

# **An Evaluation of Family Legal Services of the Legal Services Society**

## **Final Report**

For

Legal Services Society



May 1, 2012

**NOTICE TO READER:**

This document incorporates hyper links (blue font) within the document for navigation.

To activate a hyperlink: mouse over link and press *Crtl + Click* (on the mouse) to follow link.

To return to the page you were viewing:

*Alt + "left directional arrow key"*

**Reminder:** Alt and Crtl keys are always held down while used in combination with other keys.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents .....	i
List of Tables .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Executive Summary .....	v
1.0 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Overview of Services Involved in the Evaluation .....	1
2.0 Methodology .....	3
2.1 Survey Objectives .....	3
2.2 Survey Questionnaire .....	3
2.3 Experience and Training of Interviewers .....	4
2.4 Selection of sample .....	4
2.5 Contact Procedures and Results .....	7
2.6 Limitations and Strengths of the Methodology .....	9
3.0 Client Demographics and Originating Service .....	11
4.0 Resolution of Original Issue .....	13
5.0 Services Used by Clients .....	25
6.0 Reasons for Non-Resolution of Issues .....	35
7.0 Issues That Re-Emerge After Initial Resolution .....	38
8.0 New But Related Issues .....	45
9.0 Other Contextual and Outcome Issues .....	51
10.0 Conclusions .....	60

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Key Services, Locations and Time Periods of Samples.....	6
Table 2:	Results of Survey Contacts .....	8
Table 3:	Results of Survey Contacts, by Type of LSS Service .....	9
Table 4:	Demographics of Clients.....	11
Table 5:	Service Used by Client from which He/She was Referred to Evaluation.....	12
Table 6:	Frequency of Issues.....	13
Table 7:	Types of Issues and Degree of Completion .....	15
Table 8:	Degree of Completion of Issues, by Demographics.....	16
Table 9:	Degree of Completion of Issues, by Type of Service Used .....	18
Table 10:	Satisfaction with Outcome of Issues (only for issues that were resolved).....	19
Table 11:	Satisfaction with Outcome, by Demographics .....	20
Table 12:	Client Satisfaction with Outcome, by Service Type .....	21
Table 13:	Types of Issues and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved) .....	23
Table 14:	Types of Services and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved) .....	24
Table 15:	LSS and Other Services used by Survey Sample.....	26
Table 16:	Comparison of Total Respondent Usage of each Service with the Number of Clients Referred to the Evaluation from that Service .....	27
Table 17:	Order of Use of Services .....	28
Table 17A:	Frequency of Use of Services .....	29
Table 18:	Rating of Helpfulness of Service in Getting Client Closer to a Resolution.....	32
Table 19:	Whether Service Referred Client to Other Legal Services .....	34
Table 20:	Reason Why Issues Did Not Get Resolved.....	36
Table 21:	Types of Issues, and Time for Issues to Re-emerge After Original Resolution .....	39
Table 22:	Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution .....	40
Table 23:	Types of Services Used for Issues that Start Up Again, and Comparison with Original LSS Services Used.....	42
Table 24:	Degree of Completion of Restarted Issues.....	43
Table 25:	Degree of Satisfaction with Outcome of Restarted Issues (completed cases only) .....	44

Table 26: New but Related Issues that Arise, and Comparison with Re-emerged Issues.....	46
Table 27: Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues.....	48
Table 28: Degree of Completion of New Issues .....	50
Table 29: Prior Use of a Legal Aid Service for a Family Matter, by Demographics.....	52
Table 30: Other Types of Issues that Impact on the Main Family Issue(s).....	54
Table 31: Types of Impact Other Issues have on the Main Family Legal Issue .....	55
Table 32: Client Responses to Statements about Knowledge and Confidence Outcomes.....	57
Table 33: Mean Client Ratings of Statements about Knowledge and Confidence outcomes by Demographics .....	58
Table 34: Mean Client Ratings of Statements about Knowledge and Confidence outcomes by Services .....	59
Table S1: Comparison of Legal Aid Representation population and Survey Sample for Selected Demographics .....	72
Table S2: Usage of Services by LSS Program Clients (completed interviews only).....	73
Table S3: Client Rating of Helpfulness of the Service in Getting Them Closer to a Resolution .....	74
Table S4: Which Services were Mentioned or Involved Referrals .....	75
Table S5: Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution .....	77
Table S6: Services Used for Cases that Start Up Again, by type of Issue Involved .....	78
Table S7: Types of Issues and Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues .....	80

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank Jacqueline Wood, Sherry Poirier and Sue Brown of the Legal Services Society for providing input on the survey questionnaire, developing contact lists of respondents, and responding so immediately and helpfully to many requests and inquiries over the course of the project.

Peggie-Ann Kirk coordinated the interviewing team and conducted a large part of the interviewing with her usual efficiency, aided by Heather Fox, Marilyn Miller and Kay Medland. Anthony Beks of Capital Stenographic Services, both data entered the questionnaires and word processed the report.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

This is the final report of an evaluation of service outcomes for 783 clients of six Legal Services Society (LSS) family law services, based on a telephone survey conducted between September 2011 and March 2012.

The respondents were drawn from the following services:

▪ Representation (Legal Aid) (serves the entire province)	180
▪ Family LawLine (serves the entire province)	87
▪ Family Duty Counsel (in 45 provincial court locations)	282
▪ Out-of-Court Advice Lawyers (8 locations)	163
▪ Aboriginal Community Legal Workers (ACLWs) (in 4 Vancouver Island locations)	18
▪ Legal Information Outreach Workers (LIOWs) (in 4 locations)	53

### Objectives

The report presents basic client outcome data and related findings on the issues listed as objectives below. In 2006 a similar survey was conducted for the LSS with a different configuration of family-related services. Much of the content of that survey was intentionally preserved in the current survey, thereby permitting comparison of key results.

The primary objectives for this study were to determine:

- Types of issues that clients of the six services were seeking to resolve, the extent to which and the form in which they achieved resolution, and their satisfaction with the outcome.
- The types of services clients used to address their issues, how helpful they were perceived to be and referrals made to other services.
- Whether the issues re-emerged after appearing to be fully resolved, and how these re-emerged issues were then dealt with.
- Whether new related family legal issues arose, and how they were dealt with.
- Whether clients gained new confidence, knowledge or reassurance as a result of the legal services they received.

### Findings

Findings in this report are presented in 34 tables in the main body of the report, plus seven supplementary tables as appendices. The key findings are:

#### *Issue types and resolution*

- Custody, access and child maintenance/support are each involved in approximately half (45-55%) of all cases.
- There is an average of 2.0 family issues per case, virtually identical to the 2006 survey (2.1).

- Twenty-eight percent of issues are still pending. This rate is higher than the pending rate in the 2006 survey, which was able to draw from older cases.
- Not including pending cases, the combined resolution rate (i.e. “completely resolved” and “resolved, but issue re-emerged”) is 83% for completed issues (cf 85% in 2006). Only 8% of completed issues had “no resolution” (cf 7% in 2006).
- 13% of all issues that are completely resolved at one point re-emerge at a later date (cf 19% in 2006). Access, child support, and spousal support had the highest rates of re-emergence (18%, 18% and 16% respectively).
- Although for reasons explained in the body of the report service-related completion data should be considered with caution, the ACLWs had a higher “completely finished” rate than the other five services (83%), and LIOWs a much lower rate (45%).
- In 79% of all resolved issues, the client was “mostly” or “completely” satisfied with the outcome (cf 77% in 2006).
- ACLWs and LIOWs had the most positive client responses concerning satisfaction with outcomes (both at 87% “mostly” or “completely” satisfied, but no service had less than 76% in these combined categories. It is important to emphasize that more than one service may have contributed to these satisfaction results.
- 88% of resolved issues were confirmed by court order or a written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer (cf 90% in 2006 survey).

#### *Use of services*

- Clients used an average of 2.4 services to resolve their family legal issue(s) (cf 3.3 in the 2006 survey).
- Although all clients used LSS services, they also used non-LSS services for 21% of their overall issues.
- Analysis of the order of use of services helped clarify that services such as LawLine, Legal Aid Intake, community advocacy services, and Family Justice Counsellors tend to be used by clients as front-end services (i.e., used earlier by clients). The Internet may be used at any point in the client’s quest for resolution to his/her issue(s).
- There are frequently repeat visits to the same service by clients for the same problem with Legal Aid Representation, private lawyers, and advocacy service, whereas other services are used less repetitively.
- Clients gave high ratings of helpfulness (in terms of moving their case towards resolution) to ACLWs, Legal Aid Intake and community advocacy services.
- The main “networkers” or “referrers” are LIOWs, Legal Aid Intake, Family LawLine, and community advocacy services.

#### *Reasons for non-resolution of issues*

- Although based on only 87 issues overall, the main reason for non-resolution is system barriers, with other reasons fairly evenly divided between relationship dynamics and clients’ personal circumstances.

#### *Issues that re-emerge after their initial resolution*

- 106 respondents reported on 143 issues that re-emerged after initial resolution.

- Although the data sets are very small, child support, access and custody issues which re-emerged did so on average at 6 months. Sixty-two percent of all issues that re-emerged did so within the first 6 months.
- As in the 2006 survey, the two principal reasons for re-emergence of issues was the need for the individual to adapt to a changing situation, and refusal by one or other party to comply with an order or agreement.
- In 23% of re-emerging issues, clients did not contact a resource, despite having done so before (cf 20% in 2006).
- The non-resolution rate of re-emerged issues is 28% (if pending cases are excluded), considerably higher than the 7% for original issues, but lower than the non-resolution rate of 37% in the 2006 survey.
- The satisfaction rate for completed issues that re-emerged is much lower than for original issues (47% versus 79%). It is also much lower than the comparable indicator (68%) in the 2006 survey.

*New but related issues that emerge after resolution of the original issue*

- Child support features as a new issue with the same regularity as it did in original issues, but new custody and access issues are less prominent. Divorce is mentioned more frequently. The same patterns occurred in the 2006 survey.
- Less than half as many services are used by clients for new issues (1.1 per client) as for the original issues (2.4).
- If pending cases are excluded from the analysis, the rate of “non-resolution” of new issues (35%) is higher than that for re-emerged issues (28%).

*Prior use of a legal aid service for a family matter*

- A new question introduced in the current survey, but not included in 2006, explored previous use of Legal Aid services by respondents. Overall, 29% of clients said they had used a Legal Aid service (e.g. Legal Aid Representation, Family Duty Counsel, Advice Counsel or other LSS service) prior to the case in this study. Almost 40% had used such a service more than once.

*Other issues that have had an impact on family issues*

- 35% of clients reported that other issues had impacted resolution of their family issues. The two primary types of issues were financial (38%) and health (25%). Examples of direct impacts are provided in the report.

*Client responses to statements about knowledge and confidence outcomes*

- When asked to respond to four statements pertaining to their knowledge and confidence about dealing with legal problems in the future, respondents were most positive about knowing where to go to get legal assistance in the future. They were slightly less positive about their confidence in recognizing the legal component of a family matter or of knowing their rights. They were the least positive about being sure their rights would be adequately addressed in a similar case in the future.



## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This is the final report of an evaluation of service outcomes for clients of six Legal Services Society (LSS) family law services. The evaluation also examines the extent to which these services integrate with those of other service providers.

The report presents basic client outcome data and related findings on issues described in Section 2.1 of this report. In 2006 a similar survey was conducted for the LSS with a different configuration of family-related services. Much of the content of that survey was intentionally preserved in the current survey, thereby permitting comparison of key results. These comparisons should not be seen as the formal product of a structured methodological approach, e.g., a comparison of the same services at two points in time, with statistical assessment of significant differences. Although some of the services are the same or similar, several have changed substantially and/or are completely new. Rather, the comparisons are intended to serve a reflective, interpretive and contextual purpose.

Data is presented in 34 tables, with accompanying text primarily in point form. Seven supplementary tables are also included in Appendix 2. It is important to emphasize that the data is presented in relation to client issues and services used, not cases. This is because cases typically involve more than one issue and more than one service. Outcomes and subsequent events may differ, depending on the issue and services used.

### **1.1 Overview of Services Involved in the Evaluation**

There were six LSS services from which samples of clients were drawn for inclusion in the evaluation.

Lawyer representation:

- This service provides a legal aid lawyer to low income individuals who must be financially eligible for a service under the LSS Family Tariff. This service is only for serious family matters, e.g., when an immediate court order is required to ensure clients' or their children's safety and security; when there is a serious denial of access to children; when the other parent threatens to remove a child permanently from the province; or when the other parent has access, but has unlawfully held the children and denied the other parent custody.

Lawyer advice services:

- Family Duty Counsel (FDC) are private lawyers who contract with LSS to provide services in 46 provincial courthouses and 11 supreme courts in BC. In this service, lawyers give legal advice to unrepresented clients with family law and child protection problems, speaking in court on simple matters such as adjournments, consent and emergency restraining orders, uncontested custody, access and support hearings. They

can also help draft or review documents and negotiate issues, but do not represent clients at trial.

- **Out of Court Advice Lawyers.** Advice lawyers are available at family justice counsellors' (FJC) offices around the province as well as at some courthouses. They also meet clients in some other combined services (e.g. the Vancouver and Nanaimo Access Centres) Advice lawyers help clients by supporting mediation and giving legal advice about agreements being mediated with FJCs. They do not provide assistance in court, although like family duty counsel, they may provide advice about a court action. Clients receive up to 3 hours advice for each new family matter if they meet financial eligibility requirements (less restrictive eligibility rules apply than for representation). However, even if not financially eligible, people can get advice for up to 1 hour if they are mediating an agreement. The service is usually provided in person, but can also be arranged by telephone in some cases (e.g. for clients in other offices if there is a conflict). This is a joint service with the Ministry of Attorney General's Family Justice Services Division.
- **Family LawLINE.** This is a telephone advice service by lawyers for individuals around the province who do not qualify for and/or cannot access other services. Individuals access the service by calling LSS's provincial call centre. Family LawLINE started in November 2010, following the closure of a more general LSS LawLINE service in April 2010.

