants: Over half of Latina participants reported needing help with therapy/counseling and almost a third mentioned family therapy. Immigration help was mentioned by almost 30% while almost 42% mentioned help with language/translating. Permanent housing was mentioned by 35.2% of Latinas, a higher percentage than in the Black/African American or White subgroups. Economic needs were mentioned by about 30% of participants with the exception of emergency cash, which was mentioned by somewhat fewer Latina participants. Only 6.4% of Latinas mentioned needing help with emergency shelter while almost 21% mentioned a safety plan and 16.4% mentioned needing help managing contact with a partner/ex-partner.

Asian participants were too few in number from which to draw strong conclusions, but the results are suggestive. Immigration, divorce, permanent housing, and

help getting work and health care were among the most frequently mentioned needs. The number of people in the Indigenous/Mixed race category is also too small from which to draw conclusions.

We then used statistical analyses to determine if differences among subgroups occurred simply by chance. The accepted standard in science is a probability of less than 5% that findings occurred by chance alone; in other words, only 5 times out of 100 would you get this result by chance. Using this criterion, we examined differences among the groups in the survey sample and found the following statistically significant differences:

Emergency shelter: The Asian and Latina groups reported a higher need for help with this than the Black/African American and White groups; nevertheless, the proportion of those in all groups who reported needing help with emergency shelter was quite low.

Therapy/Counseling: The proportion of those wanting therapy/counseling increased from a low of 39.4% among Black/African American participants to 53.5% among Latinas and 52.4% among Asians.

Immigration and Language/Translating: More of those in the Asian and Latina subgroups reported needing help in these areas than Black/African American and White participants.

Transportation and other issues: In general, more of those in the Asian group reported needing help with transportation. A significant difference also appeared in reported need for help with clothing, with higher proportions of Black/African Americans and Latinas reporting this need.

In sum, the overall pattern was similar to that found among the whole sample, with an emphasis on therapy/counseling and a much smaller number of people reporting a need for help with safety. A higher proportion of those in the Latina and Asian groups reported needing help with immigration and transportation. Economic/financial needs did not differ significantly among the Race/ethnicity subgroups.

Parenting Status and Needs

We compared responses to current needs for those with and without children (see Table 1.3 in the appendix for client needs by parenting status).

Those without children most frequently reported the need for therapy/counseling (49.3%). Only 7.6% of those without children expressed a need for help managing contact with the abuser, while about 19% of those with children did so. A need for permanent housing was mentioned by 25.4% of this group. They also expressed a need for economic assistance (help with credit history, etc.). Help with divorce was also mentioned by about 21% of those in this group. The need for shelter was mentioned by only 4.5% of this group but almost 19% expressed a need for help developing a safety plan. Getting work and getting health care were concerns for about a fifth of this group.

Those with children most frequently (45.7%) expressed a need for therapy/counseling while over a quarter also mentioned family counseling. Economic

needs were also a concern to this group, with 33.4% mentioning permanent housing and over a quarter mentioning other economic issues, such as TANF/food stamps and help with credit history. Divorce and child custody needs were reported by over 20% of this group, as was help with language/translating, getting food and getting health care. Over 30% reported a need for help with clothing.

We then examined whether the differences between those with and without children were statistically significant. To do so, we omitted the items referring to children (help with child custody, visitation, etc.) since participants without children would obviously respond to these items differently than those with children. Of the remaining items, only 2 revealed statistically significant differences between the 2 groups: managing contact with partner/ex-partner, and transportation to/from a job. Almost 20% of those with children reported needing help with partner contact, while only 7.6% of those without children mentioned this. Of those with children, almost 14% of those without children mentioned needing help with transportation to/from a job, while 5.6% of those with children mentioned this. However, the fact that statistically significant differences appeared on only 2 of 28 items suggests that these 2 groups are more similar than different.

Socioeconomic Resources and Needs

In order to examine the relationship of socioeconomic resources to needs, we combined education, employment, and income into one variable labeled socioeconomic resources and divided the sample into 4 groups ranging from those with the fewest resources to those with the most resources. We then looked at the distribution of responses to the question of current needs (see Table 1.4 in the appendix for client needs by socioeconomic resources).

Those with the fewest socioeconomic resources: About 39% of this group reported a need for therapy/counseling, about the same as those with slightly more resources but lower than those who have somewhat or the most resources. A small percentage (6.8%) of this group reported needing emergency shelter and about 12% mentioned needing help with managing contact with a partner, but 16.9% mentioned a need for help developing a safety plan. Financial needs were mentioned by over 20% of this subgroup.

Those with slightly more resources: The highest percentage of people (37.4%) in this subgroup mentioned therapy/counseling while about 31% mentioned clothing as a need. About 30% mentioned permanent housing and over 20% mentioned other financial needs. Only 4.1% of people in this group mentioned emergency shelter as a need while 15% mentioned a safety plan.

Those with somewhat more resources: A similar pattern appeared here, with the largest percentage (56.6%) of those in this group mentioning therapy/counseling, 38% mentioning permanent housing, and between 25% and 34% mentioning other financial

needs. Only 10.4% of this group mentioned emergency shelter while 15.6% mentioned a safety plan and 10.5% mentioned needing help with contact with a partner/ex-partner.

Those with the most resources: Again, a similar pattern emerged with the largest percentage (48.5%) of those in this group mentioning therapy/counseling; in addition, a sizeable proportion (41.2%) mentioned family therapy. No one in this group mentioned emergency shelter as a need, while 28.4% mentioned permanent housing. The percentages mentioning financial needs were smaller than in the previous group but still in the twenties. About 21% mentioned managing contact with a partner/ex-partner.

When we examined the statistical significance of differences among those with varying levels of socioeconomic resources, several differences emerged.

Safety: The highest percentage of those who reported the need for help with emergency shelter were in the “somewhat more” resources group while those with the most resources reported no need for help with this.

Therapy/Counseling: As the amount of resources increased, the percentage of those who reported a need for therapy/counseling also increased.

Immigration and language/translating: As resources increased, the need for help with immigration and translating decreased.

In sum, as we might expect, as resources increase, in general the need for help decreases, with the exception of therapy/counseling. Nevertheless, even among those with the most resources, almost half reported a need for therapy/counseling. Safety concerns, as in the need for emergency housing, were expressed by a small percentage of people, while financial concerns were mentioned by between 20-30% of people.

Overall: The major need expressed by participants in all subgroups was for help with therapy/counseling. Economic/financial concerns were more frequently mentioned than safety issues; help with emergency shelter was mentioned by few participants, although need for help managing contact with a partner/ex-partner was mentioned by a little under a fifth of participants. Help with immigration and translating was mentioned by a sizable percentage of Asians and Latinas, while the mention of a need for permanent housing was higher among these two groups as well. Most other differences among demographic groups did not reach statistical significance.

Past Services Provided and Current Needs of Survivors

Research Question 2: What is the relationship of past needs and services to current needs of survivors of domestic violence?

- Have past needs been met?
- Are current needs a continuation of past needs or “new” needs?
- How satisfied were survivors with services they received in the past?

Survivors seek help from domestic violence agencies for immediate pressing issues, whether it is safe housing and other safety measures, court advocacy (e.g., assistance with orders of protection), legal representation (e, assistance with divorce proceedings), or therapy/counseling. Agencies provide a myriad of services to address the

immediate needs of survivors. A survey administered several months after the survivors first sought help allows us to examine the relations between services that survivors originally sought, those services they received, and current needs.

Two sections in the survey allow us to examine this relationship. In the first section, survivors were asked to consider the statement: “When I came to the domestic violence agency **6 months ago, I needed...**” The survey then listed 38 services ranging from those pertaining to safety, material/financial assistance, therapy/counseling, and legal representation. For each of the services survivors were asked whether they needed the service and if they received it.

In the second section, survivors were asked about their current needs: “Now we would like you to think about your current situation. Below is a list of things people may need help with. Which of these do you need help with **now?**” The list contains the same services listed in the first section.

We then combined responses regarding past services needs and receipt and current service needs in the following way: Did people need this service in the past; if they needed it, did they receive it; and if they needed it in the past did they still need it? Our aim here is to identify the following:

- a. *Those with continuing needs:* those who received a service and still need it;
- b. *Those with met needs:* those who received a service and no longer need it;
- c. *Those with unmet needs:* those who needed but did not receive a service and still need it; and
- d. *Those with new needs:* those who did not need a service previously and now need it.

We examine each of these patterns of need within each of the service categories (safety, therapy/counseling, etc.). Table 2.1 presents responses for the sample as a whole. The number of participants who responded to statements about each service type is listed in the column headed “Valid N.” Note that in order for responses to appear in this table, participants had to answer 3 questions:

1. Did you need this in the past?
2. Did you receive this in the past?
3. Do you need this now?

All three questions had to be answered “yes” or “no” for responses to appear in Table 2.1. If people responded “not applicable” to any of the three questions about a particular service, their responses were not included for that service. Consequently, the Valid N varies for each service listed. When examining this table, note that the % for each service needed only applies to the Valid N for that service, that is, to those who reported that the service applied to them (either in the past or currently). For example, only 10.3% reported a continuing need for emergency shelter; this constitutes about 10 people (10.3% of a Valid N of 97).

Relationship between Past Needs, Services Received, and Current Needs

Table 2.1 presents a shifting pattern of needs. Most participants who reported safety-related needs indicated that those needs had been met previously and a relatively small percentage of people reported continuing or new safety needs. Varying percentages of participants reported continuing and/or new needs in the following areas: economic/financial sustenance, therapy/counseling, legal issues, and issues related to children (see Table 2.1 in the appendix for relationship between past needs, services received, and current needs).

Needs related to Safety: Most participants who needed emergency shelter reported that they received it previously and no longer needed it (81.4%). Of those who reported that they still needed it, most had needed it previously, so this is a continuing need although for a small number of people (18.6% of 97, which is about 18 people out of the sample of 450). This same pattern existed for most other safety issues; most people may have needed help with safety issues in the past but no longer need it. For example, over three quarters of participants needing assistance with orders of protection now reported that they had received that help previously and currently did not need it; of the 21.9% who reported currently needing it, most had needed it previously, so it was a continuing need for them. Over half of participants who reported needing legal advocates going with them to court reported that they got the assistance previously and they no longer needed it. Of those who reported currently needing this service, most had needed the service previously. Similarly, for those participants who needed help with a safety plan: 72.3% had received assistance with this and no longer needed it, with most of the 27.8% who still needed assistance had previously needed assistance. When we look at “managing contact with partner/ex-partner” we see a higher continuing need. Only about half the participants reported getting this service and no longer needing assistance (52.1%), while 47.9% reported currently needing assistance and most of those had needed it in the past.

In sum, most people who needed help with safety issues in the past no longer needed help with them now. For those who do need help with safety now, this is a continuing, not a new, need.

