

Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics Online

<http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/pdf/t200342010.pdf>

Table 2.0034.2010

U.S. District Court judges' opinions on victim involvement in criminal proceedings

2010^a

Question: "Below is a list of statements about possible changes relating to how Federal sentencing protects the interests of crime victims. For each statement or possible change, fill in the circle that best reflects your view."

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Interests of crime victims generally are adequately protected under current Federal sentencing procedures.	34%	45%	9%	10%	2%
Presentence reports should be required to include information a victim wishes to be included in the report.	19	35	16	17	13
Portions of presentence reports, including descriptions of the offense conduct and guideline calculations, should be disclosed to victims.	9	26	20	24	22
Victims should have the opportunity to comment on the presentence report, including on disputed guidelines factors, before the sentence is imposed.	5	17	10	31	37
Congress should amend the restitution statutes to more broadly define the term "victim" to include persons who suffer any harm, injury, or loss that would have not occurred but for the defendant's crime.	10	36	20	21	13
Congress should amend the restitution statutes to more broadly provide for compensation to victims, including for emotional distress or other consequential harm or loss that the victim suffered as a result of the defendant's crime.	7	23	18	27	24
Courts should have the authority to order restitution to victims in all cases.	26	40	20	7	7

Note: This survey of United States District Court judges was conducted by Abt Associates on behalf of the United States Sentencing Commission. Respondents were recruited by repeated emails, telephone calls, and the mailing of paper copies of the survey. Responses were submitted electronically and on paper. All responses received before Mar. 31, 2010, were included in the results. Approximately 50 judges asked to be excluded on the grounds they were no longer active judges, had sentenced no criminal offenders in the last 2 years, or for other reasons. Of the 942 judges who remained, 639 responded to the survey for a 67.8% response rate. The 639 judges who responded had sentenced 79% of Federal criminal offenders during fiscal years 2008 and 2009, indicating that survey respondents had presided over a disproportionately large number of such cases and that judges disposing fewer cases had responded to the survey at lower rates. Response rates on individual items may be lower due to respondents refusing to answer.

^aPercents may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Source: United States Sentencing Commission, *Results of Survey of United States District Judges January 2010 through March 2010*, Table 7 [Online]. Available: http://www.usc.gov/Judge_Survey/2010/JudgeSurvey_201006.pdf [June 30, 2010].