#### Information and advice service:

- **Legal Information Outreach Workers (LIOW).** From January to April 2010 LIOWs existed in all regional centres except Prince George, including Kamloops, Kelowna, Surrey, Victoria, Nanaimo, Terrace and Vancouver. Since April 2010 they have existed only in Vancouver and in Terrace. The Vancouver position does some outreach in the mornings in Community Court in the Downtown Eastside, but this involves few family matters. There is also outreach by the LIOW in the First Nations Court in New Westminster. The Terrace position does outreach to Prince Rupert. This service can be either in person (walk-in) or by telephone. The person is usually referred to the LIOW by an intake worker, especially if he/she doesn't qualify for either advice or representation service.
- **Aboriginal Community Legal Workers (ACLWs).** The role of the ACLW is to identify and access appropriate LSS services and to advocate on clients' behalf. This role may involve some court support work. There are two ACLWs. One serves Alert Bay and Port Hardy, the other serves Nanaimo and Duncan. The latter is based at the Nanaimo Justice Access Centre, but also works out of the Tillicum Lelum Native Friendship Centre (Nanaimo), the Cowichan First Nation band office (Duncan) and the Nanaimo and Duncan courthouses.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

A telephone survey of clients of the six LSS services described in Section 1.1 was conducted in the 8-month period between September 2011 and March 2012. This section describes the survey objectives, the survey questionnaire, selection of the sample, training of the interviewers, client contact results, and strengths and limitations of the data.

### 2.1 Survey Objectives

The objectives for this study as outlined by LSS were to determine:

- Types of issues that clients of the six services described in Section 1.1 are seeking to resolve.
- The extent to which and the form in which they achieve resolution to their issue (formal or informal).<sup>1</sup>
- Reasons for non-resolution of issues.<sup>2</sup>
- Their satisfaction with the outcome.
- The types of services, internal and external to LSS, that clients used to address their issues, and how helpful they were perceived to be.
- Whether the LSS service provider suggested or actively connected clients with any of these services.
- Whether at any time clients used any form of PLEI (web or print-based) to address or resolve their problems.
- Whether the issues re-emerged after appearing to be fully resolved, and how these re-emerging issues were then dealt with.
- Whether new related family legal issues arose, and how they were dealt with.
- Whether clients had additional types of issues (e.g. income, housing, debt, criminal matters) that impacted their family issues.
- (If yes) Whether, clients received help with the additional related legal problem(s).
- Whether clients gained new confidence, knowledge or reassurance as a result of the legal services they received.

### 2.2 Survey Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire shown in [Appendix 1](#) was developed in interaction with the LSS evaluations coordinator in consultation with LSS stakeholders over the course of multiple drafts to address the objectives listed in Section 2.1. Although the questions closely reflect those just described, one issue in the construction of the questionnaire requires emphasis. The primary units for data collection in the questionnaire were the client “issue,” and the services used to address that issue. This approach was in recognition of the fact that when clients come to a service, they are usually addressing several related issues at once. Some issues may be

---

<sup>1</sup> A formal resolution is defined as a written agreement that was based on legal advice and witnessed; or a court order. An informal resolution is defined as a verbal or de facto agreement about the legal issue.

<sup>2</sup> Non-resolution of a legal issue is defined as not having an informal or formal resolution to a legal issue where conflict around the legal issue(s) still exists.

---

addressed sooner, more satisfactorily and at different levels of formality than others. Furthermore, clients tend to use more than one service to address a problem, so it was important to understand the interconnections and sequences between services, and their differing helpfulness in moving the issues toward resolution. For this reason, data was collected in the matrix formats shown in the questionnaire.

### **2.3 Experience and Training of Interviewers**

The challenge in this survey lay not in the questions themselves, but in the need for the interviewers to grasp the nature of the legal issues being examined, and the combinations of almost 20 services which could be used to address them. Clients frequently do not know the names of services they use, so where multiple services were used, the interviewers had to understand the nature, location and restrictions involved for each program and be able to help the client identify those services (including other services to which they might have been referred). Interviewer judgment was also required to determine whether an issue was resolved in the terms designated by LSS (even if a client didn't like the outcome), and the degree of helpfulness of the service in "getting the client closer to a resolution."

These challenges were addressed in several ways. Firstly, all of the interviewers were mature individuals with at least a bachelor's degree and extensive prior experience in interviewing in the justice and social services fields. Four had served as interviewers in the 2006 LSS survey and were therefore familiar with the basic questionnaire format and with most of the services provided.

Secondly, in September 2011 the two principals of Focus Consultants conducted 25 interviews with respondents who had used representation services. In this process small changes were made to the questionnaire to improve its flow and/or reduce confusion. Thirdly, written summaries of approximately 20 services were developed for the interviewers to help them guide the respondents in the identification and sequencing of services they had actually used. Fourthly, the questionnaire itself contained a number of key definitions or explanations for quick reference by the interviewer.

Finally, as the survey progressed, either the interviewers or data entry clerk would bring to the attention of the director problems about recording responses to particular questions. In each of these instances, a decision was reached and that decision was distributed in writing to both interviewers to maintain as much uniformity of interviewing and recording procedures as possible.

### **2.4 Selection of sample**

There were several constraints on how the sample of cases for this study could be drawn:

- *The fact that the study was focused on outcomes necessitated selection of cases from as early a time period as possible for each type of service.*

In the field of family law, cases frequently take many months or even years to achieve resolution. Furthermore, because of the dynamics that are associated with families that have broken up or are breaking up, issues may open up again after an initial resolution, and new but related issues may emerge at a later date.

If follow-up evaluation interviews are conducted too soon after the client's initial contact with the legal service, a high proportion of cases are often still unresolved and therefore very little can be said about case outcomes. For this reason, as shown in Table 1 samples of representation clients in this study are drawn from cases referred in January – February 2010. As noted in the next point, it was not possible to go back as far for the other five services.

The advantage of drawing a sample from an older period is a high rate of completed cases and therefore an ability to provide useful long term outcome data. The disadvantage is that successful contact rates with clients are much lower than in surveys of more recent cases, and it is therefore not possible to obtain a representative sample.

- *It was not possible to pick a single, uniform time period and source of respondents for all six programs.*

Several of the programs were recently established, or had recently been re-established in a new configuration. Samples needed therefore to be drawn from more recent time periods. For example, Family LawLINE only began in November 2010, the ACLW services in January 2009 and November 2009, and the current configuration of LIOWs in April 2010. Theoretically it would have been possible to draw on FDC and advice lawyer consents earlier than September/October 2010, but there was concern about whether earlier forms could consistently have been located.

- *Programs varied significantly in their capacity to provide lists of clients who had given permission to be contacted for research purposes.*

LSS maintains a database of all clients who are referred to private lawyers under the family tariff, so it is a relatively easy task to produce contact lists for such clients. Family duty counsel and out-of-court advice lawyers are required to obtain signed Acknowledgement of Services forms from clients at the time of service. These forms contain a request to participate in future evaluations, to which clients give consent when they sign the form unless otherwise noted. By contrast LIOWs do not maintain client databases, so consents were gathered only after the decision to conduct the survey was undertaken. This also meant the time period from which consents were drawn was more recent than for representation cases. A consent process for Family LawLINE has been in place since the beginning of the program.

- *All cases required screening to avoid any cases in which the caller might be jeopardized by a contact.*

In a small number of cases, a contact by a researcher with a client could potentially cause disturbance to the client, loss of privacy or recrimination by a spouse or ex-spouse. All such cases were flagged and reviewed by LSS staff or duty counsel prior to release of the sample list to Focus Consultants for this study.

A summary of the six services, their location, client populations, sample targeted and time period of sample is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Key Services, Locations and Time Periods of Samples**

LSS Family Service	Locations	Client Population	Sample Targeted	Time Period of Sample
1. Representation	Throughout province	Approximately 316 referrals per month	174	January – February, 2010
2. Family LawLINE	Throughout province. Six lawyers on roster; 2 per day on LawLINE	Approximately 150 per month	108	November 2010 – February 2011
3. Family Duty Counsel (in court)	Approximately 198 FDC; 45 court locations throughout province	Approximately 2375 clients per month	331	September – October 2010
4. Out-of-Court Advice Lawyers	Kamloops, Kelowna, Nanaimo, New Westminster, Prince George, Surrey, Victoria, Vancouver	Approximately 317 clients per month	174	September – October 2010
5. Aboriginal Community Legal Workers (ACLWs)	2 ACLWs in 4 locations: Port Hardy, Alert Bay, Duncan, Nanaimo	Approximately 17 – 20 total clients per month	34	Nanaimo/Duncan, April – December, 2001; Port Hardy/Alert Bay, May – December 2011
6. Legal Information Outreach Workers (LIOWs)	4 (including Terrace); 1 FTE LIOW does outreach to agencies, etc., but not to clients	Approximately 70 clients with family law issues/month	60	Vancouver, July – November 2011; Terrace/Prince Rupert, September – November, 2011
TOTAL	n/a	n/a	881	n/a

## **2.5 Contact Procedures and Results**

Lists of potential respondents for each service were forwarded to Focus Consultants by LSS for inclusion in the sample. Certain names were dropped from the list because they were duplicates, i.e., they had already been forwarded in relation to one of the other five programs. Up to a maximum of 12 telephone contacts were attempted with all other respondents. The results of the contact attempts are presented in Table 2, which shows that

- The overall completion rate was 36%. This was a slight increase from the 2006 survey.
- Only 35 clients refused to participate when contact was made. This represented 2% of total clients, the same percentage as in 2006.
- Thirty-nine percent of the clients (847/2152) could not be contacted at all. The primary reasons for inability to contact clients, comprising 91% of the 847 situations, were telephone numbers which were no longer in service and wrong numbers. These reasons reflect several factors. The first is that the samples were of clients who in many cases had used LSS programs from 12 to 20 months prior to the attempted survey contacts, so many clients had moved and/or changed telephone numbers. Secondly, a large percentage of contact numbers are for cell phones, the numbers for which are often more short-lived than land lines. Thirdly, the fact that family cases usually involved tensions and changes in marital relationships makes it unsurprising that a significant proportion of clients had changed domicile and/or contact information.

The “not possible to contact at all” rate of 39% was lower than the comparable rate of 47% in 2006. This was not unexpected in that many of the 2006 survey cases were even older than the ones in the current survey. There was thus less likelihood of clients “moving on,” and numbers therefore being lost.

However, even when the telephone number is correct, it is becoming increasingly difficult to contact clients simply by phoning repeatedly at different times of the day or week. This is shown in the 17% of overall cases where contact could not be made despite repeated attempts (compared to only 11% in 2006). This is because individuals are increasingly using call display to screen calls. If clients do not know the person listed on the display, they often will not respond to the call, especially if they see the number repeatedly. We were sometimes able to get through to a client after trying 4 or 5 times, simply by changing the interviewer and therefore the number from which we were calling.

**Table 2: Results of Survey Contacts**

<b>2011 – 12 Survey</b>			<b>2006 Survey</b>
<b>Contact Result</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Interviews completed</b>	<b>783</b>	36%	33%
<b>Not possible to contact at all</b>	<b>847</b>	39%	47%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ wrong number (290)</li> <li>▪ not in service (482)</li> <li>▪ no phone number (11)</li> <li>▪ moved; no forwarding number (20)</li> <li>▪ transition house/hotel, no contact possible (26)</li> <li>▪ fax number only (4)</li> <li>▪ incomplete phone number (1)</li> <li>▪ no longer employed at work number (3)</li> <li>▪ phone blocked to unknown numbers (10)</li> </ul>			
<b>No contact after 6-12 attempts</b>	<b>373</b>	17%	11%
<b>Contact made, but could not interview</b>	<b>81</b>	4%	2%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ client didn't remember service (31)</li> <li>▪ client away during research period (4)</li> <li>▪ client couldn't be available (43)</li> <li>▪ client deceased (1)</li> <li>▪ client claims he/she was refused service (2)</li> </ul>			
<b>Administrative issues requiring that clients be dropped from the sample</b>	<b>30</b>	1%	6%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ duplicates (client used two different services, so was only phoned once) (30)</li> </ul>			
<b>Refusals</b>	<b>35</b>	2%	2%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ client declined participation (30)</li> <li>▪ intermediary would not contact client (1)</li> <li>▪ client declined because of cell phone charges (4)</li> </ul>			
<b>Other</b>	<b>3</b>	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL (of bolded figures)</b>	<b>2152</b>	100%	100%

Notes:

1. Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.
2. Figures in bold are main categories, and are the ones used in the overall totals. Figures in parentheses are sub-categories of the bolded figures



Table 3 shows the results of contact attempts, by the type of LSS service. Overall, the original targets for completed interviews were substantially met (89%). Completion rates primarily reflected a combination of the date and size of sample. In terms of date of sample, the two services with the highest completion rates in relation to the number of consents received (ACLWs and LIOWs) were services that collected consents most recently (in 2011). The service with the lowest completion rate in relation to consents (Representation) had the earliest dated sample (January/February 2010). In terms of size of sample, Representation files had 3.7 consents for every targeted interview, which resulted in a 103% completion rate. Family Lawline had only 1.9 consents per targeted interview, and achieved an 81% completion rate. ACLWs had 2.2 consents per targeted interview, and achieved only 53% completion (a rate that was also exacerbated by more numbers not in service).