Needs related to therapy/counseling: Here participants reported a different pattern than that we saw for safety. While safety needs have been met for most people, therapy/counseling needs are continuing. In addition, a higher percentage of people reported current needs in this area than for current safety needs. Of the people who reported previously needing therapy or counseling, the majority (52.4%) reported still needing those services. Only a little more than a third (34.1%) reported previously having had counseling or therapy in the past and no longer needed it. Only a handful (4%) of participants who reported currently needing therapy/counseling reported that they had not needed it previously (that is, that it is a new need). While participants also reported a high current need for family counseling, most of those who reported currently needing family counseling either needed it previously and were not able to receive it (25.8%) or had not sought it previously (29.5%).

In sum, the majority of people reported a continuing or new need for therapy/counseling. A sizeable percentage reported a new or unmet need for family counseling.

Needs related to economic issues or material issues: Here the relationship between previous and current needs varies considerably, although in all cases there is a substantial current need. For a number of needs (Help getting work, Housing, Help with Credit History, Transport to job seeking, and Emergency Cash) the majority (ranging from 52.7% to 73.9%) of the participants reported that their current needs were either unmet previously or were new needs. In the case of services related to receiving assorted public benefits, while a majority (55.5%) of the participants reported needing help with this now, a significant number (44.5%) who had previously received the service no longer needed it. This same pattern holds for participants who reported needing help with transportation to and from jobs; while a majority reported needing help with this now, a substantial percent (42.9%) who had previously received the service no longer needed it. Finally, for assistance with financial planning/literacy and help with clothing, a relatively small portion (24.1% and 21.2%) of those who needed the service and received it did not need it now, and a relatively higher proportion of those who previously received the service (29.9% and 39.4% respectively) continued to need help with this.

In sum, whether or not people received services related to economic/financial/material concerns in the past, a substantial percentage reported needing help with these now.

Needs related to legal assistance: Here we consider whether participants reported needing a legal advocate go to court with them and other issues related to the judicial system: divorce, visitation, and child custody. (We considered legal advocacy concerning orders of protection under safety issues.) Those who needed help with divorce now mostly had needed it previously; for only a small percentage was this a new need (6.7%). In the case of child custody and visitation, a substantial plurality of participants identified these issues as a current need, but did not identify them as previously needed (28.6% and 39.7% respectively).

In sum, while help with divorce appears to be a continuing need, those who need legal assistance in other areas are divided between those who got this help in the past and those for whom it is a new need.

Needs related to immigration/non-English speakers: Immigration is largely a continuing need: only a small fraction (7.1%) of the participants who identified it as a need had not previously reported needing help with it. Similarly, help with language/translation is a continuing, not new need; only 5.3% of the participants who reported a need for it had not reported needing assistance with it in the past.

Needs related to children: Most of those who reported needs related to parenting identified them as continuing needs with a minority (19%) reporting parenting as a new

need. Looking at needs related to childcare, we see a similar pattern, but with a higher proportion (34.3%) reporting that this was not a previous need.

In sum, there are varying relationships between current and past needs depending on the type of services needed. In most cases, needs related to safety were met when participants first sought help from the agency, and relatively few had new safety needs. Looking at services related to therapy/counseling, a different picture emerges. For most there is a continuing need for therapy/counseling. In the case of family counseling, some participants reported this as an unmet need (i.e., they had needed it previously) while for others, it is a new need. Of people who reported a current need for services related to economic and material issues, a high percentage (compared to other categories of needs) reported that these needs were unmet previously or that they were new needs. Regarding legal issues, there are sizable new needs reported by participants with respect to visitation and child custody along with continuation of on-going previous needs. For divorce, however, most current needs are a continuation of previous needs for which people had received services in the past. Participants also reported a continuing need for help with immigration.

Satisfaction with Past Services

In the first section of the survey, survivors were asked to report their satisfaction with previous services when they considered the statement: “When I came to the domestic violence agency 6 months ago, I needed... For each of the 38 services listed, survivors were asked to rate the services they received on a five point scale from “Very Satisfied” to “Very Dissatisfied” (see Table 2.2 in the appendix for client satisfaction with past services).

Participants overwhelmingly rated services highly. As can be seen in the table, there is little variation in the ratings, with all of the services rated by a majority of the participants as either “Highly Satisfied” or “Satisfied.” For all but one of the services (“Other help with legal”), the majority of participants gave the rating of “Highly Satisfied.” Only one service, “help with childcare,” received a rating from sizable minority of the participants as “highly dissatisfied,” but even that service received a rating of “highly satisfied” from the majority (60.5%) of participants.² There were no statistically significant differences in the rating of services by participants of different ethnicity/race, parenting status, or socioeconomic status.

Few Survivors Currently Living with Abusers

Participants were asked in the survey if they were currently living with someone who abuses them. Only thirty-eight (8.6 % of the sample) reported that they were. Although the survey did not ask if the abuser was the one who led them to seek services, it is likely that the abuser is the same person, since 30 of the 38 reported that they had lived with the abuser one year or more. 42% of these survivors reported that they were experiencing physical or sexual abuse. 86.6% reported experiencing verbal abuse, 36.8%

² The high satisfaction ratings could partially be the result of satisfaction response bias.

economic, and 78.9% emotional. Their average age was about 44 years; 36.8% were Black/African American, 34.2% were White, 23.7% were Latina and 2.6% were Asian; 60.5% were not employed, 13.2% were employed part time, and 18.4% were employed full time. Over half (55.3%) had some college or were college graduates, while 34.2% were high school graduates or less. Most (68.4%) were living with their partner, while 13.2% were single/widowed and 10.5% were divorced or not living with their partner. Most (88.6%) had children.

As can be seen in Table 2.3, the majority of those survivors who are living with abusers report “a lot” in terms of queries to their safety status. However, these reports are lower than those reported by all the survey takers (see Table 3.1). In looking at their reports of current needs (Table 2.4), they are more likely to report a need for help with developing a safety plan, managing contact with a partner/ex-partner, visitation, divorce, legal advocate going to court, therapy/counseling and permanent housing (but not emergency housing), than current needs reported by all the survey takers.

Outcomes of Services

Research Question 3: What is the impact of domestic violence agency services?

- a. What is the impact on the whole sample?
- b. How do impacts vary by race/ethnicity?
- c. How do impacts vary by socioeconomic resources?
- d. How do they vary by whether or not victims have children?

Services offered by domestic violence agencies have the aim not only of increasing safety of survivors but also of enhancing their autonomy and quality of life. To assess the impact of services on survivors, our survey asked participants “As a result of getting help from a domestic violence agency, some people may experience changes. Below is a list of statements. For each of the statements on the list, please circle the number that best describes how much you have changed **as a result of the help you received from the domestic violence agency.**” The survey then presented a list of statements ranging from “I feel safe from violence in my home” to “I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship.” Participants responded to each item with “a lot/some/none/does not apply.” Here we look at the percent of people who gave each of those responses.

Outcomes of the Whole Sample

Table 3.1 presents responses for the sample as a whole (see Table 3.1 in the appendix for outcomes of the whole sample). The number of participants responding to each statement is listed in the column headed “Valid N.” The number of those who responded to each statement may vary because not all items applied to everyone. For example, only 59 people responded to the statement about substance abuse problems as this may not apply to others; participants without children indicated “does not apply” to the statements referring to children and so were excluded from that statement.

Table 3.1 indicates that, overall, many participants reported that getting services from a domestic violence agency helped them “a lot.”

Statements referring to safety received a strongly positive endorsement; for example, about 77% of participants responded “a lot” and 20.6% reported “some” to being helped with “I feel safe from violence in my home” while only 2.3% responded “none” to this item; 81.9% responded “a lot” to being helped with “I know how to reported violations of my order of protection;” 81.9% to “I have ways to keep myself safe;” and 87.3% to “I have ways to keep my children safe.” An exception was the statement “I have ways to manage contact with my abuser” which was endorsed “a lot” by 58.2% of participants.

Statements referring to the impact of domestic violence also received frequent endorsement of “a lot:” for example, about 82% to “I understand about the causes of domestic violence;” 87.6% to “I understand about how domestic violence affects me;” 89.3% to I understand about how domestic violence affects my children.

Statements referring to outlook on life received positive endorsement from many participants, for example 75% of the sample reported “a lot” and 22.5% reported “some” to “I feel hopeful about my future.” Only 2.5% responded “none” to this item. 77.5% reported “a lot” to “I am more confident about making decisions.”

Statements referring to economic issues less often received endorsements of “a lot:” for example, 43.4% of the sample reported “a lot” to being helped with supporting themselves financially while 44.1% responded “some” to this item; 46.7% reported “a lot” to being helped with supporting their children financially.

Statements referring to children received frequent endorsements of “a lot:” only .8% of the sample responded “none” to being helped with keeping their children safe and 2.5% indicated “none” to “My children are safe from violence in the home” while 91.3% of participants reported “a lot” to “My children are attending school.”

In sum, most participants reported very positive outcomes as a result of help received from domestic violence agencies, especially regarding their children’s well-being and their own safety and outlook on life. One exception was managing contact with the abuser, help with which less frequently was rated “a lot.” Other areas with less frequent positive ratings primarily refer to economic issues, such as being self-supporting and supporting one’s children. Small numbers of people responded to the items about substance abuse, perhaps because these items did not apply to them or because of fears about confidentiality.³

Race/Ethnicity and Outcomes

Differences among participants in their life situations and experiences may affect the impact of services. Therefore we examine the outcomes among groups delineated by

³ It should be noted here that there is a discrepancy between the number of people who said they currently need help with substance abuse treatment and the number of people who stated “I am getting help for my substance abuse problems” and/or “I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship.” This discrepancy might be partially explained by the fact that people may be reluctant to admit that they are using illegal drugs. In addition, the outcome measure about the role substance abuse plays in their relationships could be answered by people who do not use substances at all; it could include people who have been affected by their abusive partner’s substance abuse.

three demographic variables: race/ethnicity; social and economic resources; and those with or without children. The following tables present outcomes for each of these groups separately. First we consider the statements most frequently rated “a lot” within each subgroup of participants; then we consider differences among groups.

Table 3.2 presents outcomes for 5 racial/ethnic groups: Black/African American, White, Latino, Asian, and Indigenous/Mixed Race (see Table 3.2 in the appendix for outcomes by race). Note that the number of participants in the last two groups is small; therefore results presented for these groups should be considered tentative.

Black/African American: Among Black/African American participants, the statements indicating that domestic violence services helped them “a lot” most frequently got the general pattern of responses described above. Seventy-four percent of Black/African American participants reported “a lot” to the statement “I feel safe from violence in my home.” Other items referring to current safety received endorsements of “a lot” from more than 80% of Black/African American participants. However, the statement “I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me,” was rated “a lot” by only 56% of participants, and “I have ways to help my children cope with the impact of domestic violence” by 64.7% of participants. The statement “I have ways to manage contact with my abuser” was endorsed “a lot” by only slightly more than half of participants. Statements referring to economics also received relatively less frequent ratings of “a lot:” “I can support my children financially” (52.6%) and “I can support myself financially” (43.4%). Statements referring to children’s safety, school attendance, and impact of domestic violence were endorsed “a lot” by over 80% of Black/African American participants.