**Table 3: Results of Survey Contacts, by Type of LSS Service**

Service Type	Sample Targeted	Consent Forms Received	Completed Interviews	Percentage of Sample Target Completed	Percentage of Consents Resulting in Completions
1. Representation	174	649	180	103%	28%
2. Family LawLine	108	203	87	81%	43%
3. Family Duty Counsel (in court)	331	820	282	85%	34%
4. Out-of-court Advice lawyers	174	356	163	94%	45%
5. Aboriginal Community Legal Workers (ACLWs)	34	39	18	53%	46%
6. Legal Information Outreach Workers	60	85	53	88%	62%
Total	881	2152	783	89%	36%

## 2.6 Limitations and Strengths of the Methodology

There were both strengths and limitations to the sample selection methodology used, and therefore of the resulting data. The principal limitations are that:

- The overall successful contact rate was too low to permit achievement of a representative sample of cases. This was primarily a factor of the age of the sample. The problem could not be remedied without inclusion of a significantly greater sample, which for some programs was not possible because they were relatively new, and for others it would have meant a higher rate of “pending” cases for which outcome data could not be gathered.

Nonetheless, as pointed out below, the overall sample size was sufficient to make detailed and useful analyses of programs and issues, and on certain demographic measures the sample reflects the population of LSS cases, which lends confidence in the results.

- For the ACLWs, the sample was too small to be considered representative. Because of the small overall number of ACLW respondents, the number of cases or issues in any given cell of a cross-tabulation is often negligible. At the same time, there is a consistency of strong patterns in the overall ACLW data that somewhat balances those negative factors and lends more credibility to the results (e.g., Tables 9, 12, 14, 17A and 18).
- For reasons explained above, the samples necessarily were drawn from different time periods, which means that there is no common “snapshot” period that the data can claim to represent.
- It is not possible to assert that the samples that were drawn from each of the services were representative of the populations from which they were drawn. This is primarily because there is no population demographic data for most of the services involved. The Legal Aid Representation service was the only one for which comparison was possible. The results of an analysis are shown in Table S1 (Appendix 2). The only data set that had complete population demographic data was gender. For that demographic there was no statistically significant difference between the population and survey sample data. For two other demographics – ethnicity and education – there are a large number of population cases without data. Tests of significance were run on both demographics using the data available, and there was a statistically significant difference between the population and survey sample for the same time period.<sup>3</sup>

The primary strengths are that:

- The strategy of selecting samples that were as “aged” as possible was successful in producing data with a relatively low rate of “pending” cases. As shown in Table 7, the overall pending rate was 27%, which meant that outcome data was available on 73% of cases. Despite being a higher rate than in the 2006 survey (see discussion of Table 7 in Section 4.0), this is still a significant improvement over earlier studies for LSS, in which the pending rate has ranged from 39% to 52%.<sup>4</sup>
- Although the samples were not large enough in relation to the population from which they were drawn to allow them to be considered representative, for all programs except the ACLWs, the size of the sample was large enough to permit breakdown and comparison of data between programs and in most cases between data categories within programs.

---

<sup>3</sup> As shown in Table S1 for ethnicity,  $p=0.0006$ , and for education,  $p=0.0033$  at .05 level of significance.

<sup>4</sup> This data is from a series of reports conducted by Focus Consultants for LSS. Provincial Family Duty Counsel rate was 39% (*Evaluation of the Family Duty Counsel Project in Six Provincial Sites, Final Report*, April 27, 2004, p. 13). LawLine was 40% (*Evaluation of the LawLine Enhancement Project; Survey of Advice Callers*, October 15, 2004, p. 14). LawLink was 44% (*Evaluation of the LawLink Project, Final Report*, June 7, 2005, p. 40). Expanded Family Duty Counsel was 52% (*Evaluation of the Expanded Family Duty Counsel Project (Robson St. Court House)*, March 31, 2004, p. 17).

### 3.0 CLIENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND ORIGINATING SERVICE

Tables 4 and 5 present data on client demographics and on the service through which client names were drawn for purposes of the evaluation.

The data in Table 4 shows that users of LSS family law services in this study were predominantly (66%) female. Regionally, the proportion of female clients ranged from a low of 50% (5/10) in the Northwest to 81% (21/26) in the North. By service type the proportion of female clients ranged from 55% (154/282) for Family Duty Counsel to 77% for both Family Lawline (67/87) and LIOWs (41/53).

A large majority of clients (86%) had high school graduation or post high school education. This result is higher than in the 2006 survey (76%). The lowest education levels (some or no high school) were in the ACLW (56%, 10/18) and Representation (29%, 51/175) services. Only 4% (6/157) of Advice Lawyer clients and 6% (5/81) of Family LawLine clients were in these lower education brackets.

As noted in [Section 2.6](#) and in [Table S1 of Appendix 2](#), these demographic results reflect the population results drawn from LSS data for Representation clients in terms of gender. However, the survey sample for Representation clients contains a significantly *higher* proportion of respondents with higher education attainments (i.e., “graduated high school” or “post high school”) than the CMS Representation population ( $p=0.0033$ , .05 level of significance), as well as a higher proportion of non-Aboriginal respondents than in the CMS Representative population. ( $p=0.0006$ , .05 level of significance).

**Table 4: Demographics of Clients**

Demographic	Frequency	Percent
Gender (N=783)		
▪ Male	267	34%
▪ Female	516	66%
Ethnic Status (N=774; NR=9)		
▪ Aboriginal	50	6%
▪ Non-aboriginal	724	94%
Education (N=756; NR=27)		
▪ No high school	11	1%
▪ Some high school	98	13%
▪ Graduated high school	213	28%
▪ Post high school	434	57%

Notes:

1. N = number of respondents who answered the question or for whom data was available; NR = non-response, or data not available.
2. Percentages do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.

As discussed in Section 2.6 and shown in Table 5, there is a significant enough size effect in the samples of five of the six services to permit useful analysis and sub-division of data. However, the sample of the ACLW service is too small to permit comparisons with the other services with complete confidence.

It should be emphasized that the size of the samples for each service only roughly reflects the volume of clients in those services. The sample size for each service is the product of a number of constraints discussed in the previous section, and the main concern was to attempt to develop a large enough sample for analysis and cross-tabulation within each service.

**Table 5: Service Used by Client from which He/She was Referred to Evaluation**

Service	Frequency	Percentage
Representation	180	23%
Family LawLine	87	11%
Family Duty Counsel (in court)	282	36%
Out of Court Advice Lawyers	163	21%
Aboriginal Community Legal Workers (ACLWs)	18	2%
Legal Information Outreach Workers	53	7%
Total	783	100%

Notes:

1. Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.
2. The volume and proportion of clients for each service in this table does *not* reflect the overall volume and proportion of clients for those services on a monthly or yearly basis. See discussion in Sections 2.4, 2.6 and 3.0.

## 4.0 RESOLUTION OF ORIGINAL ISSUE

Tables 6-14 describe the types of issues involved in the 783 client cases, their degree of completion, client satisfaction with the resolved issue, and the type of resolution involved.

### *Issues (Table 6)*

- Table 6 presents data on the frequency of different issue types.
- Custody, access and client maintenance/support are each involved in approximately half (45-55%) of all cases. This result is similar to the 2006 survey. Access issues had the largest drop in frequency of these three issue types, down from 52% in 2006 to 45% in this survey.
- The second tier issues are divorce and guardianship, which featured in 11-17% of cases. In 2006, spousal maintenance/support, property division and divorce were the second tier issues.
- There was an average of 2.0 family issues per case, virtually identical to the 2006 survey (2.1).

**Table 6: Frequency of Issues**

Type of Issue	Number of Cases Which Involved this Issue	Percentage of Cases Which Involved this Issue (N=783)	Percentage in 2006 Survey (N=812)
Custody	435	56%	56%
Child maintenance, support	357	46%	49%
Access	355	45%	52%
Divorce	132	17%	14%
Guardianship	83	11%	8%
Restraining order to prevent violence	58	7%	5%
Spousal maintenance, support	57	7%	11%
Property division	41	5%	11%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	23	3%	1%
Possession of family home	18	2%	4%
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	1	0%	1%
Other	23	3%	1%

Notes:

1. N = Total number of respondents who answered this question.
2. There was more than 1 issue possible per case, therefore percentages equal more than 100%. Services are listed in descending order of percentage of cases in which they are involved, except for the “other” category.
3. “Other” included 6 travel-related issues (child passport), 5 unspecified family matters, 3 separation agreements (issues unspecified), 2 financial obligation/debt, 2 paternity, 1 adoption, 1 name change, 1 enforcement (issue unspecified), 1 representation agreement, 1 family information for client only.

*Degree of completion (Table 7)*

- Table 7 presents data on the degree of completion of cases.
- Overall, 28% of issues (445/1580; NR=3) are still pending. Statistically this rate is significantly higher<sup>5</sup> than the 2006 survey rate of 17%. As explained in Section 2.4 there were constraints on how far back in time a sample could be drawn because some of the LSS services (e.g. Family LawLine, ACLW and LIOW) had either only been established between April and November 2010, or the service had only recently established a process for collecting consents. Despite this more elevated pending rate, the survey overall provides a relatively complete data set about outcomes.  
As was the case in 2006, it is in cases that primarily proceed through Supreme Court (property division, divorce, possession of family home) that the pending rates are highest. However, spousal maintenance and support, unlike in 2006, has joined this higher “pending” rate.
- The “completely resolved” rate of 70% is slightly higher than in 2006. However, the “resolved, but issue re-emerged” rate is 13%, as compared to 19% in 2006. This is a statistically significant difference.<sup>6</sup> It is likely that this pattern is connected to the fact that overall, cases are more recent than in the 2006 survey. There has therefore been less time for issues to re-emerge. The combined resolution rate of “completely resolved” and “resolved, but issue re-emerged” is 83% (944/1140), almost identical to 2006 (85%). Only 8% (87/1134) of issues that were finished (i.e. on which no more action would be taken) had “no resolution,”<sup>7</sup> (compared to 7% in 2006).
- Property division, possession of family home and custody issues achieve high levels of complete resolution responses (86%, 78% and 77% respectively). Guardianship, access and divorce issues are at the next level (71% – 73%). The third tier is comprised of child support and orders forbidding removal of the child from the province (65% – 67%).
- Thirteen percent (144/1140) of all issues that are completely resolved initially resurfaced at a later point. It is perhaps not surprising that the three issues with higher rates of re-emergence are access (18%), child maintenance and support (18%) and spousal support (16%). These issues are more subject than others to changes in family composition, residence and financial circumstances. The overall re-emergence rate is lower than in the 2006 survey (12% versus 19%), which is likely explained by the shorter time between drawing the sample and conducting the evaluation interview in the current survey. “Resolved” issues have had less time to fall apart. However, the types of issues that most frequently re-emerge are the same.

---

<sup>5</sup>  $p < .0001$  at .05 level of significance.

<sup>6</sup>  $p < .0008$  at .95 level of significance.

<sup>7</sup> See definition of “no resolution” in [footnote 2](#) on page 3

**Table 7: Types of Issues and Degree of Completion**

Type of Issue	Total finished (non-pending issues)	Degree of Completion of Finished Cases			
		No Resolution	Situation Changed	Completely resolved	Resolved, but issue re- emerged
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Property division	21 (100%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	18 (86%)	1 (5%)
Possession of family home	9 (100%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)
Custody (NR=3)	324 (100%)	18 (6%)	31 (10%)	248 (77%)	27 (8%)
Guardianship	60 (100%)	5 (8%)	5 (8%)	43 (73%)	6 (10%)
Divorce	69 (100%)	10 (14%)	9 (13%)	49 (71%)	1 (1%)
Access	266 (100%)	11 (4%)	18 (7%)	188 (71%)	49 (18%)
Order forbidding removal of child from province	18 (100%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	12 (67%)	2 (11%)
Child maintenance, support	267 (100%)	26 (10%)	19 (7%)	174 (65%)	48 (18%)
Spousal maintenance, support	31 (100%)	5 (16%)	3 (9%)	18 (59%)	5 (16%)
Restraining order to prevent violence	51 (100%)	6 (12%)	13 (25%)	30 (59%)	2 (4%)
Other	18 (100%)	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	13 (72%)	2 (11%)
TOTAL, All issues (NR=3)	1134 (100%)	87 (8%)	103 (9%)	801 (71%)	143 (13%)

Notes:

1. Percentages are totalled horizontally, but may not total 100% due to rounding.
2. Services are listed in descending order of percentage “completely resolved.” The exception is for “other cases,” listed at the bottom.
3. NR = No response.
4. “Situation changed” means that after the service had started, the circumstances which gave rise to the case changed (e.g., the other party changed his/her mind), so it was no longer necessary to pursue the matter.
5. This table only shows the results of issues that are finished, i.e., issues that are still pending are excluded. The pending rate for all issues is 28% (445/1580). Pending rates by issue were: possession of family home 50% (9/18); property division 49% (20/41); divorce 48% (63/132); spousal maintenance/support 46% (26/57); guardianship 29% (24/83); custody 25% (108/432; NR=3); access 25% (89/355); child maintenance/support 25% (90/357); order forbidding removal of child from province 22% (5/23); restraining order to prevent violence 12% (7/58); “other” issues 22% (5/23). There were no pending cases for restraining order to prevent removal of assets.

*Degree of completion, by demographics (Table 8)*

- Table 8 presents data on the statistical significance of demographic variables in terms of the degree of completion of issues. It shows that there are no statistically significant differences on completion responses based on gender or education, but there is based on Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal ethnicity. Aboriginal clients had a higher completion rate (77%) than non-Aboriginals (70%). In the 2006 survey the situation was reversed: there was a statistically significant higher rate of completely finished cases for non-Aboriginals (67%) than for Aboriginals (54%). In the current survey Aboriginal clients had a higher rate of re-emergence of issues (17%) than non-Aboriginals (12%), but this difference was much less than in 2006 (27% for Aboriginals, 18% for non-Aboriginals).

**Table 8: Degree of Completion of Issues, by Demographics**

Demographics	Total	Degree of Completion of Issues			
		No Resolution	Situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue	Completely finished	Appeared to be completely finished at one point, but then issue re-emerged later
<i>Gender</i>					
Male	381 (100%)	31 (8%)	27 (7%)	275 (72%)	48 (13%)
Female	735 (100%)	54 (7%)	74 (10%)	514 (70%)	93 (13%)
<i>Education</i>					
No High School	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (75%)	4 (25%)
Some High School	127 (100%)	5 (4%)	14 (11%)	87 (69%)	21 (17%)
Graduated High School	322 (100%)	27 (8%)	30 (9%)	232 (72%)	33 (10%)
Post High School	643 (100%)	50 (8%)	55 (9%)	457 (71%)	81 (13%)
<i>Ethnic Status</i>					
Aboriginal	69 (100%)	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	53 (77%)	12 (17%)
Non-Aboriginal	1050 (100%)	82 (8%)	103 (10%)	733 (70%)	131 (12%)

Notes:

- Total does not include pending cases.
- Percentages may exceed 100% due to rounding.
- There are no statistically significant differences between categories of the gender and education measures at the .05 level of significance. However, the difference in responses between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal respondents are significant at the .05 level ( $p=0.0325$ ).



*Degree of completion by type of service used (Table 9)*

- This table presents results for degree of completion by service type. It is important to consider that the type of issue, the degree of conflict, the nature of the client and the complexity of the issue that is being brought to each service are all factors in the rate at which cases can be successfully completed. It should also be remembered that in this table other services may impact positively or negatively the completion rate for any given service (because clients use an average of 2.4 services each). With these caveats noted, the ACLW project has the highest “completely finished” rate of the five services (83%) while the LIOW service has a significantly lower rate than the others. Both have a much smaller sample size than the other services, so the data may be less reliable. The other four services ranged between 66% - 75% completion. Legal Aid Representation cases had the highest rate of problem re-emergence (18%), but since the sample was drawn from an earlier period than the other services there has been more time for problems to reappear.
- The “no resolution” patterns are simply the inverse of the “completely finished” patterns: ACLWs had the lowest “no resolution” rate (4%), while LIOWs had the highest (26%). The same caveat about sample size mentioned in the previous point applies to this finding as well. It can be hypothesized that because the ACLW is an advice and advocacy project, the rate of resolution of programs can be expected to be high. By contrast, the LIOW is primarily an information service where clients are more on their own, and therefore might achieve lower resolution rates. (Nonetheless, in the 2006 survey, LIOW cases had a 70% “completely finished” rate and only a 4% “no resolution” rate.)

*Satisfaction with outcome (Table 10)*

- Table 10 presents data on client satisfaction with the outcomes of issues. Note that satisfaction is only for issues that were completed, (either for better or for worse). “Satisfaction with outcome” is not the same as “satisfaction with the service,” so whether the outcome is favourable strongly colours the client’s response.
- The client’s satisfaction with outcome rating was on the positive end of the 4 point scale (“mostly” and “completely”), for 79% of all resolved issues (733/932), compared to 77% in the 2006 survey. However, the “completely” rate was higher in the 2006 survey (60%) than in the 2011-12 survey (55%)
- The ordering of issues that were “completely” satisfied was broadly similar between the two surveys.

**Table 9: Degree of Completion of Issues, by Type of Service Used**

Service Used	Total Number of issues	Degree of Completion of Issues			
		No Resolution	Situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue	Completely finished	Appeared to be completely finished at one point, but then issue re-emerged later
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	24 (100%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	20 (83%)	3 (13%)
Family Duty Counsel	396 (100%)	37 (9%)	23 (6%)	298 (75%)	38 (10%)
Family Lawline	132 (100%)	12 (9%)	5 (4%)	94 (71%)	21 (16%)
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	215 (100%)	13 (6%)	31 (14%)	151 (70%)	20 (9%)
Legal Aid (representation)	339 (100%)	18 (5%)	36 (11%)	225 (66%)	62 (18%)
Legal Information Outreach Worker	31 (100%)	8 (26%)	8 (26%)	14 (45%)	1 (3%)

Notes:

1. Percentages total horizontally, but may not equal 100% due to rounding.
2. Services are arranged in descending order based on the percentage in the “completely finished” column.
3. Since clients on average use 2.4 services when addressing their issues (see [Table 15](#)), the completion responses for any given service also reflect the contributions of other services.

**Table 10: Satisfaction with Outcome of Issues (only for issues that were resolved)**

Type of Issue	Frequency of Issue	Satisfaction with Outcome				2006 Survey percentages “Completely”
		Not at all	Only partly	Mostly	Completely	
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	60%
Divorce	50 (100%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	45 (90%)	77%
Restraining order to prevent violence	32 (100%)	6 (19%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	22 (69%)	76%
Guardianship	47 (100%) (NR=3)	1 (2%)	3 (6%)	11 (23%)	32 (68%)	67%
Custody	271 (100%) (NR=4)	26 (10%)	26 (10%)	63 (23%)	156 (58%)	65%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	14 (100%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	8 (57%)	67%
Access	235 (100%) (NR=1)	20 (9%)	29 (12%)	65 (28%)	121 (51%)	57%
Property division	19 (100%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	6 (32%)	9 (47%)	55%
Child maintenance, support	219 (100%) (NR=2)	36 (16%)	27 (12%)	56 (26%)	100 (46%)	51%
Possession of family home	7 (100%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	57%
Spousal maintenance, support	23 (100%)	7 (30%)	1 (4%)	9 (39%)	6 (26%)	52%
Other	14 (100%) (NR=1)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	9 (64%)	89%
Total	932 (100%) (NR=11)	107 (11%)	92 (10%)	221 (24%)	512 (55%)	60%

Notes:

1. The phrasing of the question pertaining to satisfaction was “Was the original outcome what you hoped for, i.e., what you hoped would happen.”
2. This table only lists cases that were resolved, i.e., which in [Table 7](#) included cases that were “completely resolved” plus “resolved, but issues re-emerged,” minus “NR” as indicated above.
3. Percentages are totalled horizontally, but may not total 100% due to rounding.
4. Issues are listed in descending order of percentages in the “completely” column for satisfaction. The exception is “other” issues, which is listed at the bottom.
5. NR = no response.

*Satisfaction with outcome, by demographics (Table 11)*

- Table 11 presents data on the statistical significance of certain demographic variables in relation to client satisfaction with outcome. It shows that there are no statistically significant differences for clients' satisfaction with outcome based on ethnicity, but the differences based on gender and education level are significant at the .05 ( $p=0.0001$  in both cases). There is a higher level of satisfaction among females than males (spread across all issues). This was the case in the 2006 survey, but it is more pronounced in this survey.

Although there is a statistically significant difference based on education levels, the meaning of that difference is not readily apparent. Respondents who "graduated high school" had the highest combination of "mostly satisfied" and "completely satisfied" responses (87%), as was the case in the 2006 survey.

In 2006, Aboriginal respondents had significantly higher levels of "completely satisfied" ratings than non-Aboriginal respondents. In this survey they had only marginally higher ratings.

**Table 11: Satisfaction with Outcome, by Demographics**

Demographics	Total	Satisfaction with Outcome			
		Not at all	Only Partly	Mostly	Completely
<i>Gender (N=931; NR=12)</i>					
Male	328 (100%)	56 (17%)	41 (13%)	84 (26%)	174 (45%)
Female	603 (100%)	51 (8%)	51 (8%)	138 (23%)	363 (60%)
<i>Education (N=913; NR=30)</i>					
No High School	16 (100%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	5 (31%)	8 (50%)
Some High School	102 (100%)	14 (14%)	18 (18%)	22 (22%)	48 (47%)
Graduated High School	265 (100%)	15 (6%)	19 (7%)	90 (34%)	141 (53%)
Post high school	530 (100%)	75 (14%)	53 (10%)	97 (18%)	305 (58%)
<i>Ethnic Status (N=916; NR=27)</i>					
Aboriginal	65 (100%)	7 (11%)	10 (15%)	10 (15%)	38 (58%)
Non-Aboriginal	851 (100%)	99 (12%)	82 (10%)	199 (23%)	471 (55%)

Notes:

- The phrasing of the question pertaining to satisfaction was "was the original outcome what you hoped for, i.e., what you hoped would happen."
- This table only lists cases that were resolved, i.e., which in [Table 7](#) included cases that were "completely resolved" plus "resolved, but issues re-emerged," minus "NR" as indicated above.
- Percentages may exceed 100% due to rounding.
- There are no statistically significant differences between categories of the ethnicity measure at the .05 level. The difference in response between male & female respondents and between respondents with different education levels is significant at the .05 level ( $p=0.0001$  for both gender and education)
- NR = no response

*Client satisfaction with outcome, by service type (Table 12)*

- Table 12 presents data on client satisfaction with outcome in relation to the service type. Please note that the same caveats concerning Table 9 apply to this table as well. That is, the type of issue, the degree of conflict, the nature of the client and the complexity of the issue that is being brought to each service are all factors in the rate at which cases can be successfully completed. In addition, in this table other services may impact positively or negatively the completion rate for any given service (because clients use an average of 2.4 services each).
- Overall, the satisfaction levels are quite high. LawLine (84%) is considerably higher than was LawLine Advice in the 2006 survey (66%), while the Advice Lawyer service (76%) is slightly lower than in 2006 (81%). Family duty counsel (76%) is marginally higher than it was in 2006 (73%). LIOWs, despite their low completion rates in Table 9, have very high satisfaction rates (87%), and are much higher than in 2006 (61%). Overall the average positive rating is higher in this survey (79%) than in the 2006 survey (77%), but it is important to remember that the two surveys involved different combinations and weightings of services.

**Table 12: Client Satisfaction with Outcome, by Service Type**

Service type	Total	Satisfaction with Outcome	
		Not at all or only partially satisfied	Mostly or completely satisfied
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	23 (100%)	3 (13%)	20 (87%)
Legal Information Outreach Worker	15 (100%)	2 (13%)	13 (87%)
Family Lawline	109 (100%)	17 (16%)	92 (84%)
Legal Aid Representation	283 (100%)	56 (20%)	227 (80%)
Family Duty Counsel	333 (100%)	80 (24%)	253 (76%)
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	168 (100%)	41 (24%)	127 (76%)
Total (NR=12)	931 (100%)	199 (21%)	732 (79%)

Notes:

1. The phrasing of the question pertaining to satisfaction was “was the original outcome what you hoped for, i.e., what you hoped would happen.”
2. Percentages total horizontally.
3. Services are arranged in descending order, based on the percentage in the “mostly or completely satisfied” column.
4. The original data was in four columns, but the two negative and two positive responses were combined in this table for ease of presentation.
5. Since clients use an average of 2.4 services when addressing their issues (see Table 15), the satisfaction responses for any given service also reflect the contributions of other services.

*Type of resolution (Table 13)*

- Table 13 describes the types of resolutions that are achieved.
- The overwhelming majority of resolved issues (88%) were confirmed by a court order or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer. This is not surprising, in that 84% (792/943) of the completed issues involved family duty counsel, advice lawyer or legal aid (see also [Table 14](#)).
- Of the two more formal mechanisms involving a court order, 47% involved litigation and 41% were by consent. Consent was the more frequent mechanism for divorce (59% versus 35% by litigation), guardianship (50% consent, 40% litigation) and possession of family home (43% consent, 29% litigation, but only involving 5 cases). Of the two mechanisms, litigation was most predominant in restraining orders to prevent violence (90% versus 7% consent), property division (58% versus 32% consent), and orders forbidding removal of the child from the province (64% versus 21% consent).

*Type of resolution by type of service (Table 14)*

- Table 14 describes the type of resolution in relation to the type of service used by the client.
- Overall the level of formal resolutions is high (88%), with no service achieving less than 78% formal resolution. Nevertheless, the profiles of the services vary considerably in regard to the type of resolution. Family Duty Counsel and Advice lawyers are the most similar in the distribution of all four types of resolution. Family Duty Counsel and Legal Aid Representation have a similar overall level of formal resolution (by consent and litigation) as opposed to less formal. ACLWs have the highest level of formal agreements by consent, and lowest by litigation.

**Table 13: Types of Issues and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved)**

Type of issue	Frequency of issue	Type of Resolution			
		Verbal or de facto	Written agreement, but not reviewed by lawyer	By consent (in court or in written agreement)	After court hearing (by litigation)
Restraining order to prevent violence	30 100% (NR=2)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	27 (90%)
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	1 100%	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Custody	273 100% (NR=2)	22 (8%)	15 (5%)	109 (40%)	127 (47%)
Access	233 (100%) (NR=3)	18 (8%)	12 (5%)	101 (43%)	102 (44%)
Guardianship	48 100% (NR=2)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	24 (50%)	19 (40%)
Child maintenance, support	214 100% (NR=7)	12 (6%)	12 (6%)	86 (40%)	104 (49%)
Spousal maintenance, support	23 100% (NR=1)	3 (13%)	0 (0%)	10 (43%)	10 (43%)
Property division	19 100%	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	6 (32%)	11 (58%)
Possession of family home	7 100%	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)
Divorce	49 100% (NR=1)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	29 (59%)	17 (35%)
Order forbidding removal of child from province	14 100%	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	9 (64%)
Other	13 100% (NR=2)	2 (23%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	6 (46%)
Total	924 100% (NR=20)	65 (7%)	49 (5%)	375 (41%)	435 (47%)

Notes:

1. Percentages are totaled horizontally. They may not total 100% due to rounding.
2. NR = no response, or “not sure”
3. The total responses equal issues that are “completely resolved” plus “resolved, but issue re-emerged” in Table 7, minus NR as indicated above in this table.