White: Responses from White participants also follow the general pattern described above with some exceptions. Over three quarters of White participants reported “a lot” when asked whether domestic violence services had helped in response to the statement “I feel safe from violence in my home” and 83.2% to “My children are safe from violence in the home.” Other safety items (I know how to reported violations of my order of protection; I have ways to keep myself safe) were endorsed by about three quarters of White respondents. Items referring to the impact of domestic violence on oneself and one’s children were endorsed by about 85% of participants. Hopefulness about the future and self-confidence were endorsed by over 60% of participants (a much lower rate than among Black/African American and Asian participants). Economic items received the endorsement of “a lot” from slightly over 40% of participants, again somewhat lower than among Black/African American participants, especially referring to supporting children financially.

Latino: The Latino group responded in a pattern similar to the overall sample with some exceptions. As with other groups, the fewest participants endorsed economic items “a lot.” Safety items received much more frequent responses of “a lot:” e.g., myself (78.5%) and my children (85.9%) are safe in the home, although only 59% indicated “a lot” when responding to the statement “I have ways to manage contact with my abuser.” Over 90% responded “a lot” to the item “I understand about how domestic violence affects my children/me” but the frequency of endorsing “a lot” for the item “I am able to

cope with the impact of domestic violence on me” was lower (about 73%). This group expressed more positivity about the future (about 82% endorsed “a lot” concerning “I am more confident about making decisions” and about 80% regarding “I feel hopeful about my future,” which is higher than Black/African American or, especially, White participants. They also more frequently endorsed the statement “I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me,” especially when compared to Black/African American participants (73% v 56%).

Asian and Indigenous/Mixed Race: Participants in the Asian group ranged from only 6 people responding to an item about substance abuse (the item may not be relevant to other participants) to a high of 21 to other statements; the indigenous/mixed race group consisted of, at most, 9 people. These numbers are too low to draw conclusions about the groups.

In sum, racial/ethnic subgroups in the sample follow the general pattern of positive impact from help received. Items referring to safety generally received positive responses, although less frequently for managing contact with the abuser. Areas receiving the least frequent positive endorsements refer to finances.

We then used statistical analyses to determine if differences among racial/ethnic subgroups occurred simply by chance. The accepted standard in science is a probability of less than 5% that findings occurred by chance; in other words, only 5 times out of 100 would you get this result by chance. Using this criterion, we examined differences among the groups in the survey sample and found the following statistically significant differences:

On the statement “I can support myself financially” the Asian group was significantly less likely to say “a lot” in response to how much did domestic violence services help you.

On the statement “I understand about the causes of domestic violence” Black/African American participants were significantly less likely to say “a lot.”

On the statement “I understand my legal rights as a domestic violence victim” the Latino group was significantly more likely to say “a lot.”

On the statement “I am able to support myself and my children” the Latino group was significantly more likely to say “a lot.”

Although these differences are informative, the fact that only 4 statements differ statistically among the 22 statements suggests that subgroup differences are greatly outweighed by the similarity of responses.

Parenting Status and Outcomes

We compared responses to outcome statements for those with children to those without children (see Table 3.3 in the appendix for outcomes by parenting status).

Those without children responded “a lot” most frequently to safety concerns (e.g., “I feel safe from violence in my home, I have ways to keep myself safe, I understand about the causes of domestic violence”). Many of them reported “a lot” to whether services helped with understanding their legal rights, and similarly (but somewhat less frequently) to statements referring to a positive outlook on life (e.g., “I am more confident about making decisions; I feel positive about my future”). The lowest frequency of being helped referred to finances (“I can support myself financially”). Items about substance abuse also received low frequencies of being helped a lot, but few participants responded to these items (others may have marked these as not applicable to them).

Those with children also responded “a lot” to safety items, including those referring to their children and themselves feeling safe from violence in the home. In addition, 92.5% said that services from domestic violence agencies helped “a lot” with having their children attend school. Items receiving lower frequencies (but still reported as “a lot” by over half the sample) refer to substance abuse, although, as above, fewer participants responded to these items. The lowest frequencies of being helped “a lot” refer to finances (“I can support myself financially; I can support my children financially”).

To examine whether differences in responses between those with and without children were statistically significant, we first excluded those items referring to children because those without children would obviously answer differently. Of the remaining items, only one item approached statistical significance ($p=.058$): “*I can support myself financially.*” Thirty-four percent of those without children reported that domestic violence agency services had helped them “a lot” with this while 44.5 percent of those with children responded “a lot.” Again, only one difference out of 22 statements suggests that the groups are more similar than different on items not referring to children.

Socioeconomic Resources and Outcomes

In order to examine the relationship of socioeconomic resources to outcomes, we combined education, employment, and income and divided the sample into 4 groups ranging from those with the fewest socioeconomic resources to those with the most resources. We then looked at the distribution of responses to the statements about how much people have changed as a result of receiving help from domestic violence agencies (see Table 3.4 in the appendix for outcomes by socioeconomic resources).

Those with the fewest resources most frequently reported being helped “a lot” with safety items, including feeling safe, understanding the causes and impact of domestic violence on them and their children, and understanding their legal rights. An

exception was the item referring to contact with the abuser, which fewer people marked as being helped “a lot.” Many people in this group being helped “a lot” on items referring to a positive outlook on life (about 81% reported feeling confident about making choices and about 76% reported feeling hopeful about the future). Items referring to finances received lower frequencies of “a lot” but still over 50%. Items referring to substance abuse also received frequencies over 50% but were responded to by fewer people (more people may have marked them as “not applicable”).

Those with slightly more resources followed a similar pattern to those with the fewest resources, reporting being helped “a lot” with most of the safety items. However, *those with slightly more resources* received less help with managing contact with the abuser. Fewer participants reported being helped “a lot” with being able to cope with the impact of domestic violence, either on themselves or their children. Fewer also reported being helped “a lot” with finances and with understanding the impact of domestic violence. Slightly more reported being helped “a lot” with managing contact with the abuser, but the frequency is still below that to other statements. Again, fewer people responded to items about substance abuse.

Those with somewhat more resources follow a similar pattern, although their frequency of being helped “a lot” with finances drops even lower (about 40%) than the group with the fewest resources (53.4%). They are also somewhat less likely to have reported “a lot” to whether they feel safe from violence in the home. In other ways, their pattern of responses is similar to the group with slightly more resources.

Those with the most resources are least likely to say they were helped “a lot” with respect to having confidence in their own decisions. They responded similarly to other subgroups with respect to other statements.

A test of the statistical significance of the differences among groups with varying socioeconomic resources revealed only one difference that reached significance: “I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me.” More of those with the fewest socioeconomic resources reported that services helped them “a lot” with this than other groups. However, 1 significant difference among 22 statements suggests that these groups may be more similar than different.

In sum, the pattern of responses suggests that outcomes from receiving services from domestic violence agencies are very positive overall. Many participants reported being helped a lot with safety concerns, although managing contact with the abuser remains a problem for some. Finances are also an area where fewer participants reported being helped a lot.

Changes in Economic Status

Research Question 4: What changes did survivors experience in economic status?

Another key research question regarding the outcome of services is whether survivors' economic status changed over the time of the study. At initiation of services, survivors reported their income and its sources. Then, in the survey (approximately 4 to 6 months after first seeking help) survivors again reported their current income and income sources. The preliminary analysis presented in detail below (and reflected in Tables 4.1 and 4.2) shows that there is movement toward greater income for many. However, this does not necessarily translate into economic security. It is important to note that, on average, the yearly income that participants reported on the survey is \$16,768, just above the poverty line in Chicago of \$16,020 for a family of two (not considered sustainable in most instances given the cost of living in the Chicago area). Nevertheless, the majority (65.5%) of survivors reported an increase in their income, although there was a sizable percentage (23.3%) who saw their income decrease. There are also some changes in employment status, with gains in employment being larger than decreases. Similarly, there are sizable increases in receipt of social welfare benefits. However, these data need further analysis to explore the specific relationship between increases and decreases in income, gain or loss employment, welfare benefits and other income support such as child support or spousal income.

Changes in Income Pre-Survey to Survey

Table 4.2 provides a brief summary of changes in income from initial receipt of services to the time of the survey. 76 respondents (23.3%) saw a decrease in their annual incomes, while 214 respondents (65.6%) saw an increase in their annual incomes. 11% of respondents saw no change in their incomes. For those whose incomes decreased, the average decrease was from roughly \$26,458 to \$14,343. For those whose incomes increased, the average increase was from \$7,854 to \$23,319 (see Table 4.3).

Changes in Employment Status Pre-Survey to Survey

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 show that the majority of respondents' employment statuses were unchanged or improved from the time of initial services to the time of the survey. 61.9% of respondents' work statuses were unchanged, 24.6% saw an increase (from part-time to full time, from unemployed to full time, or from unemployed to part-time) and 13.5% of respondents saw a decrease in their employment status (from full time to part-time, from full time to unemployed or from part-time to unemployed).

Changes in Welfare Receipt Pre-Survey to Survey

Table 4.6 provides a snapshot of welfare receipt from the time of initial services to the survey, specifically for General Assistance, Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF). There is a substantial increase in enrollment in all of these programs: from 1.3% to 11.6% for General Assistance, 5.2% to 16% for SSDI, 3.3% to 10.6% for SSI, and 4.6% to 35.6% for TANF.

Sustaining Evaluation

One of the purposes of the Domestic Violence Outcome Measures project was to establish sustainable, ongoing evaluation procedures in agencies. In the course of doing so, we encountered several challenges. Here we describe both the positive and the negative aspects of ongoing data collection.

One of the biggest challenges is high staff turnover in agencies. The frequent changeover of staff, from frontline staff to supervisors, required continual staff re-training about this project and its procedures and forms. If agencies paused recruitment due to staff turnover, it took months to train new staff and resume the previous recruitment and survey completion levels. Turnover among directors and supervisors was particularly challenging because they may not have been informed immediately about the project.

As part of this project, agency staff were to maintain contact with participants in the 6 months following recruitment. Staff did this through monthly phone calls, emails, or in person visits with the participant. While this may seem an easy task, staff found this to be burdensome in two ways. First, monthly client contact required a time commitment from staff who already had full schedules. Second, many agencies lose contact with participants because of a change in phone number, email, address, etc. Although extensive contact information was obtained during recruitment, this information may no longer be valid after time has passed. Domestic violence clients are in a time of change and stress in their lives, and maintaining contact with them may be difficult. Moreover, if a participant reestablished contact with the agency, it might have happened after eligibility for the survey had lapsed.

Another challenge faced by agencies was the high dropout rate of participants. When the project began, a dropout rate of 25% was anticipated. However, the current estimated dropout rate is 47% among all agencies but this rate varies greatly by program. Agencies recruited clients from the counseling, shelter, court advocacy, and legal services programs. Those programs in which staff developed strong relationships with clients (counseling and shelter) had higher retention rates than programs in which staff and clients had limited contact (court advocacy and legal services). Of these four services, the program with the highest dropout rate was court advocacy. Court advocacy involves time-limited contact between the client and the agency or case manager. Also, court advocacy participants (who typically are seeking an order of protection) often feel overwhelmed by paperwork and the legal system, and to many, this project seemed like “just one more legal document.” The burdensome nature of the court process made many of them unwilling to commit to another procedure that to them, seemed court-related.

Agencies that had higher retention and survey completion rates had highly relational programs, were small, community-based agencies, had a dedicated central staff member for this project, and had consistent monthly contact. The counseling and shelter

programs typically had higher retention rates due to their high levels of interaction between clients and agency staff. In addition, agencies that were small and community-focused were able to develop strong, ongoing relationships with clients which helped ensure high retention rates. Another trait of agencies with high retention rates was central, dedicated staff members who understood the significance of the project and took it upon themselves to keep the project on track. In addition, agencies that were dedicated and consistent in their monthly contacts to clients saw higher retention and survey completion rates.

Staff motivation was another challenge faced by agencies. Difficulties such as high staff turnover, the time needed for maintaining client contact, and high dropout rates of participants, could cause staff to become frustrated with this project and lose motivation. Staff motivation has improved over the last two years with greater support from the Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network (CMBW) staff, but challenges continued.

The recent budget impasse in Illinois has exacerbated the challenges faced by agencies, as many have been forced to cut or shift personnel and funding. Many of the agencies participating in this project had to suspend participant recruitment and survey completion because the staff members working on the project were either shifted to other agency responsibilities or laid off. Only in the last few months have all affected agencies resumed recruitment as prior to the budget impasse.

Several of these problems were alleviated by the addition of a CMBW staff member dedicated to this project. A central coordinator can provide training whenever needed and can sustain ongoing contact with agencies, maintaining motivation and correcting problems as soon as they occur. A coordinator also can identify early on if agencies are having problems and take steps to correct them. In addition, videotaping training so that it is always available to agencies would be helpful. Nevertheless, the problem of recruitment, particularly through court advocacy, would remain a challenge.

Conclusion

These findings tell a clear and compelling story about the long-term status of those who have received services from domestic violence agencies. Most rated the services they received very favorably and reported them as very effective. Outcomes of services are, overall, very positive. Services helped a great deal with safety for most participants and their children and it no longer is a primary concern for most survivors. Instead, they report a continuing and sometimes new need for counseling/therapy services. Many need assistance, mainly with legal and economic concerns, in maintaining safe and sustainable lives for themselves and their families. Below we summarize the major findings.

1. The need for help with emergency safety that people sought when they first contacted a domestic violence agency was mostly met and is no longer their most prominent concern. Over 80% of the participants who sought emergency shelter got it

and no longer need it. About 78% of participants who previously needed assistance with orders of protection got the help they needed and no longer need it. Fewer than 5% of the sample reported currently needing shelter and fewer than 10% reported needing help getting an order of protection. A sizeable minority of participants, about 18%, however, reported needing help managing contact with the abuser.

2. In contrast, counseling/therapy is now the primary help needed reported by about 46% of participants. The major need expressed by participants in all subgroups, whether divided by race/ethnicity, socio-economic level, or parenting status, was for help with therapy/counseling. Participants who had previously needed this assistance continued to need it, even if they had accessed this service in the past. And, for a substantial minority, about a quarter of participants, assistance with family counseling was either a new or unmet previous need. In sum, while services helped many participants to feel confident about making decisions and hopeful for the future, a continuing need for therapy/counseling services remains for many.

3. Over a quarter of participants reported a need for help with economic and material concerns, either in the form of permanent housing, emergency cash, help with credit history, financial planning/literacy, food/clothing, health care, or work. Fewer participants reported that services helped a lot with these concerns than with other issues. Of people who reported a current need for these services, a high percentage (compared to other categories of needs) reported that these needs were unmet previously or that they were new needs.

4. There is movement toward greater income for many participants in the survey. Income sources included employment, both full and part-time, child-support and/or social welfare benefits. In particular, there was a sizeable increase in the number of recipients newly obtaining public assistance. However this movement does not necessarily translate into economic security. It is important to note that the yearly income, on average, reported in the survey is \$16,768.02, hovering just above the poverty line for a family of two (not considered sustainable in most instances given the cost of living in the Chicago area).

5. Along with many of the economic and material needs discussed above, participants reported other issues that affect sustaining a stable and independent household, which is critical to safety. A sizable minority of participants reported needs, both new and continuing from the past, with respect to visitation and child custody. Most who needed help with divorce had received it in the past but continued to need it. About 16% of participants reported a continuing need for help with immigration. Many legal issues, such as those concerning divorce, child support, and visitation, are likely to be related to the one outstanding safety concern reported by a substantial minority of survivors: managing contact with the abuser.

6. There were few differences in outcomes of services or in current needs for help by race/ethnicity, socio-economic level, or parenting status. Help with immigration and translation was mentioned by a sizable percentage of Asians and Latinas, while the report

of a need for permanent housing was higher among these two groups as well. Most other differences among demographic groups did not reach statistical significance.

7. Instituting evaluation on an on-going basis in agencies is challenging for several reasons, including demands on staff time, high turnover rates in agencies, and the continual need for training. A central coordinator is critical to maintaining on-going data collection.

The Domestic Violence Outcome Measures project sought to identify the outcomes and current needs of those who received services from domestic violence agencies. This project was a test of whether the CMBWN could implement a multi-agency data gathering system, whether domestic violence agencies could maintain contact with a sample of survivors over 6 months, and whether the information gathered from those survivors would be useful to inform program and policy development. The answer to all these questions is a resounding yes.

Appendix

Comparison of Survey and Infonet Services

Participants in the survey were asked to report services that they received several months ago when they sought help from a domestic violence agency. They were given a list of services and asked whether they received them. These services had previously been reported on InfoNet.

Table 1.0, included below, presents a comparison of the frequency of services reported on InfoNet with those reported by survey participants. In some cases, the frequency of services reported on the survey are higher, such as help with food and clothing. In other cases, such as parenting services, a higher frequency appears on InfoNet. It is possible that clients may not recall or be aware of all the services they received. For example, those staying with their children at a shelter may not consider efforts made for their children to be parenting services. Another source of the discrepancy may be due to the purpose of InfoNet as it records only services for which agencies are reimbursed by the state. Agencies may offer services that are not reimbursed; these would not appear in InfoNet data.

Table 1.0 - Comparison of Survey and InfoNet Data		
Services	Survey N varies	InfoNet (N=412)
Therapy/Counseling Services	71.1%	79.1%
Parenting Services	17.6%	58.7%
Legal Services	51.3%	64.6%
Help with Getting Work	12.0%	24.8%
Housing/Shelter	28.7%	28.4%
Help with Health Care	14.9%	9.0%
Substance Abuse Treatment	1.6%	8.7%
Help with Transportation	19.1%	11.7%
Help with Food and Clothing	52.7%	36.2%
Other Help Needed	41.6%	87.9%

Table 1.1 - Current Client Needs			
		Yes	No
	<i>Valid</i>		
	<i>N</i>	N%	N%
Emergency Shelter	438	4.8%	95.2%
Permanent Housing	441	30.8%	69.2%
TANF, Food Stamps, etc.	441	24.9%	75.1%
Emergency cash from agency	436	25.7%	74.3%
Help with credit history	437	29.3%	70.7%
Financial planning/ literacy	436	28.0%	72.0%
Therapy/Counseling	443	45.8%	54.2%
Family Counseling	439	25.5%	74.5%
Help with parenting	438	13.7%	86.3%
Help with child care	441	15.6%	84.4%
Legal advocacy to get an order of protection	438	9.8%	90.2%
Legal advocate going with you to court	439	18.2%	81.8%
Immigration	432	16.4%	83.6%
Divorce	437	22.7%	77.3%
Child custody	436	17.2%	82.8%
Visitation	430	12.8%	87.2%
Developing a safety plan	432	16.7%	83.3%
Managing contact with partner/ex-partner	435	17.5%	82.5%
Transport to/from shelter	434	4.4%	95.6%
Transport to/from job	434	6.7%	93.3%
Transport to/from job seeking	434	10.4%	89.6%
Transport to/ from court	431	5.8%	94.2%
Help with Language/ Translating	432	21.5%	78.5%
Help with Food	437	28.6%	71.4%
Help with Getting Work	430	24.9%	75.1%
Help with Health Care	437	22.0%	78.0%
Help with Substance Abuse Treatment	434	.9%	99.1%
Help with Clothing	435	29.9%	70.1%