**Table 14: Types of Services and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved)**

Service Used	Total	Type of Resolution			
		Verbal or de facto	Written agreement, but not reviewed by lawyer	By consent (in court or in written agreement)	After court hearing (by litigation)
Family Lawline	108 100% (NR=6)	13 (12%)	11 (10%)	42 (39%)	42 (39%)
Family Duty Counsel	332 100% (NR=4)	21 (6%)	15 (5%)	110 (33%)	186 (56%)
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	165 100% (NR=6)	12 (7%)	15 (9%)	60 (36%)	78 (47%)
Legal Aid Representation	278 100% (NR=7)	13 (5%)	8 (3%)	137 (49%)	120 (43%)
Legal Information Outreach Worker	15 100%	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	8 (53%)	4 (27%)
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	23 100%	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18 (78%)	5 (22%)
Total	921 100% (NR=23)	62 (7%)	49 (5%)	375 (41%)	435 (47%)

Notes:

1. Percentages are totalled horizontally. They may not total 100% due to rounding.
2. NR = no response.
3. The total responses equal issues that are “completely resolved” plus “resolved, but issue re-emerged” in Table 7, minus NR as indicated above in this table.
4. The eight issues where there was Legal Aid representation and the resolution was a “written agreement, but not reviewed by lawyer” involved three cases. Two had three issues (custody, access and child maintenance) and one had two issues (custody and access). Respondents were not asked for the reasons for non-review of the agreement by the Legal Aid lawyer, but they appear to be as follows. In the first case the respondent stated that the lawyer “was too busy to go to court with her,” so may not have reviewed the final agreement. In the second the issues were taken to a family justice counsellor after the involvement of the lawyer, so the final agreement evolved through that service. In the third case “the lawyer recommended going through court but we did not want to go that route,” so it can be speculated that the respondent and former spouse evolved their own agreement.



## 5.0 SERVICES USED BY CLIENTS

This section presents client feedback on the frequency and patterns of their use of services to address their issues.

### *Frequency of use of services (Table 15)*

- Table 15 presents data on the frequency of use of different services by the client. Note that the table does *not* represent how the average “person off the street” uses LSS and other services, as all clients were referred to this survey from specific services. Data for the frequency of use of services is therefore coloured by the main services from which clients have been drawn for the survey. For example, since many clients of the Family Duty Counsel and Legal Aid Representation services were selected for an interview, these services will naturally show a higher frequency of use.
- 783 persons used 1841 services, or an average of 2.4 services per client. This is a major drop from the 2006 survey figure of 3.3 services per client. Part of the explanation for this difference is that in 2006 more Representation services were involved, some of which were nested within each other, and each of which would also have involved Legal Aid Intake as another service. In addition, in the 2006 survey LawLine Advice and LawLine Information were listed as separate services, each with over 100 users, and LawLink, which no longer exists, was used by almost 20% of respondents.
- Although all clients used LSS services, they also used non-LSS services for 21% (381/1841) of the overall issues. In the 2006 survey the comparable figure was 23% (617/2692).

### *Use of services other than the survey sample service (Table 16)*

- Table 16 helps to reduce the “colouring” effect alluded to in the first bullet for Table 15. As in Table 15, it shows the overall use of services for all client issues, but also shows the proportion of that use that stems from the sample interviewed. Thus there were 96 issues that were taken to the Family LawLine service, but 87 of those were from the interview sample for that service. Nine clients drawn from other service samples also used Family LawLine, i.e., they contributed an extra 10% of total LawLine users. This extra 10% is referred to as a “multiplier statistic” in Table 16.
- Three services can be compared with the 2006 survey services in terms of this overlapping usage of the primary LSS services in the study. In 2006 the Family Duty Counsel multiplier statistic was 1.33, compared to 1.39 in this survey. In 2006 the Emergency Services referrals statistic was 1.48, compared to Legal Aid Representation at 1.31 in the current survey. The LIOW statistic was much higher in 2006 (2.53) compared to this survey (1.01). In 2006 LIOW respondents also used emergency services referrals and extended services referrals.

**Table 15: LSS and Other Services used by Survey Sample**

<b>Services used by client</b>	<b>Number of issues for which this service was used</b>	<b>Percentage of cases in which this service was used (N=783)</b>
Family LawLine	96	12%
Family Duty Counsel	391	50%
Out-of-Court Advice Counsel	175	22%
Legal Representation	236	30%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	54	7%
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	20	3%
Internet: Family Law in BC	155	20%
Internet: Clicklaw	11	1%
Internet: Site not known	29	4%
Printed Materials	60	8%
Legal Aid Intake	244	31%
Community Advocacy Service/Clinic	45	6%
Pro Bono Clinic	29	4%
Family Justice Counsellor	160	20%
Private Lawyer	106	14%
Supreme Court Self-Help Info Centre	16	2%
Other Service	14	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1841</b>	

Notes:

1. This table only represents the services used by this sample of clients, who were referred to the survey through each of the six LSS programs. This is *not* a random sample of all LSS clients, so does not represent proportionately how overall services are used.
2. There were 783 persons who used the services, and 1841 services used overall, or an average of 2.4 services per client.
3. Percentages exceed 100% because more than one service was used by each client.
4. Overall, 21% of the issues (381/1841) were addressed by non-LSS services (i.e., the last six services on the list, plus Clicklaw. "Internet – site not known" and "printed materials" are counted as LSS services, and represent 5% of total issues. If these two services of information were predominantly non-LSS, the total non-LSS portion would be approximately 25%.
5. "Other services" included counsellors (2), other internet resources (2), mediators (2), advocacy workers (2), courthouse (2), Parenting after Separation (1), an MLA (1), library (1), Alberta Legal Aid (1).

- It should be emphasized that the multiplier statistic only shows the extent of overlapping use of the six LSS services in the study. It is not an indication of the extent to which these services network to other services in general. For example, in this table LIOWs only had one other respondent from the five other services who contributed to their total usage (there were 53 respondents in the LIOW sample, but 54 respondents used LIOWs). Intuitively this is logical, in that the other five services in Table 16 are more comprehensive (offering advocacy or representation services), so their clients are unlikely to then come to the LIOWs for assistance. However, as will be seen in the discussion of [Tables 19](#) and [S4](#) (Appendix 2), LIOWs were the highest of clients to use other services (e.g., to the Family Law website and to printed materials).

**Table 16: Comparison of Total Respondent Usage of each Service with the Number of Clients Referred to the Evaluation from that Service**

LSS Service	Column #1: Total number of respondents who used this service in the overall evaluation sample	Column #2: Number of clients specifically referred from this service in the evaluation	Column #3: Multiplier statistic (Column #1 divided by Column #2)
Family Duty Counsel	391	282	1.39
Legal Representation	236	180	1.31
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	20	18	1.11
Family LawLine	96	87	1.10
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	175	163	1.07
Legal Information Outreach Worker	54	53	1.01

Notes:

- Services are listed in descending order of the multiplier statistic.
- An expanded version of this table is in Appendix 2 ([Table S2](#)), showing other services used by clients and how other service samples contributed to this multiplier statistic.

*Order of Use and Frequency of Use of Services (Tables 17 and 17A))*

- In Table 17 services are listed in the descending order of frequency with which services were used before other LSS services. Higher percentages in this column indicate services that appear to be used at the front end of clients' use of resources. Although a different method of establishing the order of use of services was used in the 2006 survey, the results are broadly similar. Although the frequency counts are too low to reliably establish the placement of LIOWs, ACLWs and Family LawLine, the primary front end services are Legal Aid Intake, community advocacy services and Family Justice counsellors. The internet sites tend to be used both before and after the main LSS sites, or throughout clients' quest for resolution of their problems.

**Table 17: Order of Use of Services**

Service	# of times this service is used in combination with one or more of the six LSS services	Frequency this service was used before the other LSS service	Frequency this service was used after the other LSS service	Frequency this service was used both before and after the other LSS service
Legal Information Outreach Worker	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Legal Aid Intake	238 (100%)	194 (82%)	39 (16%)	5 (2%)
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	44 (100%)	24 (55%)	16 (36%)	4 (9%)
Family Justice Counsellor	160 (100%)	87 (54%)	65 (41%)	8 (5%)
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Family LawLine	9 (100%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)
Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	12 (100%)	5 (42%)	7 (58%)	0 (0%)
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	29 (100%)	12 (41%)	17 (59%)	0 (0%)
Family Duty Counsel (NR=2)	107 (100%)	37 (35%)	39 (36%)	31 (29%)
Internet: used, but can't remember site	29 (100%)	7 (24%)	6 (21%)	16 (55%)
Private Lawyer	106 (100%)	20 (19%)	78 (74%)	8 (8%)
Legal Representation	56 (100%)	9 (16%)	41 (73%)	6 (11%)
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	154 (100%)	22 (14%)	77 (50%)	55 (36%)
Supreme Court Self-Help Info Centre	16 (100%)	2 (13%)	13 (81%)	1 (6%)
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	60 (100%)	8 (13%)	36 (60%)	16 (27%)
Internet: ClickLaw	11 (100%)	1 (9%)	4 (36%)	6 (55%)
Other	13 (100%)	6 (46%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)

Notes:

1. Percentages total horizontally, but do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.
2. Services are listed in descending order of the "frequency this service was used before the other LSS service," except for "other."
3. NR = no response.
4. The small frequency counts for several of these services listed makes their position in the table less reliable than services with larger frequency counts.

- Table 17A lists services in descending order based on the frequencies with which their clients use the services more than once. Those that most frequently are used more than once are the representation (Legal Aid or private lawyer) or advocacy services, and internet sites, which can be used at any time. In the middle ranges are services that are not structured to be used repeatedly, but sometimes encourage a repeat visit if the client's pursuit of a problem warrants it. These include Family Justice counsellors, Family Duty Counsel and Advice Counsel. The third tier consists of feeder services (LawLine, Legal Aid Intake and LIOW), one-time advice services (pro bono clinics) or printed materials.

**Table 17A: Frequency of Use of Services**

Service	# of clients who used this service	# of clients who used the service more than once	Percentage of clients who used service more than once
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	20	19	95%
Legal Representation (NR=8)	228	206	90%
Internet: ClickLaw (NR=1)	10	9	90%
Internet: used, but can't remember site	29	25	86%
Private Lawyer (NR=2)	105	82	78%
Supreme Court Self-Help Info Centre	16	12	75%
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site) (NR=4)	151	109	72%
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer) (NR=1)	44	29	66%
Family Justice Counsellor (NR=6)	157	103	66%
Family Duty Counsel (NR=19)	372	215	58%
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer (NR=19)	156	77	49%
Family LawLine (NR=8)	88	42	48%
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	60	27	45%
Pro Bono Clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	29	8	28%
Legal Aid Intake (NR=2)	242	31	13%
Legal Information Outreach Worker (NR=1)	53	6	11%
Other (NR=1)	13	9	69%

Notes:

- Percentages total horizontally, but do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.
- Services are listed in descending order of the "percentage of clients who used the service more than once," except for "other."
- NR = no response.

*Rating of helpfulness of service (Table 18)*

- Table 18 shows client ratings of the helpfulness of each service in getting them closer to a resolution.
- From a service provider's standpoint, one might view a group of services as serially moving a client's case towards resolution, and each service as a helpful contributor to the client's progress. By contrast, the client may praise only the service that "got them where they wanted", and consider the others as unnecessary trials and tribulations along the way. As was the case in the 2006 survey, interviewers found it difficult to encourage the respondents to think in terms of a service helping them to "get closer to a resolution", rather than judge helpfulness only in terms of the service most immediately connected to the ultimate resolution. Clients also found it difficult to think of any service being helpful in moving them towards a resolution if they did not have a successful outcome.
- In Table 18 ratings of helpfulness are on a 5-point scale, where 1= "not helpful at all and 5= "very helpful." In the top tier of mean ratings (4.0 and over), ACLWs are clearly seen to be very helpful (4.8) as an advocacy service. Legal Aid Intake (4.3) is appreciated as an entry portal to obtain a Legal Aid lawyer. Advocacy services also often help clients throughout their problem resolution process. The middle tier (3.6 – 3.9) comprises the primary LSS family services, plus the Family Law internet site, private lawyers and the Supreme Court Self-Help Centre (SCSHC). The lowest tier are information only services or time-limited (pro bono) advice. In most cases the mean ratings are within one or two tenths of a point of the 2006 survey ratings. Of five services that have a .3 difference or greater than 2006, one is higher in the current survey (private lawyers, up .7), and four are lower (pro bono clinics .3, SCSHC .4, Legal Aid Representation .4 and LIOWs .7).
- Respondents who used Legal Aid Representation services and who rated helpfulness at "1," "2," or "3" on the 5-point scale were asked why the service was considered "not very helpful." More than one response was possible per person. The responses for this subgroup of 87 respondents (NR=2) were:
  - 68% (59/87) claimed the lawyer gave the client too low a priority (little or no communication, slow service);
  - 21% (18/87) perceived the lawyer to be rude, unsympathetic, inattentive and/or lacking in cultural understanding.
  - 17% (15/87) felt the lawyer was incompetent or dishonest;
  - 6% (5/87) stated that the LSS criteria for eligibility and/or coverage was too restrictive.

Twenty-four other respondents made a variety of comments, most of which reiterated the spirit of the above comments. Four each said their lawyer quit, their lawyer was disinterested, and their lawyer was too busy; 2 each said they did not like the court system, the lawyer was incompetent, the lawyer was not assertive enough; 1 each complained of cost, eligibility or that the service was not useful.

- In 20% of issues involving Legal Aid representation lawyers (44/220, NR=16), the respondents said they had a change of Legal Aid lawyers. For 35 of the 44 issues the respondent said they had two lawyers, and for seven issues they had three or four lawyers over the course of their case. There was no correlation between having a change of lawyers and perception of helpfulness. Of the 54 reasons for the change given by 44 respondents for these 44 issues, 18 (33%) were essentially neutral toward their lawyer

(lawyer left the firm or changed focus, retired, was on leave or was sick) and 16 (30%) were critical of the lawyer (complaints about the lawyers' attitude, commitment or experience). Of the remainder, 3 were because the lawyer was too busy, 2 because of external investigations into the lawyers' conduct in other cases, and 5 did not know why the lawyer changed.

- An analysis of ratings of helpfulness in relation to each of the three demographic measures showed that there is no statistically significant difference in responses based on ethnicity and education categories. However, there was a statistically significant difference in responses based on gender. Female clients had a higher mean rating of helpfulness than did males. This pattern is similar to that reported in Table 11 for satisfaction with outcome of the case. The table for this analysis is in Appendix 2, Table S3.