Table 1.2 - Current Client Needs by Race

	<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>															
	Black/African American			White			Latino			Asian			Indigenous/ Mixed Race			
	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		
<i>Valid N</i>	Black/African American N	N%	N%	White N	N%	N%	Latino N	N%	N%	Asian N	N%	N%	I/MR N	N%	N%	
Emergency Shelter	421	134	4.5%	95.5%	117	1.7%	98.3%	141	6.4%	93.6%	20	10.0%	90.0%	9	11.1%	88.9%
Permanent Housing	425	138	28.3%	71.7%	116	25.9%	74.1%	142	35.2%	64.8%	20	40.0%	60.0%	9	77.8%	22.2%
TANF, Food Stamps, etc.	425	136	15.4%	84.6%	117	27.4%	72.6%	142	31.7%	68.3%	21	38.1%	61.9%	9	22.2%	77.8%
Emergency cash from agency	420	137	25.5%	74.5%	115	23.5%	76.5%	140	24.3%	75.7%	20	30.0%	70.0%	8	75.0%	25.0%
Help with credit history	422	137	38.0%	62.0%	116	17.2%	82.8%	139	28.8%	71.2%	21	33.3%	66.7%	9	66.7%	33.3%
Financial planning/ literacy	420	136	31.6%	68.4%	116	18.1%	81.9%	139	29.5%	70.5%	20	45.0%	55.0%	9	55.6%	44.4%
Therapy/Counseling	426	137	39.4%	60.6%	117	43.6%	56.4%	142	53.5%	46.5%	21	52.4%	47.6%	9	33.3%	66.7%
Family Counseling	422	137	23.4%	76.6%	115	19.1%	80.9%	141	31.9%	68.1%	20	20.0%	80.0%	9	22.2%	77.8%
Help with parenting	422	137	8.0%	92.0%	116	13.8%	86.2%	140	16.4%	83.6%	20	20.0%	80.0%	9	22.2%	77.8%
Help with child care	424	137	18.2%	81.8%	117	9.4%	90.6%	141	17.7%	82.3%	20	15.0%	85.0%	9	33.3%	66.7%
Legal advocacy to get an order of protection	421	138	5.1%	94.9%	113	11.5%	88.5%	142	14.8%	85.2%	19	5.3%	94.7%	9	11.1%	88.9%
Legal advocate going with you to court	422	138	10.9%	89.1%	113	21.2%	78.8%	142	23.9%	76.1%	20	30.0%	70.0%	9	11.1%	88.9%
Immigration	417	138	3.6%	96.4%	115	11.3%	88.7%	138	29.7%	70.3%	17	47.1%	52.9%	9	0.0%	100.0%
Divorce	421	137	13.1%	86.9%	115	25.2%	74.8%	141	26.2%	73.8%	19	57.9%	42.1%	9	0.0%	100.0%
Child custody	420	138	9.4%	90.6%	114	20.2%	79.8%	140	21.4%	78.6%	19	31.6%	68.4%	9	11.1%	88.9%
Visitation	414	138	8.7%	91.3%	111	13.5%	86.5%	137	17.5%	82.5%	19	10.5%	89.5%	9	11.1%	88.9%
Developing a safety plan	416	134	9.7%	90.3%	114	19.3%	80.7%	141	20.6%	79.4%	18	22.2%	77.8%	9	22.2%	77.8%
Managing contact with partner/ex-partner	419	137	11.7%	88.3%	115	24.3%	75.7%	140	16.4%	83.6%	18	27.8%	72.2%	9	22.2%	77.8%
Transport to/from shelter	418	137	2.2%	97.8%	114	3.5%	96.5%	140	6.4%	93.6%	18	16.7%	83.3%	9	0.0%	100.0%
Transport to/from job	418	137	6.6%	93.4%	114	5.3%	94.7%	140	6.4%	93.6%	18	16.7%	83.3%	9	11.1%	88.9%
Transport to/from job seeking	418	136	11.8%	88.2%	117	9.4%	90.6%	138	9.4%	90.6%	18	22.2%	77.8%	9	11.1%	88.9%
Transport to/ from court	415	136	2.2%	97.8%	114	3.5%	96.5%	138	10.9%	89.1%	18	16.7%	83.3%	9	0.0%	100.0%
Help with Language/ Translating	416	136	1.5%	98.5%	115	18.3%	81.7%	139	41.7%	58.3%	17	35.3%	64.7%	9	0.0%	100.0%
Help with Food	421	138	27.5%	72.5%	115	27.0%	73.0%	140	32.1%	67.9%	19	21.1%	78.9%	9	33.3%	66.7%
Help with Getting Work	415	136	19.1%	80.9%	114	25.4%	74.6%	138	26.1%	73.9%	18	44.4%	55.6%	9	44.4%	55.6%
Help with Health Care	420	138	14.5%	85.5%	113	18.6%	81.4%	141	27.7%	72.3%	19	47.4%	52.6%	9	22.2%	77.8%
Help with Substance Abuse Treatment	417	138	.7%	99.3%	112	.9%	99.1%	140	1.4%	98.6%	18	0.0%	100.0%	9	0.0%	100.0%
Help with Clothing	418	136	31.6%	68.4%	114	25.4%	74.6%	140	32.1%	67.9%	19	26.3%	73.7%	9	44.4%	55.6%

Table 1.3 - Current Client Needs by Parenting Status

		Does client have children?					
		No Children			Children		
		Yes	No	Yes	No		
		No N	N%	N%	Yes N	N%	N%
Current Client Needs	Valid N						
Emergency Shelter	410	67	4.5%	95.5%	343	5.0%	95.0%
Permanent Housing	414	67	25.4%	74.6%	347	33.4%	66.6%
TANF, Food Stamps, etc.	414	67	17.9%	82.1%	347	26.8%	73.2%
Emergency cash from agency	409	66	22.7%	77.3%	343	26.2%	73.8%
Help with credit history	411	67	29.9%	70.1%	344	29.7%	70.3%
Financial planning/ literacy	409	65	24.6%	75.4%	344	28.5%	71.5%
Therapy/Counseling	415	67	49.3%	50.7%	348	45.7%	54.3%
Family Counseling	411	65	10.8%	89.2%	346	28.0%	72.0%
Help with parenting †	345	0	0.0%	0.0%	345	15.7%	84.3%
Help with child care †	347	0	0.0%	0.0%	347	18.2%	81.8%
Legal advocacy to get an order of protection	410	67	7.5%	92.5%	343	10.8%	89.2%
Legal advocate going with you to court	411	67	14.9%	85.1%	344	19.8%	80.2%
Immigration	406	66	22.7%	77.3%	340	15.3%	84.7%
Divorce	410	67	20.9%	79.1%	343	23.6%	76.4%
Child custody †	343	0	0.0%	0.0%	343	20.4%	79.6%
Visitation †	338	0	0.0%	0.0%	338	15.7%	84.3%
Developing a safety plan	406	64	18.8%	81.3%	342	16.1%	83.9%
Managing contact with partner/ex-partner	408	66	7.6%	92.4%	342	19.3%	80.7%
Transport to/from shelter	407	66	4.5%	95.5%	341	4.7%	95.3%
Transport to/from job	407	66	13.6%	86.4%	341	5.6%	94.4%
Transport to/from job seeking	407	65	10.8%	89.2%	342	10.2%	89.8%
Transport to/ from court	404	66	6.1%	93.9%	338	6.2%	93.8%
Help with Language/ Translating	405	65	13.8%	86.2%	340	22.6%	77.4%
Help with Food	410	66	30.3%	69.7%	344	28.5%	71.5%
Help with Getting Work	405	65	23.1%	76.9%	340	25.6%	74.4%
Help with Health Care	409	66	27.3%	72.7%	343	20.4%	79.6%
Help with Substance Abuse Treatment	406	66	1.5%	98.5%	340	.9%	99.1%
Help with Clothing	407	66	27.3%	72.7%	341	30.8%	69.2%

† Excludes people who do not have children.

Table 1.4 - Current Client Needs by Socioeconomic Resources

Current Client Needs		Socioeconomic Capital											
		Least			Low Intermediate			High Intermediate			Most		
		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No	
		Valid N	Least N	N%	N%	Low Int N	N%	N%	High Int N	N%	N%	Most N	N%
Emergency Shelter	343	59	6.8%	93.2%	122	4.1%	95.9%	96	10.4%	89.6%	66	0.0%	100.0%
Permanent Housing	348	61	27.9%	72.1%	123	30.1%	69.9%	97	38.1%	61.9%	67	28.4%	71.6%
TANF, Food Stamps, etc.	347	61	27.9%	72.1%	121	22.3%	77.7%	98	26.5%	73.5%	67	20.9%	79.1%
Emergency cash from agency	343	59	20.3%	79.7%	121	25.6%	74.4%	97	33.0%	67.0%	66	16.7%	83.3%
Help with credit history	344	59	15.3%	84.7%	121	28.9%	71.1%	97	34.0%	66.0%	67	29.9%	70.1%
Financial planning/ literacy	343	59	16.9%	83.1%	119	26.1%	73.9%	98	29.6%	70.4%	67	25.4%	74.6%
Therapy/Counseling	349	61	39.3%	60.7%	123	37.4%	62.6%	99	56.6%	43.4%	66	48.5%	51.5%
Family Counseling †	289	51	21.6%	78.4%	103	24.3%	75.7%	84	28.6%	71.4%	51	41.2%	58.8%
Help with parenting †	288	50	14.0%	86.0%	103	16.5%	83.5%	83	14.5%	85.5%	52	17.3%	82.7%
Help with child care †	288	49	18.4%	81.6%	103	17.5%	82.5%	84	22.6%	77.4%	52	19.2%	80.8%
Legal advocacy to get an order of protection	345	59	10.2%	89.8%	122	7.4%	92.6%	97	10.3%	89.7%	67	16.4%	83.6%
Legal advocate going with you to court	347	59	16.9%	83.1%	122	13.9%	86.1%	99	20.2%	79.8%	67	22.4%	77.6%
Immigration	340	59	28.8%	71.2%	119	12.6%	87.4%	95	14.7%	85.3%	67	9.0%	91.0%
Divorce	345	58	19.0%	81.0%	122	25.4%	74.6%	98	25.5%	74.5%	67	23.9%	76.1%
Child custody †	286	50	18.0%	82.0%	101	22.8%	77.2%	83	21.7%	78.3%	52	19.2%	80.8%
Visitation †	282	47	10.6%	89.4%	101	16.8%	83.2%	83	14.5%	85.5%	51	17.6%	82.4%
Developing a safety plan	341	59	16.9%	83.1%	120	15.0%	85.0%	96	15.6%	84.4%	66	9.1%	90.9%
Managing contact with partner/ex-partner	342	59	11.9%	88.1%	121	18.2%	81.8%	95	10.5%	89.5%	67	20.9%	79.1%
Transport to/from shelter	342	59	11.9%	88.1%	120	6.7%	93.3%	96	4.2%	95.8%	67	0.0%	100.0%
Transport to/from job	341	58	8.6%	91.4%	120	8.3%	91.7%	96	11.5%	88.5%	67	0.0%	100.0%
Transport to/from job seeking	341	60	23.3%	76.7%	118	10.2%	89.8%	96	12.5%	87.5%	67	1.5%	98.5%
Transport to/ from court	338	58	12.1%	87.9%	118	6.8%	93.2%	96	7.3%	92.7%	66	0.0%	100.0%
Help with Language/ Translating	340	57	33.3%	66.7%	119	23.5%	76.5%	98	19.4%	80.6%	66	7.6%	92.4%
Help with Food	345	59	30.5%	69.5%	121	26.4%	73.6%	98	29.6%	70.4%	67	20.9%	79.1%
Help with Getting Work	341	59	27.1%	72.9%	119	19.3%	80.7%	96	28.1%	71.9%	67	14.9%	85.1%
Help with Health Care	344	60	25.0%	75.0%	120	16.7%	83.3%	97	22.7%	77.3%	67	19.4%	80.6%
Help with Substance Abuse Treatment	342	58	0.0%	100.0%	120	1.7%	98.3%	97	1.0%	99.0%	67	0.0%	100.0%
Help with Clothing	343	60	41.7%	58.3%	120	31.7%	68.3%	97	29.9%	70.1%	66	15.2%	84.8%

† Excludes people who do not have children

Table 2.1 - Relationship between Past Needs, Services Received, and Current Needs

Services	Valid N	Needed Received Need Now	Needed Received Not Need Now	Needed Not Received Need Now	Not Needed Not Received Need Now
Emergency shelter	<i>97</i>	10.3%	81.4%	3.1%	5.2%
Permanent housing	<i>170</i>	10.0%	30.0%	34.1%	25.9%
TANF, food stamps, etc.	<i>155</i>	23.2%	44.5%	16.1%	16.1%
Emergency cash from agency	<i>115</i>	9.6%	16.5%	36.5%	37.4%
Help with credit history	<i>138</i>	13.0%	18.8%	28.3%	39.9%
Financial planning/literacy	<i>137</i>	29.9%	24.1%	21.2%	24.8%
Therapy/counseling	<i>273</i>	52.4%	34.1%	9.5%	4.0%
Family counseling	<i>132</i>	18.2%	26.5%	25.8%	29.5%
Help with parenting	<i>79</i>	30.4%	35.4%	15.2%	19.0%
Help with child care	<i>70</i>	20.0%	24.3%	21.4%	34.3%
Legal advocacy to get an order of protection	<i>147</i>	12.2%	78.2%	4.1%	5.4%
Legal advocate going with you to court	<i>145</i>	24.8%	54.5%	5.5%	15.2%
Immigration	<i>70</i>	48.6%	22.9%	21.4%	7.1%
Divorce	<i>104</i>	48.1%	29.8%	15.4%	6.7%
Child custody	<i>84</i>	33.3%	21.4%	16.7%	28.6%
Visitation	<i>68</i>	23.5%	25.0%	11.8%	39.7%
Developing a safety plan	<i>191</i>	17.8%	72.3%	3.7%	6.3%
Managing contact with partner/ex-partner	<i>117</i>	30.8%	52.1%	4.3%	12.8%
Transport to/from shelter	<i>46</i>	15.2%	60.9%	10.9%	13.0%
Transport to/from job	<i>42</i>	7.1%	42.9%	28.6%	21.4%
Transport to/from job seeking	<i>53</i>	17.0%	24.5%	28.3%	30.2%
Transport to/from court	<i>47</i>	19.1%	57.4%	10.6%	12.8%
Help with language/translating	<i>95</i>	66.3%	22.1%	6.3%	5.3%
Help with food	<i>158</i>	36.1%	32.9%	11.4%	19.6%
Help with getting work	<i>110</i>	25.5%	21.8%	24.5%	28.2%
Help with health care	<i>114</i>	23.7%	31.6%	17.5%	27.2%
Help with substance abuse treatment	<i>9</i>	11.1%	66.7%	11.1%	11.1%
Help with clothing	<i>137</i>	39.4%	21.2%	12.4%	27.0%

Table 2.2 - Client Satisfaction with Past Services

		Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Client Satisfaction (General)	<i>Valid N</i>	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
How satisfied were you with Emergency Shelter?	103	78.6%	14.6%	1.0%	5.8%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with Permanent Housing?	71	74.6%	16.9%	5.6%	0.0%	2.8%
How satisfied were you with this other type of shelter/housing?	25	64.0%	24.0%	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with TANF, Food Stamps, etc.?	121	56.2%	29.8%	5.8%	4.1%	4.1%
How satisfied were you with other help getting benefits?	31	74.2%	25.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with getting emergency cash from agency?	35	68.6%	20.0%	5.7%	0.0%	5.7%
How satisfied were you with getting help with credit history?	44	70.5%	18.2%	9.1%	2.3%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with getting help with financial planning/literacy?	101	55.4%	25.7%	7.9%	3.0%	7.9%
How satisfied were you with other help with finances?	26	73.1%	15.4%	7.7%	3.8%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with therapy/counseling?	259	80.3%	15.8%	2.3%	1.2%	.4%
How satisfied were you with therapy/counseling for your children?	103	77.7%	18.4%	1.0%	1.9%	1.0%
How satisfied were you with family counseling?	69	78.3%	20.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with other help with mental health?	24	58.3%	29.2%	4.2%	8.3%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with parenting?	67	74.6%	16.4%	4.5%	1.5%	3.0%
How satisfied were you with help with childcare?	43	60.5%	2.3%	4.7%	4.7%	27.9%
How satisfied were you with other help with parenting?	10	70.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with legal advocacy to get an order of protection?	161	75.2%	16.8%	.6%	3.1%	4.3%
How satisfied were you with a legal advocate going to court with you?	136	77.9%	14.0%	4.4%	1.5%	2.2%
How satisfied were you with help with immigration?	57	64.9%	28.1%	3.5%	1.8%	1.8%
How satisfied were you with help with divorce?	91	70.3%	17.6%	8.8%	2.2%	1.1%
How satisfied were you with help with child custody?	49	63.3%	30.6%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
How satisfied were you with help with visitation?	35	57.1%	40.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%

Table 2.2 - Client Satisfaction with Past Services (continued)						
Client Satisfaction (General)	Valid N	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
How satisfied were you with other help with legal services?	25	40.0%	40.0%	4.0%	12.0%	4.0%
How satisfied were you with help developing a safety plan?	199	78.9%	20.6%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with managing contact with your partner/ex-partner?	117	65.0%	30.8%	1.7%	.9%	1.7%
How satisfied were you with other help with personal safety?	26	80.8%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
How satisfied were you with help with transportation to/from shelter?	36	75.0%	13.9%	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with transportation to/from job?	18	77.8%	16.7%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with transportation to/from job seeking?	22	81.8%	13.6%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with transportation to/from court?	34	73.5%	17.6%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%
How satisfied were you with other help with transportation?	13	76.9%	7.7%	7.7%	0.0%	7.7%
How satisfied were you with help with language/translating?	98	75.5%	21.4%	0.0%	1.0%	2.0%
How satisfied were you with help with food?	127	74.8%	20.5%	3.1%	1.6%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with getting work?	59	50.8%	37.3%	6.8%	1.7%	3.4%
How satisfied were you with help with health care?	72	69.4%	25.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with substance abuse treatment?	8	75.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%
How satisfied were you with help with clothing?	97	78.4%	16.5%	1.0%	2.1%	2.1%
How satisfied were you with the other help that you got?	25	76.0%	16.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%

	Table 2.3 - Client Outcomes for People Currently Living with Abuser			
	Valid N	A lot	Some	None
		N%	N%	N%
I feel safe from violence in my home	36	52.8%	38.9%	8.3%
My children are safe from violence in the home †	25	56.0%	36.0%	8.0%
I have ways to manage contact with my abuser	31	54.8%	38.7%	6.5%
I am more confident about making decisions	38	68.4%	31.6%	0.0%
My children are attending school †	23	91.3%	8.7%	0.0%
I can support myself financially	33	33.3%	51.5%	15.2%
I can support my children financially †	26	46.2%	38.5%	15.4%
I know how to report violations of my order of protection	28	92.9%	0.0%	7.1%
I have ways to keep myself safe	36	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%
I have ways to keep my children safe †	26	73.1%	19.2%	7.7%
I understand about the causes of domestic violence	37	83.8%	16.2%	0.0%
I understand about how domestic violence affects me	38	89.5%	10.5%	0.0%
I understand about how domestic violence affects my children †	29	86.2%	13.8%	0.0%
I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me	38	60.5%	34.2%	5.3%
I have ways to help my children cope with the impact of domestic violence †	27	55.6%	37.0%	7.4%
I understand my legal rights as a domestic violence victim	38	71.1%	26.3%	2.6%
I feel hopeful about my future	38	71.1%	23.7%	5.3%
I am able to support myself and my children †	26	42.3%	46.2%	11.5%
I have moved forward on my education/training plans	28	53.6%	21.4%	25.0%
I have begun to explore the role my abuser's substance abuse plays in my life	20	60.0%	35.0%	5.0%
I am getting help for my substance abuse problems	2	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship	12	75.0%	16.7%	8.3%
† Excludes people who do not have children				

		Table 2.4 - Current Client Needs for People Currently Living with Abuser	
		Yes	No
	Valid N	N%	N%
Emergency Shelter	37	2.7%	97.3%
Permanent Housing	38	34.2%	65.8%
TANF, Food Stamps, etc.	37	24.3%	75.7%
Emergency cash from agency	38	26.3%	73.7%
Help with credit history	38	36.8%	63.2%
Financial planning/ literacy	38	28.9%	71.1%
Therapy/Counseling	38	50.0%	50.0%
Family Counseling †	31	35.5%	64.5%
Help with parenting †	31	22.6%	77.4%
Help with child care †	31	19.4%	80.6%
Legal advocacy to get an order of protection	38	7.9%	92.1%
Legal advocate going with you to court	38	23.7%	76.3%
Immigration	37	10.8%	89.2%
Divorce	37	27.0%	73.0%
Child custody †	31	12.9%	87.1%
Visitation †	31	16.1%	83.9%
Developing a safety plan	37	27.0%	73.0%
Managing contact with partner/ex-partner	37	24.3%	75.7%
Transport to/from shelter	38	0.0%	100.0%
Transport to/from job	38	0.0%	100.0%
Transport to/from job seeking	38	5.3%	94.7%
Transport to/ from court	38	2.6%	97.4%
Help with Language/ Translating	38	13.2%	86.8%
Help with Food	38	31.6%	68.4%
Help with Getting Work	36	22.2%	77.8%
Help with Health Care	38	13.2%	86.8%
Help with Substance Abuse Treatment	37	0.0%	100.0%
Help with Clothing	37	18.9%	81.1%
† Excludes people who do not have children			

Table 3.1 - Outcomes of the Whole Sample				
	Valid N*	A lot	Some	None
I feel safe from violence in my home	433	77.1%	20.6%	2.3%
My children are safe from violence in the home	354	85.6%	11.9%	2.5%
I have ways to manage contact with my abuser	371	58.2%	29.1%	12.7%
I am more confident about making decisions	436	77.5%	21.6%	.9%
My children are attending school	309	91.3%	4.5%	4.2%
I can support myself financially	417	43.4%	44.1%	12.5%
I can support my children financially	347	46.7%	40.9%	12.4%
I know how to report violations of my order of protection	360	81.9%	13.3%	4.7%
I have ways to keep myself safe	436	81.9%	17.9%	.2%
I have ways to keep my children safe	355	87.3%	11.8%	.8%
I understand about the causes of domestic violence	443	81.7%	15.1%	3.2%
I understand about how domestic violence affects me	443	87.6%	11.7%	.7%
I understand about how domestic violence affects my children	375	89.3%	9.6%	1.1%
I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me	440	65.7%	32.5%	1.8%
I have ways to help my children cope with the impact of domestic violence	361	67.0%	30.7%	2.2%
I understand my legal rights as a domestic violence victim	443	77.4%	19.9%	2.7%
I feel hopeful about my future	444	75.0%	22.5%	2.5%
I am able to support myself and my children	383	60.6%	31.3%	8.1%
I have moved forward on my education/training plans	377	57.0%	27.3%	15.6%
I have begun to explore the role my abuser's substance abuse plays in my life	229	58.5%	30.1%	11.4%
I am getting help for my substance abuse problems	59	54.2%	13.6%	32.2%
I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship	137	54.0%	29.2%	16.8%
*Valid N excludes those to whom this item does not apply				