A comparison of the mean ratings in the current survey with those in the 2006 survey shows, that with the exception of the post high school rating, the relationships are identical between each of the sets of categories within the gender, education and ethnicity tables. There is more spread in mean ratings in the current survey for gender and education, but less for ethnicity, than there was in 2006. In 2006 there was a statistically significant difference between categories in both the gender and ethnicity measures, but not in the education measure.

**Table 18: Rating of Helpfulness of Service in Getting Client Closer to a Resolution**

Service	Mean Rating on Scale of 5	Rating of helpfulness of service in getting client closer to resolution					Mean Rating 2006 Survey
		Not helpful at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Very helpful (5)	
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker (ACLW) (N=20)	4.8	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	18 (90%)	n/a
Legal Aid Intake (N=243; NR=1)	4.3	23 (9%)	5 (2%)	16 (7%)	31 (13%)	168 (69%)	4.2
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer) (N=45)	4.0	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	10 (22%)	12 (27%)	20 (44%)	4.0
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer (N=173;NR=2)	3.9	14 (8%)	10 (6%)	29 (17%)	41 (24%)	79 (46%)	3.9
Family Duty Counsel (N=385; NR=6)	3.8	42 (11%)	25 (6%)	76 (20%)	84 (22%)	158 (41%)	3.7
Private lawyer (N=106)	3.8	12 (11%)	11 (10%)	15 (14%)	20 (19%)	48 (45%)	3.1
Family LawLine (N=96; NR=2)	3.7	8 (8%)	9 (9%)	21 (22%)	27 (28%)	31 (32%)	3.5 (LawLine Advice)
Legal Representation (N=231; NR=5)	3.7	27 (12%)	16 (7%)	46 (20%)	58 (25%)	84 (36%)	4.1
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site) (N=155)	3.7	11 (7%)	8 (5%)	42 (27%)	51 (33%)	43 (28%)	3.6 (LawLink)
Legal Information Outreach Worker (LIOW) (N=53; NR=1)	3.6	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	21 (40%)	16 (30%)	11 (21%)	4.3
Family Justice Counsellor (N=160)	3.6	14 (9%)	15 (9%)	54 (34%)	23 (14%)	54 (34%)	3.4
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre (SCSHC) (N=16)	3.6	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	3 (19%)	6 (38%)	4.0
Internet: ClickLaw (N=11)	3.5	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	5 (45%)	0 (0%)	4 (36%)	n/a
Printed materials (brochures, booklets info sheets) (N=60)	3.4	4 (7%)	4 (7%)	23 (38%)	21 (35%)	8 (13%)	3.5
Pro Bono Clinic (lawyer at a clinic) (N=29)	3.1	4 (14%)	4 (14%)	10 (34%)	6 (21%)	5 (17%)	3.4
Internet: used but can't remember site (N=29)	3.0	4 (14%)	6 (21%)	8 (28%)	7 (24%)	4 (14%)	n/a
Other (N=12; NR=2)	4.3	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)	8 (67%)	

Notes:

- Percentages total horizontally, but do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.
- Services are listed in descending order of mean rating of helpfulness, except for "other."
- N = number of responses. NR = no response.
- Using a Chi-square analysis with the 5 rating levels, there is a statistically significant difference at the .05 level of significance between the 2006 survey results and the 2011-12 results for private lawyers (p=0.0079; higher rate of helpfulness in getting closer to resolution) and for LIOWs (P=0.003; lower rate of helpfulness). However, there are too few cases in the two lowest rating cells for the LIOW results to be considered fully reliable.



*Tendency to refer (Table 19)*

- Table 19 shows the degree to which different services refer clients to other services.
- The high number of “can’t remember” responses make it difficult to place complete reliance on client responses about whether services referred them to or mentioned other services. Nonetheless, there are marked differences between the “yes” and “no” responses in several services and large enough initial numbers of service use to allow some confidence in this data. For example, if one characterizes as “networking services” those with 65% or more “yes” responses, they include Legal Aid intake (with its obvious connection to Legal Aid representation, Family LawLine and community advocacy services. Pro bono clinics, Family Justice Counsellors, Out-of-Court Advice Lawyers, ACLWs and Family Duty Counsel occupy a middle level of referral frequency, with all other services referring at a much lower level. As was the case in the 2006 survey, clients do not appear to have gleaned referral information from the Internet. Overall, there appears to have been a drop in referral frequency compared to the 2006 survey, particularly in regard to Family LawLine (compared to LawLine advice), Representation lawyers (compared to Emergency referrals), community advocacy services and Family Justice Counsellors. LIOWs appear to be the only service that has had a significant increase in referrals since 2006.
- A sub-analysis of referral data explored to whom referrals are made. Unfortunately the volume of overall referrals is insufficient to show strong patterns, so the analysis is presented in [Table S4](#) of Appendix 2. The main patterns appear to be:
  - The most frequent recipient of referrals is Legal Aid Representation, primarily from Legal Aid Intake;
  - The referral agents with the greatest diversity of referrals (10 or more types) are Family Duty Counsel, LIOWs, Family LawLine, Advice lawyers, Legal Representation (although they have a small overall number of referrals), Legal Aid Intake and Family Justice Counsellors. Family Duty Counsel’s main connections are to the Family Law website and Legal Aid intake. LIOWs connect clients most frequently to the Family Law website and to printed materials. Family LawLine connects to the Family Law website, Family Duty Counsel and private lawyers. Advice lawyers refer most frequently to the Family Law website, as do Representation lawyers. Legal Aid Intake refers overwhelmingly to Representation lawyers, as this is their primary function. Family Justice Counsellors most frequently refer to Advice lawyers, and are structurally established to do so in several centres.
  - The most frequent recipient of referrals is Legal Aid Representation, primarily from Legal Aid Intake. Both the Family Law website and Family Duty Counsel are also major recipients of referrals. The main referral agents to the website are Family LawLine, Family Duty Counsel, Advice lawyers and LIOWs. The main referral agents to Family Duty Counsel are Family LawLine, LIOWs, Family Law website and Family Justice counsellors.
  - Based on the data in [Table S4](#), when a client is referred (and many are not), the average number of referrals is 1.2. This compares with 1.7 in the 2006 survey.

**Table 19: Whether Service Referred Client to Other Legal Services**

Service	Total use of Service	Frequency of service mentioning or referring client to any other legal service	Percentage referred	Percentage referred in 2006 survey
Legal Information Outreach Worker	38 (NR=16) 100%	39	100%	78%
Legal Aid Intake	227 (NR=17) 100%	193	85%	96%
Family LawLine	64 (NR=32) 100%	48	75%	88% (LawLine Advice)
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	31 (NR=14) 100%	21	68%	85%
Family Justice Counsellor	98 (NR=62) 100%	57	58%	78%
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	16 (NR=13) 100%	9	56%	65%
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	91 (NR=84) 100%	39	43%	33% (Family Advice Lawyer)
Family Duty Counsel	260 (NR=131) 100%	103	40%	27%
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	18 (NR=4) 100%	7	39%	n/a
Internet: ClickLaw	11 100%	2	18%	n/a
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	136 (NR=19) 100%	20	15%	9% (LawLink)
Legal Representation	195 (NR=41) 100%	23	12%	49% (Emergency Services)
Private Lawyer	95 (NR=11) 100%	9	9%	15%
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	16 100%	1	6%	14%
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	55 (NR=5) 100%	3	5%	11%
Internet: used, but can't remember site	23 (NR=6) 100%	0	0%	n/a
Other	12 (NR=2) 100%	3	25%	29%

Notes:

1. Percentages total horizontally.
2. NA = "no answer," because respondent could not remember.
3. The large number of respondents who could not remember whether services were mentioned or whether they were referred to a service make this data unreliable.
4. Services are listed in descending order of percentages in "Percentage Referred" column, except for "Other."

## **6.0 REASONS FOR NON-RESOLUTION OF ISSUES**

As was shown in [Table 7](#), there was no resolution for respondents with 87 issues. Table 20 describes the reasons for non-resolution of these issues. Given the relatively small numbers within each issue category, percentages are only included for the overall totals. The main reason for non-resolution is systemic barriers (41% of responses), with the remaining reasons fairly evenly divided between relationship dynamics and personal circumstances or reactions. “Other” reasons comprised 29% of the total.

The 41 “other” responses included inter-jurisdictional/out of province cases (10), high conflict with spouse (6), perceived impacts of LSS funding cutbacks (5), perceived inadequacy or lack of commitment by the lawyer (5), disappearance/hiding by ex-spouse (4), no follow-through by the client (3), communication error with lawyer (3), lawyer dropped case (2), perception that police did not take the issue seriously (1), substantive complications of case (1) and language barriers (1).

**Table 20: Reason Why Issues Did Not Get Resolved**

Reason Not Resolved	Type of Issue											
	All Issues	R.O. to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Guardian-ship	Child support	Spousal support	Property division	Order forbid removal from province	Possession of family home	Divorce	Other
<b>Systemic Barriers</b>	<b>57 (41%)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
Client could not afford a lawyer	50	2	13	8	2	15	2	1	0	1	6	1
Client willing to represent self, but could not afford extra expenses	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Client felt intimidated, confused or overwhelmed by court system.	15	0	3	1	1	6	0	1	0	0	3	0
Time delays made it pointless to continue	5	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Error or lack of quality assistance on part of service provider	4	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Relationship Dynamics</b>	<b>19 (14%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
Client felt worn down by opposing party	13	1	2	3	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	0
Client felt threatened by opposing party	11	1	2	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	2	0

Reason Not Resolved	Type of Issue											
	All Issues	R.O. to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Guardian-ship	Child support	Spousal support	Property division	Order forbid removal from province	Possession of family home	Divorce	Other
<b>Client Personal Circumstances or Reaction</b>	<b>22 (16%)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Client illness or other personal circumstances meant client could not continue	11	2	3	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
Client felt it wasn't worth the hassle to continue	11	1	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	0
<b>Other</b>	<b>41 (29%)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>139 (100%)</b>											

Notes:

1. Respondents could give more than one answer as to why their issue(s) were not resolved. The respondents had 87 issues (see "no resolution" column in Table7), and gave 163 individual reasons for non-resolution, or 1.9 per issue.
2. If there were 2 or more individual answers in the same general category they were counted only once in the general category (bolded) totals. Thus the total of individual answers can exceed the category total.

## **7.0 ISSUES THAT RE-EMERGE AFTER INITIAL RESOLUTION**

One hundred six clients had issues that re-emerged. Of these, 101 (NR=5) respondents reported a total of 143 issues that re-emerged after initial resolution. Tables 21 – 25 present data on the types of issues, processes and outcomes involved for the client in addressing these issues.

### *Time for issues to re-emerge (Table 21)*

- Table 21 presents data on the length of time it takes for issues to re-emerge after initial resolution, if they re-emerge at all.
- Although the data set is much too small to permit conclusions for all but three issue types, this data suggests that child maintenance, access and custody issues re-emerge at similar points in time, on average 6 months after the original resolution. Overall, 62% of the issues that re-emerge do so in the first six months after the resolution. However, when considering these patterns, three points deserve emphasis. Firstly, in many cases respondents were not absolutely certain about the time it took for issues to re-emerge. The data should therefore be considered with caution. Secondly, issues might still have re-emerged after the evaluation interview. The average trends for issues therefore inherently understate length for re-emergence, as they do not include cases that have taken so long to break down that they do not appear in the study. Finally, the reader is reminded that the table only deals with those issues that do re-emerge, which is only 13% of overall issues. Therefore, if one states, as above, that 62% of the re-emerged issues surfaced within six months of the original resolution, these 86 issues still represent only 8% of the original 1134 issues.

**Table 21: Types of Issues, and Time for Issues to Re-emerge After Original Resolution**

Type of Issue	Number of issues that started again after resolution	How soon issue re-emerged after original resolution (based on 139 issues)					Average time for re-start (in months)
		1-3 months	4-6 months	7-12 months	13-24 months	25+ months	
Access	49	22	8	16	3		5.9
Child maintenance, support	48	15	16	14	1		6.4 (NR=2)
Custody	27	9	7	9	1		6.3 (NR=1)
Guardianship	6	2	2	2			5.7
Spousal maintenance, support	5	2		2			6.3 (NR=1)
Order forbidding removal of child from province	2		1	1		1	6.5
Restraining order to prevent violence	2	1					6.5
Property division	1			1			10.0
Divorce	1			1			12.0
Other	2	1		1			3.0 (NR=1)
Total Issues	143						
Total Issues with time data	139 (100%)	52 (37%)	34 (24%)	47 (34%)	5 (4%)	1 (1%)	

Notes:

1. Issues are listed in descending order of frequency, except for "other."
2. Respondents did not provide time data for four issues.
3. The 143 issues described in the table were for 106 respondents (i.e., an average of 1.3 issues re-emerged for these clients at a later point). There were no re-emerged issues for "possession of family home" or "restraining order to prevent removal of assets," so these issues are not included in this table.

*Reasons for issues re-starting (Table 22)*

- Table 22 shows why issues re-emerged.
- The two principal reasons for re-emergence of issues were the need to adapt to a changed situation, and refusal by one or other party to comply with an order or agreement. These two reasons were the same as in the 2006 survey, but the frequency of “situation changed” has increased from 33% of all reasons in 2006 to 44% in this survey.
- [Table S5](#) in Appendix 2 provides a breakdown of reasons by issue type. As was the case in the 2006 survey, “refusal to comply” is the major re-emergence issue for access cases, while “situation changed, need to vary order” is the more significant reason for custody and child maintenance cases.

**Table 22: Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution**

<b>Reason why issue restarted after original resolution</b> (more than 1 reason possible)	<b>Frequency</b>
Situation changed, need to vary order (amount or conditions)	62 (44%)
Refusal to comply with Court Order or separation agreement	57 (40%)
Need to make temporary order into permanent	7 (5%)
Arrears Order could not be enforced	5 (4%)
Refusal to comply with an informal agreement	4 (3%)
Mobility issue; threat of removal of child from province or region	2 (1%)
Other	5 (4%)
Total	142 (100%)

Notes:

1. There were 142 reasons provided for the re-emergence of issues (NR=1)
2. The percentages for each category represent the percentage of all (142) reasons. They do not total 100% due to rounding.
3. Issues are listed in decreasing order of percentage, except for “other.”
4. The only “other” reason that was documented was the appeal of an order.