Table 3.2 - Outcomes by Race

	Race/Ethnicity												
	Race/Ethnicity												
	Black/African American				White				Latino				
		A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None
<i>Valid N*</i>	Black/AA N	N%	N%	N%	White N	N%	N%	N%	Latino N	N%	N%	N%	
I feel safe from violence in my home	416	132	74.2%	23.5%	2.3%	112	77.7%	22.3%	0.0%	144	78.5%	16.7%	4.9%
My children are safe from violence in the home	339	96	85.4%	12.5%	2.1%	95	83.2%	15.8%	1.1%	128	85.9%	9.4%	4.7%
I have ways to manage contact with my abuser	359	115	53.9%	31.3%	14.8%	103	56.3%	35.0%	8.7%	122	59.0%	25.4%	15.6%
I am more confident about making decisions	419	131	81.7%	17.6%	.8%	117	69.2%	29.9%	.9%	143	81.8%	17.5%	.7%
My children are attending school	295	84	85.7%	8.3%	6.0%	83	94.0%	2.4%	3.6%	110	92.7%	3.6%	3.6%
I can support myself financially	401	129	43.4%	45.7%	10.9%	109	40.4%	43.1%	16.5%	136	46.3%	46.3%	7.4%
I can support my children financially	333	97	52.6%	37.1%	10.3%	94	43.6%	39.4%	17.0%	122	46.7%	45.9%	7.4%
I know how to report violations of my order of protection	347	113	86.7%	8.8%	4.4%	88	79.5%	14.8%	5.7%	122	82.8%	13.1%	4.1%
I have ways to keep myself safe	421	134	82.1%	17.2%	.7%	114	77.2%	22.8%	0.0%	143	86.7%	13.3%	0.0%
I have ways to keep my children safe	342	100	87.0%	11.0%	2.0%	97	84.5%	14.4%	1.0%	124	89.5%	10.5%	0.0%
I understand about the causes of domestic violence	426	135	72.6%	20.0%	7.4%	117	85.5%	13.7%	.9%	144	86.8%	11.1%	2.1%
I understand about how domestic violence affects me	426	136	83.1%	15.4%	1.5%	117	85.5%	13.7%	.9%	144	92.4%	7.6%	0.0%
I understand about how domestic violence affects my children	359	108	85.2%	12.0%	2.8%	100	86.0%	13.0%	1.0%	130	93.8%	6.2%	0.0%
I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me	423	134	56.0%	40.3%	3.7%	116	64.7%	33.6%	1.7%	144	72.9%	26.4%	.7%
I have ways to help my children cope with the impact of domestic violence	345	102	64.7%	30.4%	4.9%	96	68.8%	30.2%	1.0%	127	69.3%	29.1%	1.6%
I understand my legal rights as a domestic violence victim	426	136	73.5%	22.1%	4.4%	116	69.0%	28.4%	2.6%	144	88.2%	10.4%	1.4%
I feel hopeful about my future	427	135	77.8%	19.3%	3.0%	118	65.3%	30.5%	4.2%	144	79.9%	19.4%	.7%
I am able to support myself and my children	367	111	57.7%	36.0%	6.3%	103	51.5%	35.0%	13.6%	131	71.8%	23.7%	4.6%
I have moved forward on my education/training plans	364	110	53.6%	36.4%	10.0%	101	57.4%	18.8%	23.8%	126	57.9%	28.6%	13.5%
I have begun to explore the role my abuser's substance abuse plays in my life	218	72	59.7%	20.8%	19.4%	45	62.2%	33.3%	4.4%	83	56.6%	32.5%	10.8%
I am getting help for my substance abuse problems	58	21	61.9%	4.8%	33.3%	15	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	15	33.3%	13.3%	53.3%
I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship	133	37	56.8%	21.6%	21.6%	36	52.8%	33.3%	13.9%	48	50.0%	31.3%	18.8%

***Valid N excludes those to whom this item does not apply**

Table 3.2 - Outcomes by Race (continued)

	Race/Ethnicity								
	Asian				Indigenous/Mixed Race				
	A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None
	Asian N	N%	N%	N%	I/MR N	N%	N%	N%	N%
I feel safe from violence in my home	20	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	8	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	
My children are safe from violence in the home	14	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
I have ways to manage contact with my abuser	12	66.7%	25.0%	8.3%	7	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	
I am more confident about making decisions	20	75.0%	20.0%	5.0%	8	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	
My children are attending school	12	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	6	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
I can support myself financially	19	31.6%	52.6%	15.8%	8	37.5%	12.5%	50.0%	
I can support my children financially	14	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	6	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	
I know how to report violations of my order of protection	15	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	9	55.6%	22.2%	22.2%	
I have ways to keep myself safe	21	81.0%	19.0%	0.0%	9	55.6%	44.4%	0.0%	
I have ways to keep my children safe	16	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	5	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	
I understand about the causes of domestic violence	21	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	9	77.8%	22.2%	0.0%	
I understand about how domestic violence affects me	20	95.0%	5.0%	0.0%	9	77.8%	22.2%	0.0%	
I understand about how domestic violence affects my children	14	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	
I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me	21	76.2%	23.8%	0.0%	8	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	
I have ways to help my children cope with the impact of domestic violence	15	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	5	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	
I understand my legal rights as a domestic violence victim	21	76.2%	23.8%	0.0%	9	77.8%	11.1%	11.1%	
I feel hopeful about my future	21	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	9	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	
I am able to support myself and my children	15	53.3%	40.0%	6.7%	7	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	
I have moved forward on my education/training plans	20	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	7	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	
I have begun to explore the role my abuser's substance abuse plays in my life	13	53.8%	38.5%	7.7%	5	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	
I am getting help for my substance abuse problems	6	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship	9	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	3	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	

***Valid N excludes those to whom this item does not apply**

Table 3.3 - Outcomes by Parenting Status										
	<i>Valid N</i>	Does client have children?								
		No				Yes				
		A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None
		No N	N%	N%	N%	Yes N	N%	N%	N%	N%
I feel safe from violence in my home	405	65	70.8%	26.2%	3.1%	340	77.9%	19.7%	2.4%	
My children are safe from violence in the home †	315	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	315	85.7%	11.7%	2.5%	
I have ways to manage contact with my abuser	350	51	58.8%	21.6%	19.6%	299	57.2%	31.1%	11.7%	
I am more confident about making decisions	408	66	72.7%	27.3%	0.0%	342	77.8%	21.1%	1.2%	
My children are attending school †	280	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	280	92.5%	4.3%	3.2%	
I can support myself financially	389	63	34.9%	44.4%	20.6%	326	44.5%	45.1%	10.4%	
I can support my children financially †	311	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	311	47.9%	41.2%	10.9%	
I know how to report violations of my order of protection	336	52	76.9%	17.3%	5.8%	284	83.1%	12.3%	4.6%	
I have ways to keep myself safe	410	66	80.3%	18.2%	1.5%	344	82.3%	17.7%	0.0%	
I have ways to keep my children safe †	320	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	320	87.8%	11.6%	.6%	
I understand about the causes of domestic violence	415	66	75.8%	18.2%	6.1%	349	83.4%	13.8%	2.9%	
I understand about how domestic violence affects me	414	67	88.1%	11.9%	0.0%	347	87.6%	11.5%	.9%	
I understand about how domestic violence affects my children †	329	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	329	90.6%	8.5%	.9%	
I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me	411	65	56.9%	38.5%	4.6%	346	66.5%	32.1%	1.4%	
I have ways to help my children cope with the impact of domestic violence †	322	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	322	68.9%	28.9%	2.2%	
I understand my legal rights as a domestic violence victim	414	65	83.1%	13.8%	3.1%	349	76.5%	20.6%	2.9%	
I feel hopeful about my future	415	66	68.2%	30.3%	1.5%	349	75.9%	21.2%	2.9%	
I am able to support myself and my children	327	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	327	61.8%	30.0%	8.3%	
I have moved forward on my education/training plans	355	55	60.0%	25.5%	14.5%	300	56.0%	27.3%	16.7%	
I have begun to explore the role my abuser's substance abuse plays in my life	213	36	61.1%	25.0%	13.9%	177	57.1%	31.6%	11.3%	
I am getting help for my substance abuse problems	57	10	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	47	55.3%	12.8%	31.9%	
I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship	131	26	42.3%	42.3%	15.4%	105	56.2%	25.7%	18.1%	
† Excludes those who do not have children										

Table 3.4 - Outcomes by Socioeconomic Resources

		Socioeconomic Capital																				
		Least				Low Intermediate				High Intermediate				Most								
		A lot		Some	None	A lot		Some	None	A lot		Some	None	A lot		Some	None					
		<i>Valid</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Least</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Int</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Int</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>Most</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N%</i>
I feel safe from violence in my home	343	62	82.3%	17.7%	0.0%	120	80.0%	15.8%	4.2%	97	74.2%	22.7%	3.1%	64	78.1%	18.8%	3.1%					
My children are safe from violence in the home	282	53	90.6%	9.4%	0.0%	97	89.7%	6.2%	4.1%	80	90.0%	7.5%	2.5%	52	82.7%	11.5%	5.8%					
I have ways to manage contact with my abuser	297	53	67.9%	22.6%	9.4%	103	55.3%	31.1%	13.6%	80	63.8%	21.3%	15.0%	61	62.3%	23.0%	14.8%					
I am more confident about making decisions	346	62	80.6%	19.4%	0.0%	121	80.2%	19.8%	0.0%	98	79.6%	18.4%	2.0%	65	69.2%	27.7%	3.1%					
My children are attending school	252	46	91.3%	4.3%	4.3%	91	93.4%	2.2%	4.4%	71	88.7%	5.6%	5.6%	44	95.5%	2.3%	2.3%					
I can support myself financially	330	58	53.4%	31.0%	15.5%	117	43.6%	42.7%	13.7%	91	39.6%	51.6%	8.8%	64	46.9%	45.3%	7.8%					
I can support my children financially	279	51	58.8%	25.5%	15.7%	97	45.4%	40.2%	14.4%	80	43.8%	47.5%	8.8%	51	52.9%	39.2%	7.8%					
I know how to report violations of my order of protection	284	51	80.4%	17.6%	2.0%	90	80.0%	11.1%	8.9%	86	87.2%	12.8%	0.0%	57	84.2%	8.8%	7.0%					
I have ways to keep myself safe	346	62	85.5%	14.5%	0.0%	123	81.3%	18.7%	0.0%	97	85.6%	13.4%	1.0%	64	85.9%	14.1%	0.0%					
I have ways to keep my children safe	283	54	87.0%	13.0%	0.0%	99	85.9%	13.1%	1.0%	80	96.3%	3.8%	0.0%	50	84.0%	16.0%	0.0%					
I understand about the causes of domestic violence	351	62	87.1%	12.9%	0.0%	123	82.1%	12.2%	5.7%	100	86.0%	10.0%	4.0%	66	80.3%	18.2%	1.5%					
I understand about how domestic violence affects me	349	61	93.4%	6.6%	0.0%	123	84.6%	13.8%	1.6%	99	90.9%	8.1%	1.0%	66	87.9%	12.1%	0.0%					
I understand about how domestic violence affects my children	298	53	92.5%	7.5%	0.0%	106	86.8%	10.4%	2.8%	87	95.4%	3.4%	1.1%	52	86.5%	13.5%	0.0%					
I am able to cope with the impact of domestic violence on me	347	61	90.2%	8.2%	1.6%	122	68.0%	31.1%	.8%	98	67.3%	28.6%	4.1%	66	53.0%	45.5%	1.5%					
*Valid N excludes those to whom this item does not apply																						

Table 3.4 - Outcomes by Socioeconomic Resources (continued)