*Types of services used for restarted issues (Table 23)*

- Table 23 shows the services used when issues that were originally thought to be settled started over again. The fact that some issues re-emerged leads to the question of whether clients start at the same or a higher level of service to address these issues. While it is not possible to answer this question definitively, a surrogate measure is the extent to which clients re-use the same service as at least one of their resources (clients contacted an average of 1.2 services to address restarted issues). The data in column #3 of the table shows that clients tend to return to services with high representation, advocacy or resolution content (ACLW, representation, private lawyers or Family Justice Counsellors), rather than advice or informational sources. Thus as was the case in the 2006 survey, it appears that clients who have a re-emerging problem do not necessarily go to the “back of the line.” They are more likely to re-use a higher level service (i.e., a representation, advocacy or mediation service) than they are a lower level one (i.e., information or advice only).
- For 33 of the 143 restarted issues (23%), clients gave reasons for not using a resource. Thirty-six reasons were given:
  - Client was worn out, but would have continued had representation been possible (10);
  - Perception that an order would not be enforced, whatever action was taken (8);
  - Lack of confidence in the justice system, usually by fathers who felt they were not given a fair shake (5);
  - The time involved in pursuing the issues would not make it worthwhile, given the possible gains (5);
  - Client felt he/she could pursue the case on his/her own (3);
  - Independent family circumstances (2);
  - Client feels fear or intimidation and doesn’t feel confident about being able to protect herself (1);
  - Client worn out, wouldn’t pursue the case even if represented by a lawyer (1).
- This data cannot be compared with non-use of services for the original matter, because by definition, the original group of 783 respondents all had contacted one or more services. We do not know what percentage of individuals with family legal problems do not usually contact a government or community resource. Thus it is not known whether a 23% rate at this later stage (this rate is for issues, not people) is high or low.
- Six of the 8 “other” services accessed were the Family Maintenance Enforcement Program (FMEP), all for child maintenance issues. Social workers were accessed in 2 cases.
- Table S6 in Appendix 2 provides data on the types of restarted issues that were taken by the client to each type of service.

**Table 23: Types of Services Used for Issues that Start Up Again, and Comparison with Original LSS Services Used**

<b>Service</b>	<b>Column #1: Frequency and percentage of clients who used this service to deal with restarted issues (N=101, NR=5)</b>	<b>Column #2: # of clients who used this service for the original issue, prior to re- emergence of the issue</b>	<b>Column #3: Percentage of cases where the original service is re- contacted about the re-emerged issue (Column #1 divided by Column #2)</b>
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	3 (3%)	3	100%
Legal Representation	44 (44%)	49	90%
Private lawyer	17 (17%)	23	74%
Supreme Court Self-Help Info Centre	2 (2%)	4	50%
Family Justice Counsellor	13 (13%)	28	46%
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	3 (3%)	8	38%
Family Duty Counsel	17 (17%)	56	30%
Family LawLine	4 (4%)	16	25%
Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	4 (4%)	18	22%
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	5 (5%)	23	22%
Legal Aid Intake	1 (1%)	53	2%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	0 (0%)	1	0%
Internet: ClickLaw	0 (0%)	2	0%
Internet: used, but can't remember site	0 (0%)	6	0%
Printed materials (brochure, booklets, info sheets)	0 (0%)	8	0%
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	0 (0%)	6	0%
Other	8 (8%)	4	n/a
<b>Total Contacts with services</b>	<b>121</b>		
<b>Total restarted issues</b>	<b>143</b>		
<b>Total issues where clients <u>did</u> contact a service</b>	<b>110</b>		
<b>Total issues where clients did <u>not</u> contact any service</b>	<b>33</b>		

Notes:

1. 106 clients had issues that re-emerged; of these, 101 (NR=5) identified services they used. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a problem that had restarted, so percentages in column #1 do not total 100%.
2. For 23% (33/143) of issues the client did not contact any service when the issue restarted.
3. For the 101 clients who identified services, they contacted 1.2 services (121/101) each, compared to 2.4 services each for the original set of 783 clients.
4. Services are listed in descending order of percentage of re-contacts.
5. The services that were contacted are shown in [Table S6](#) of Appendix 2, listed by re-emerged issue type.

*Degree of completion of restarted issues (Table 24)*

- Table 24 shows the degree of completion of re-emerged issues.
- The non-resolution rate of these issues (28%) is considerably higher than for the original issues shown in Table 7 (8%), and the pending rate is significantly higher (77% versus 28%). The higher non-resolution rate suggests that issues become more intractable as time goes on and/or for the reasons mentioned above, people don't look for assistance. However, the non-resolution rate is lower than in the 2006 survey (37%). The higher pending rate is largely due to the more recent occurrence of the re-emerged issues. In the 2006 survey the pending rate was 55%; this lower rate was primarily because the overall sample was drawn from longer time periods than in the current survey.

**Table 24: Degree of Completion of Restarted Issues**

Issue	Frequency of restarted issues that are finished (i.e., not pending)	Degree of completion of restarted issues that are now finished			Pending Issue
		No resolution	Situation changed, so no longer an issue	Completely finished	
Order forbidding removal of child from province	1			1	1
Property division	0				1
Spousal maintenance, support (NR=1)	1			1	3
Divorce	0				1
Access	12	4	2	6	37
Child maintenance, support (NR=1)	9	2		7	38
Guardianship	2	1	1		4
Custody (NR=2)	4		2	2	21
Restraining order to prevent violence	2	1		1	0
Possession of Family Home	0				0
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	0				0
Other (NR=1)	1	1			0
<b>Total</b>	<b>31 (100%)</b>	<b>8 (28%)</b>	<b>5 (16%)</b>	<b>18 (56%)</b>	
<b>Percentage in 2006 survey (N=118)</b>		<b>37%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>53%</b>	

Notes:

1. Percentages total horizontally, but do not total 100% due to rounding. Because of the small number of cases, percentages are presented only for the "total" row.
2. The primary data presented in this table is for restarted issues that had been settled at the time of the evaluation interview. There were 106 other issues that were still pending at the time of the evaluation interview (shown in the right most column), or 77% of the 137 re-emerged issues on which there is completion data.

*Degree of satisfaction with outcome of restarted issues (Table 25)*

- Table 25 presents limited data on client satisfaction with the outcome of issues that re-emerged. Although the data set is much too small to draw firm conclusions, the satisfaction with outcomes (9/19 or 47% “mostly” or “completely” satisfied) is much lower than in the original case (733/932 or 79%). It is also much lower than the comparable indicator (68%) in the 2006 survey.
- As per the footnote in [Table 25](#), all of the completed issues for which there was a response (13/13) were resolved by a court order or written agreement reviewed by a lawyer.

**Table 25: Degree of Satisfaction with Outcome of Restarted Issues (completed cases only)**

Issue	Frequency	Degree of Satisfaction with Outcome			
		Not at all	Only partly	Mostly	Completely
Order forbidding removal of child from province	1	1			
Spousal maintenance, support	1		1		
Access	6	2	1	2	1
Child maintenance, support	7 (NR=2)	2	1		4
Custody	2			1	1
Restraining order to prevent violence	1	1			
Retraining order to prevent removal of assets	1 (NR=1)	1			
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b> <b>(100%)</b> <b>(NR=3)</b>	<b>7</b> <b>(37%)</b>	<b>3</b> <b>(16%)</b>	<b>3</b> <b>(16%)</b>	<b>6</b> <b>(32%)</b>
<b>Percentages in 2006 survey (N=62)</b>		<b>19%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>42%</b>

Notes:

1. Percentages are not used in this table for individual issues because of the small number of responses.
2. For the 19 completed issues for which data is available, there was documentation of the type of resolution in 13 cases. In all instances the resolution was by court order or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer.
3. NR = no response.

## 8.0 NEW BUT RELATED ISSUES

There were 103 cases involving 112 issues that were new but related to the original issue, and which arose after the initial resolution.

### *Types of issues (Table 26)*

- Table 26 shows the types of new issues that arose for clients and compares them with the re-emerged issues that were presented in [Table 21](#). The obvious differences are that custody and access comprise a considerably smaller portion of the new issues than of re-emerged issues, and divorce comprises a proportionately far greater proportion of the new issues. Child support remains a significant issue, but at a lower level than for re-emerging issues. These patterns in turn flow from the patterns shown in [Table 6](#), where custody, access and child support exist in approximately 50% of all cases, but divorce, which is not covered as significantly by LSS, is an issue for only 17% of original cases. Thus one should expect re-emerging issues to carry more of the original pattern, while “new, but related issues” could, and do, reflect a new emphasis. Note that the evaluation question to the respondent was “Did any *new* family legal issue related to those you’ve already described arise?” but there was no assumption that these issues could necessarily be addressed successfully by LSS.
- The patterns described in the previous bullet are virtually identical to those in the 2006 survey.
- There is a lower percentage of new issues relative to overall cases in this survey (13%, 103/783) than in 2006 (18%, 149/812). As with re-emerging issues, this is likely a reflection of the shorter time interval between the date of the original service and the date of the evaluation interview: new issues have simply had less time to emerge.

**Table 26: New but Related Issues that Arise, and Comparison with Re-emerged Issues**

Type of Issue	Frequency of New Issues (N=112 issues)	Percentage of cases which involve this issue (N=103 cases)	Frequency of re-emerged issues (from Table 21) (N=143 issues)	Percentage of cases which involve this issue (N=106 cases)
Divorce	33	32%	1	1%
Child maintenance, support	30	29%	48	45%
Access	13	13%	49	46%
Restraining order to prevent violence	11	11%	2	2%
Property division	6	6%	1	1%
Custody	4	4%	27	25%
Spousal maintenance, support	3	3%	5	5%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	3	3%	2	2%
Guardianship	1	1%	6	6%
Possession of family home	1	1%	0	0%
Other	7	7%	2	2%

Notes:

1. More than one new issue per case was possible. Percentages therefore total more than 100%.
2. These 112 issues arose in 103 cases, or 1.09 issues per client. The comparable figure in the 2006 survey was 1.26 issues per client.

*Types of services used to resolve new issues (Table 27)*

- In Table 27, the frequency of service contacts for new but related issues is compared with the frequency of service contacts for re-emerged issues that were presented in [Table 23](#). Several patterns are evident. First, the number of services contacted (1.1 services per client) is marginally lower than for re-emerged issues (1.2), and both are significantly lower than for the original issues of the 783 clients (2.4). The most significant differences between the “new issue” group and the “re-emerged issue” group is that the former makes proportionately smaller use of Legal Aid Representation (29% vs. 44%) and Family Justice Counsellors (7% vs. 13%). They make proportionately greater use of the Family Law in BC website (17% vs. 5%). For most other services, usage levels are roughly the same. As shown in [Table S7](#) in Appendix 2, the comparatively frequent use of Legal Aid Representation services is driven by divorce and child support issues. Divorce is also a driver for use of private lawyers and the Family Law website.
- Overall, less than half as many services were contacted for new but related problems (1.1 per client) than for the original problem (2.4 per client) and there were also fewer services contacted than for re-emerged issues (1.2 per client). This pattern could be an indicator that clients have a clearer sense of the pathways for addressing their problems, but this conclusion cannot be drawn confidently for several reasons. Firstly, the averages for services contacted in re-emerged cases and new cases included clients who did not contact any service (33% for re-emerged cases and 15% for new cases). By definition, *none* of the original 783 clients contacted no services, because their names were all made available to the evaluation study through the services they had contacted. Secondly, as was seen in the discussion of Table 23, the reasons for non-use of services are usually negative rather than positive. Thirdly, fewer service options are available for clients seeking a divorce, which occurs more frequently as a client’s new issue. The same patterns were evident in the 2006 survey, although non-use of services were higher for new cases than for re-emerged cases in the 2006 survey.
- The 15 respondents who had not sought out a service to help with the new issue gave 16 reasons. Ten of these reasons show positive intent: 5 said they wanted to, but had various issues to attend to before doing so, and five said they are capable of handling it on their own. Negative reasons include lack of financial resources (2), perception that there will never be any enforcement (2), intimidation/fear (1), and lack of energy to continue to seek a resolution (1).

**Table 27: Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues**

	Frequency and % of clients who used this service for new problems (N=103 clients)	Comparison with frequencies of service contacts for the restarted issues (Table 23); (N=101 clients)
Legal Aid Representation	30 (29%)	44 (44%)
Private lawyer	18 (17%)	17 (17%)
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	17 (17%)	5 (5%)
Family Duty Counsel	14 (14%)	17 (17%)
Family Justice Counsellor	7 (7%)	13 (13%)
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	5 (5%)	2 (2%)
Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	2 (2%)	4 (4%)
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Family LawLine	1 (1%)	4 (4%)
Internet: ClickLaw	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Legal Aid Intake	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Community advocacy service or clinic	1 (1%)	3 (3%)
Legal Information Outreach Worker	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Internet: used, but can't remember site	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other	11 (11%)	8 (8%)
<b>Total contacts with services</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Total new issues</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Total issues where client contacted a service</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Total issues where client did not contact a service</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Services contacted per client</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>

Notes:

1. 103 clients had new but related problems. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a new problem, so percentages do not total 100%.
2. Fifteen percent (15/103) of clients did not contact any service when the new issue arose.
3. Services are listed in decreasing order of frequency of usage, except for "other."