		Socioeconomic Capital																
		Least				Low Intermediate			High Intermediate			Most						
		A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None	A lot	Some	None					
		<i>Valid N</i>	Least N	N%	N%	N%	Low Int N	N%	N%	N%	High Int N	N%	N%	N%	Most N	N%	N%	N%
Client Outcomes																		
I have ways to help my children cope with the impact of domestic violence		290	55	80.0%	18.2%	1.8%	102	67.6%	29.4%	2.9%	80	73.8%	23.8%	2.5%	53	58.5%	37.7%	3.8%
I understand my legal rights as a domestic violence victim		349	62	87.1%	12.9%	0.0%	121	79.3%	18.2%	2.5%	99	78.8%	16.2%	5.1%	67	76.1%	20.9%	3.0%
I feel hopeful about my future		350	62	75.8%	21.0%	3.2%	122	76.2%	23.0%	.8%	100	81.0%	16.0%	3.0%	66	72.7%	24.2%	3.0%
I am able to support myself and my children		303	57	64.9%	24.6%	10.5%	107	60.7%	29.9%	9.3%	85	67.1%	28.2%	4.7%	54	63.0%	27.8%	9.3%
I have moved forward on my education/training plans		301	55	54.5%	29.1%	16.4%	106	62.3%	21.7%	16.0%	88	56.8%	28.4%	14.8%	52	61.5%	25.0%	13.5%
I have begun to explore the role my abuser's substance abuse plays in my life		180	29	65.5%	27.6%	6.9%	68	52.9%	35.3%	11.8%	52	65.4%	25.0%	9.6%	31	61.3%	29.0%	9.7%
I am getting help for my substance abuse problems		45	9	55.6%	22.2%	22.2%	18	61.1%	11.1%	27.8%	11	63.6%	0.0%	36.4%	7	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%
I have begun exploring the role substance abuse plays in my relationship		109	16	68.8%	18.8%	12.5%	40	57.5%	22.5%	20.0%	29	55.2%	24.1%	20.7%	24	45.8%	33.3%	20.8%
*Valid N excludes those to whom this item does not apply																		

Table 4.1 - Total Yearly Income - Pre-Survey and Survey		
	Pre-Survey (N=370)	Survey (N=396)
Mean	11554.2552	18512.4018
Median	8460.0000	16768.0200

Table 4.2 - Changes in Total Yearly Income		
	Valid N	%
Decrease	76	23.3
Unchanged	36	11
Increase	214	65.6
Total	326	100.0

Table 4.3 - Average Total Yearly Incomes for Respondents Whose Incomes Decreased and Increased (Pre-Survey and Survey)				
	Decreased Incomes (N=76)		Increased Incomes (N=214)	
	Pre-Survey	Survey	Pre-Survey	Survey
Mean	26458.61	14343.75	7854.00	23319.60
Median	19200.00	11220.00	5466.00	19668.00

Table 4.4 - Change in Employment Status from Pre-Survey to Survey (General)		
	Valid N	%
Decreased	57	13.5
Unchanged	262	61.9
Increased	104	24.6
Total	423	100.0

Table 4.5 - Change in Employment Status from Pre-Survey to Survey (Specific)		
	Valid N	%
Remained full time from pre-survey to survey	75	17.7
Full time to part time from pre-survey to survey	26	6.1
Full time to unemployed from pre-survey to survey	14	3.3
Part time to full time from pre-survey to survey	24	5.7
Remained part time from pre-survey to survey	49	11.6
Part time to unemployed from pre-survey to survey	17	4.0
Unemployed to full time from pre-survey to survey	45	10.6
Unemployed to part time from pre-survey to survey	35	8.3
Remained unemployed from pre-survey to survey	138	32.6
Total	423	100.0

Table 4.6 - Differences in Welfare Usage Pre-Survey and at Time of Survey		
	Pre-Survey	Survey
General Assistance	1.3%	11.6%
SSDI	5.2%	16.0%
SSI	3.3%	10.6%
TANF	4.6%	35.6%

Table 5.1 - Demographic Comparison of Survey, InfoNet Program Participants, and Cook County			
	Sample (at first contact)*	Program Participants (2013, 2014, 2015)**	Cook County (2014, 2015)***
<i>Sex</i>	<i>(n=450)</i>	<i>(n=50665)</i>	<i>(n=40306)</i>
Female	96.4%	91.2%	90.5%
Male	0.7%	8.8%	9.5%
Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Transgender (M to F)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Transgender (F to M)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Unknown / Not reported	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%

<i>Age</i>	<i>(n=450)</i>	<i>(n=50778)</i>	<i>(n=40403)</i>
0 to 1	0.0%	1.1%	1.3%
2 to 3	0.0%	1.3%	1.5%
4 to 5	0.0%	1.7%	1.8%
6 to 7	0.0%	1.5%	1.8%
8 to 9	0.0%	1.3%	1.4%
10 to 11	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%
12 to 13	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%
14 to 15	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%
16 to 17	0.4%	1.2%	1.2%
18 to 19	1.8%	2.7%	2.5%
20 to 29	25.1%	28.3%	27.2%
30 to 39	38.7%	29.3%	28.4%
40 to 49	19.3%	17.1%	17.2%
50 to 59	11.1%	7.8%	8.3%
60 to 64	0.7%	1.5%	1.7%
65 and over	0.7%	1.5%	1.7%
Unknown / Not reported	2.2%	0.6%	0.5%

Table 5.1 - Demographic Comparison of Survey, InfoNet Program Participants, and Cook County (cont'd)

	Sample (at first contact)*	Program Participants (2013, 2014, 2015)**	Cook County (2014, 2015)***
<i>Race</i>	<i>(n=450)</i>	<i>(n=50665)</i>	<i>(n=40306)</i>
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.6%	1.7%	1.5%
Asian	4.9%	2.8%	3.7%
Black/African American	31.1%	37.5%	38.1%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.5%	0.6%
White	51.8%	44.9%	46.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native AND White	0.9%	0.3%	0.2%
Asian AND White	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Black/African American AND White	0.2%	0.6%	0.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native AND Black/African American	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Other Multiracial	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Unknown / Not reported	6.9%	13.7%	11.2%
<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>(n=450)</i>	<i>(n=50606)</i>	<i>(n=40276)</i>
Hispanic/Latino	33.8%	38.8%	36.1%
Non-Hispanic/Latino	61.8%	59.7%	62.5%
Unknown / Not reported	2.2%	1.5%	1.4%

Table 5.1 - Demographic Comparison of Survey, InfoNet Program Participants, and Cook County (cont'd)

	Sample (at first contact)*	Program Participants (2013, 2014, 2015)**	Cook County (2014, 2015)***
<i>Employment Status</i>	(n=450)	(n=45935)	(n=36036)
Full Time	26.0%	29.8%	30.1%
Part Time	20.2%	17.6%	17.4%
Not Employed	48.9%	46.1%	45.8%
Unknown / Not reported / Unassigned	4.9%	6.6%	6.1%

	(n=450)	(n=45935)	(n=36036)
<i>Education</i>			
No High School	8.7%	9.9%	9.1%
Some High School	11.8%	14.2%	14.1%
High School Grad	22.9%	25.3%	26.5%
Some College	28.2%	26.7%	26.2%
College Grad or More	21.6%	15.6%	16.3%
Unknown / Not reported / Unassigned	6.9%	8.3%	7.9%

	(n=450)	(n=45935)	(n=36036)
<i>Marital Status</i>			
Common Law Marriage	1.8%	1.1%	1.0%
Divorced	11.8%	7.5%	7.9%
Legally Separated	4.2%	1.8%	2.0%
Married	43.1%	38.3%	37.8%
Single	34.4%	46.5%	46.6%
Widowed	0.4%	1.2%	1.4%
Unknown / Not reported / Unassigned	4.2%	3.6%	3.2%

Table 5.1 - Demographic Comparison of Survey, InfoNet Program Participants, and Cook County (cont'd)			
	Sample (at first contact)*	Program Participants (2013, 2014, 2015)**	Cook County (2014, 2015)***
<i>Does client have children?</i>	<i>(n=450)</i>	<i>(n=45935)</i>	<i>(n=36036)</i>
Yes	80.0%	76.3%	84.8%
No	15.1%	20.0%	20.7%
Unknown / Not reported / Unassigned	4.9%	5.0%	4.8%

<i>Monthly Income Range</i>	<i>(n=450)</i>	<i>(n=45935)</i>	<i>(n=36036)</i>
Less than or equal to \$500	35.1%	56.9%	56.9%
Between \$500 and \$1000	19.1%	16.5%	16.1%
More than \$1000	28.0%	26.5%	27.0%
Unknown / Not reported	17.8%	0.0%	0.0%

* Casa Central, CAWC, South Suburban Family Shelter, Mujeres Latinas en Accion, Sarah's Inn, Crisis Center for South Suburbia, Life Span, Between Friends, Family Rescue, Apna Ghar, Healthcare Alternative Systems, Metropolitan Family Services, Domestic Violence Legal Clinic, Arab American Family Services, WINGS

** CASW (HCIP), CAWC, South Suburban Family Shelter, Mujeres Latinas en Accion, Sarah's Inn, CAWC (Haymarket), CAWC (Greenhouse), Crisis Center for South Suburbia, Life Span DV Program, Between Friends, Between Friends (Rolling Meadows satellite), Family Rescue, Family Rescue (Shelter), Family Rescue (DV Reduction Unit), Apna Ghar, Inc., Basta! DV Program at HAS, Metropolitan Family Services, Domestic Violence Legal Clinic, Family Rescue (Ridgeland Program), Metropolitan Family Services (North Center), Metropolitan Family Services (Calumet Center), Metropolitan Family Services (Legal Aid Bureau), Mujeres Latinas in Accion (North Riverside satellite), Metropolitan Family Services DVCAP, Arab American Family Services, WINGS

*** Rainbow House, Rainbow House (Little Village), Rainbow House (Beverly Morgan Park), CAWC (HCIP), CAWC, South Suburban Family Shelter, Mujeres Latinas en Accion, Evanston YWCA, Sarah's Inn, CAWC (Haymarket), CAWC (Greenhouse), Crisis Center for South Suburbia, Life Span DV Program, The Pillars DV Program, Neopolitan, Korean American Women in Need, Between Friends, Between Friends (Rolling Meadows satellite), Rainbow House (Mt. Sinai satellite), Family Rescue, Family Rescue (Shelter) Family Rescue (DV Reduction Unit), Apna Ghar, Inc., Basta! DV Program at HAS, Howard Area Community Center, Howard Brown Health Center, Metropolitan Family Services, New Hope Community Service Center, Polish American Association, Domestic Violence Legal Clinic, Family Rescue (Ridgeland Program), Metropolitan Family Services (North Center), Metropolitan Family Services (Calumet Center), Metropolitan Family Services (Legal Aid Bureau), Mujeres Latinas en Accion (North Riverside satellite), Anixter Center, Metropolitan Family Services DVCAP, Legal Assistance Foundation Metropolitan Chicago, WellSpring, Schwab Rehabilitation Hospital DV Program, Arab American Family Services, WINGS