*Degree of completion of new issues and client satisfaction with outcome (Table 28)*

- Table 28 describes the degree of completion of new issues that arise for clients.
- The rate of “no resolution” (35%) is higher in Table 28 than for re-emerged issues in [Table 24](#) (28%), and much higher than in [Table 7](#) for original issues (8%). This could reflect both the fact that some clients (15%, as per Table 27) had not contacted any service, and also that there are fewer resources to address divorce matters.
- The high “pending” rate is – like re-emerged issues – due to the greater recency of the new issue. This result confirms the importance of having drawn samples of cases with many years’ duration, as discussed in Section 2.
- Because of the small number of reportable cases in which the case was “completely finished,” the client’s satisfaction with the outcome of the issue is summarized in a footnote to Table 28. Overall, the positive responses (“completely” or “mostly” satisfied) were 88% (21/24), which is higher than for re-emerged issues (70%) or for the original issues (79%). These patterns are identical to those in the 2006 survey. The high proportion of child support and divorce matters (accounting for 19 of the 35 completed issues), in which a fairly clear-cut decision can be reached, may account for this highly positive response.
- As with the original cases and re-emerged cases, the vast majority (71%) of issues in new cases were completed by a court order or drafted by a lawyer.

**Table 28: Degree of Completion of New Issues**

Type of Issue	Frequency of new issues that are finished (i.e., not pending)	Degree of Completion			Pending issue
		No Resolution	Situation changed so no longer an issue	Completely finished	
Restraining order to prevent violence (NR=1)	4	1		3	6
Custody (NR=1)	1	1			2
Access (NR=1)	4	2		2	8
Order forbidding removal of children from province	2			2	1
Guardianship	0				1
Child maintenance, support	8	2		6	22
Spousal maintenance, support	2		1	1	1
Property division	1			1	5
Possession of family home	0				1
Divorce	11		1	10	22
Other	2	1	1		5
Total	35 (100%)	7 (20%)	3 (9%)	25 (71%)	74
Percentage in 2006 Survey	100%	35%	6%	59%	

Notes:

1. The primary data presented in this table is only for new issues that were settled at the time of the evaluation interview. There were 74 other new issues that were still pending at the time of the evaluation interview, or 68% of the 109 new issues for which there is completion data.
2. Because of the small number of cases, percentages are given of completion outcomes for the “total” row, not for individual issues.
3. Of the 25 completed issues, clients rated their satisfaction on 24 issues. Their replies were: “completely satisfied” in 20 cases (83%), “mostly satisfied” in 1 case (4%), “only partly” in 1 case (4%), and “not at all” in 2 cases (8%).
4. Of the 25 completed issues, clients were able to identify the type of resolution for 17 issues. Fourteen (71%) were completed by a court order or drafted by a lawyer, 2 (12%) were written agreements not reviewed by a lawyer, and 1 (6%) was a de facto agreement.

## 9.0 OTHER CONTEXTUAL AND OUTCOME ISSUES

Tables 29 – 33 present feedback on several contextual and outcome issues that relate to clients' use of the various family legal services.

### *Prior use of a legal aid service for a family matter (Table 29)*

- Table 29 presents data on clients' prior use of a legal aid service.
- Overall, 29% of clients had used a legal aid service (e.g. Legal Aid Representation, Family Duty Counsel, Advice Counsel or other LSS service) prior to the case in this study.
- There was negligible difference between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal respondents in terms of prior usage, and a slightly higher use among females than male respondents. Respondents at the lower two education levels had significantly higher prior usage than those in the two upper education levels. LIOW and ACLW respondents had low prior usage, whereas Legal Aid Representation and Family LawLine services had comparatively higher prior usage.
- Overall, 219 of the 222 respondents who had had prior use, were able to estimate the frequency of that use. Fifty-nine percent (130/219) had used a service once previously, 17% (37/219) twice, 9% (20/219) three times, 8% (17/219) four to eight times, and 7% (15/219) nine or more times.
- Overall, 218 of these 222 respondents could estimate how long ago they used a legal aid service for the first time. Thirty-four percent (75/218) first used a service from one to three years ago, 16% (34/218) from four to six years ago, 17% (36/218) seven to 10 years ago, 17% (36/218) eleven to 15 years ago, and 12% (27/218) 16 years or more ago.

**Table 29: Prior Use of a Legal Aid Service for a Family Matter, by Demographics**

Whether client has previously used a Legal Aid service for a family matter	Overall N=770); NR=13)	Gender		Ethnic Status	
		Male (N=263; NR=4)	Female (N=507; NR=9)	Aboriginal (N=49; NR=1)	Non-Aboriginal (N=712; NR=12)
No	548 (71%)	200 (76%)	348 (69%)	34 (69%)	508 (71%)
Yes	222 (29%)	63 (24%)	159 (31%)	15 (31%)	204 (29%)

Whether client has previously used a Legal Aid service for a family matter	Overall N=770); NR=13)	Education			
		No High School (N=11)	Some High School (N=96; NR=2)	Graduated High School (N=218; NR=5)	Post High School (N=429; NR=5)
No	548 (71%)	5 (45%)	58 (60%)	155 (71%)	308 (72%)
Yes	222 (29%)	6 (55%)	38 (40%)	53 (29%)	121 (28%)

Whether client has previously used a Legal Aid service for a family matter	Overall (N=770); NR=13)	Service used by client from which he/she was referred to evaluation					
		Family LawLine (N=87)	Family Duty Counsel (N=278; NR=4)	Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer (N=161; NR=2)	Legal Aid Representation (N=177; NR=3)	LIOW (N=49; NR=4)	ACLW (N=18)
No	548 (71%)	57 (66%)	194 (70%)	124 (77%)	113 (64%)	45 (92%)	15 (83%)
Yes	222 (29%)	30 (34%)	84 (30%)	37 (23%)	64 (36%)	4 (8%)	3 (17%)

*Other types of issues that impact on the main family matter (Tables 30 and 31)*

- Table 30 shows the frequency of other types of issues that impact on the main family issues, and Table 31 describes how those issues impact the main family issue.
- Thirty-five percent of respondents (268/772; NR=11) said they had other types of issues that had an impact on the main family legal issue(s) for which they had sought assistance. Financial and health matters were the biggest contributors of impacts on the family issue. There are of course many interconnections between the categories in Table 30 (e.g. health problems that lead to employment problems that lead to income loss, etc.). Overall, the 268 respondents identified 368 issues (or 1.4 issues per respondent) that impacted their family issue.
- Of the 268 respondents who had issues, 267 identified 335 impacts they were having in their family issues. Although the first two impacts in Table 31 are general impacts that relate broadly to the respondent's ability to cope and address legal issues, most other impacts are tied to specific family legal issues, such as child support, access, custody or possession of the family home.
- Examples of comments made by respondents showing the connection between social/financial issues and the legal issues are provided on [page 56](#), following Table 31.
- Clearly many of the issues in Table 30 are of a social/economic nature, so are not readily addressed by a legal service. Thus of 253 respondents (NR=15) who had these issues:
  - 52% (131/253) did not ask for help from Legal Aid or other service;
  - 13% (34/253) asked, but no help was available
  - 19% (48/253) received help from another service
  - 16% (40/253) received help from Legal Aid (i.e. from Representation or one of the other LSS services)

However, legal services providers who perceive that a client or applicant has a social-economic issue which impacts their family legal issue can help clients to identify other (non-legal) resources of 47 respondents who approached one of the LSS services and had a non-legal problem impacting their legal issue, 14 (30%) said they were referred to another service.

**Table 30: Other Types of Issues that Impact on the Main Family Issue(s)**

Category of Issue	Number of Issues	Percent of overall issues (N=368)
<b>Financial</b>	<b>(141)</b>	<b>(38%)</b>
Debt	61	17%
Low Income	48	13%
Employment	14	4%
Entitlement to Benefits	7	2%
Foreclosure	7	2%
Bankruptcy	4	1%
<b>Health</b>	<b>(92)</b>	<b>(25%)</b>
Addictions	30	8%
Health	26	7%
Mental Health	15	4%
Death/suicide	13	4%
Disability	8	2%
<b>Family Relations/Conflict</b>	<b>(31)</b>	<b>(8%)</b>
Disagreements, tensions between various members of family; disappearances	21	6%
Family violence	6	2%
Child protection	4	1%
<b>Location/Relocation</b>	<b>(46)</b>	<b>(13%)</b>
Housing	25	7%
Inter-jurisdictional issues; distance between family members; moving	16	4%
Immigration proceedings	5	1%
<b>Criminal</b>	<b>(58)</b>	<b>(16%)</b>
Criminal involvement of spouse or family member; imprisonment	58	16%
<b>TOTAL ISSUES</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes:

1. This table shows percentages of overall issues, not of people or cases.
2. Figures in bold are the total of percentages within each category. Respondents frequently mentioned more than one sub-category within each category, so they are not mutually exclusive.

**Table 31: Types of Impact Other Issues have on the Main Family Legal Issue**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Frequency of Issues</b>	<b>% of Total Issues</b>
Increased conflict and stress (impacts generally on family issues)	57	17%
General destabilization of family due to poverty, debt, bankruptcy	48	14%
Inability/difficulty to meet child support obligations due to lack of employment, low income	36	11%
Frustration/helplessness in coping with family issues due to lack of legal aid and/or ability to pay for lawyer	28	8%
Access to children hindered by no contact orders/criminal charges (both proven and unproven)	27	8%
Access to children impacted by safety concerns	26	8%
Resignation about or abandonment of legal matters due to complexity of inter-jurisdictional and/or location issues.	25	7%
Generalized anxiety in the family due to illness, disability, mental health or criminal charges	21	6%
Conflict over possession/losing the family home	19	6%
Difficulty providing appropriate space and/or maintaining regular contact with children without permanent, suitable housing	10	3%
Concern/conflict about custody and access following the death or serious illness of a parent or a child	9	3%
Access to children being hindered/denied due to past or current addiction issues	7	2%
Fear of losing children due to financial reasons (can't afford lawyer)	4	1%
Inability to afford childcare, extra expenses for children	4	1%
Alienated from children	2	1%
Difficulty in meeting access arrangements	2	1%
Other (dropped matter, problem resolved, gave up, deceased)	10	3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>100%</b>

Notes:

1. Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.
2. Percentages reflect the proportion of issues each category represents out of all issues. They do not show the percentage of respondents that mentioned that issue.
3. There were 267 respondents with 335 issues, or 1.25 issues per respondent.

**EXAMPLES OF IMPACTS DUE TO SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, MEDICAL AND LOCATIONAL FACTORS ON THE FAMILY ISSUES**

Respondent has no income, is not working, and is living in subsidized housing with child. Can't afford a lawyer to get a court order and seems to be frightened to go back to LSS because he is afraid that they will demand money from him.

Respondent lives in very reduced circumstances, has gone bankrupt and has cancer. Was entitled to spousal support but could not pursue it, as had moved out of province.

Ex-spouse was extremely abusive and controlling. Had respondent charged criminally (but the charges were false and were dropped). Hard to cooperate on family matters with such a background of stress.

Respondent was in car accident in which his child was killed. Ex-spouse feels accident was the respondent's fault and does not want him to see the remaining child ever again, so has been denying access.

Respondent is under tremendous financial pressure, as a single parent, struggling to pay court costs incurred by ex-spouse, who is financially sound and can afford lawyers to go back to Supreme Court repeatedly.

Former spouse has mental health issues; child had a nervous breakdown while living with former spouse; child over-dosed on ex's medications. Former spouse kidnapped child but police refused to enforce custody order. Respondent has incurred hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees but still has constant concern for child's safety and is being denied access.

Estranged spouse charged and imprisoned for uttering threats. When released, spouse resumed IV drug use and threatened to kill the children. Not reported to police, but respondent has been lying low ever since. Is fearful to proceed with the divorce and needs to know spouse's whereabouts to do so.

Respondent was off work due to having open heart surgery. Was told he/she had to pay child support or be incarcerated. Very stressful. Family member loaned the money to hire a lawyer to get it sorted out.

Former spouse was charged and convicted of assaulting respondent. He was on probation with a no contact order in place and not allowed to go into the family residence. Family court judge suggested that respondent allow former spouse into the house. Respondent didn't feel safe but felt the judge didn't seem to understand. Respondent felt as though she was being seen as the "bad guy."

Respondent engaged in protracted and contentious dealings with former spouse. Had been incarcerated for a jail term based on (now proven) false charges made by his former spouse. Respondent is being denied access to children, despite court order and is now seeking to vary the custody order.

Ex-spouse is an addict and (in respondent's words) a "psycho" who keeps challenging guardianship, access and maintenance issues as a way of keeping the respondent "on edge." Respondent feels that these issues might never be resolved.

Respondent is having serious health problems, has no money, and is eating from food bank, but family case just drags on and on. Very stressful as has not had any child support for a number of years.

Ex-spouse moved into basement of family home and changed all the locks, which forced respondent to move out as could not remain in the same house with ex-spouse. This had repercussions for custody and child support as it appeared that the respondent abandoned the family, which was not the case.

Ex-spouse lives in Europe for half the year and initiated proceedings there, although respondent and children live in Canada. Ex-spouse did this as a means to avoid paying spousal support because in the country where the proceedings were initiated spousal support is not required if parties are not married. Respondent has had to deal with both country's legal systems.



*Client responses to statements about knowledge and confidence outcomes (Tables 32 – 34)*

- As shown in Table 32, respondents were asked to respond to statements pertaining to their knowledge and confidence about dealing with legal problems in the future. They were most positive about knowing where to go to get legal assistance in the future. They were slightly less positive about their confidence in recognizing the legal component of a family matter or of knowing their rights. Of the four sets of statements, they were the least positive about being sure their rights would be adequately addressed in a similar case in the future (only 50% with positive rating of “6” or “7” on a 7-point scale; 23% gave negative ratings).

**Table 32: Client Responses to Statements about Knowledge and Confidence Outcomes**

Statement	# of respondents	Level of Agreement on a 7-point scale, where 1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree			
		Ratings in following ranges on the 7-point scale			Mean Rating
		1-3	4-5	6-7	
As a result of the legal services I received for the issues in this case ...					
1. I am more confident about recognizing when a family matter is at least partly a legal problem	780 (NR=3) 100%	84 (11%)	286 (37%)	410 (53%)	5.4
2. I feel I have more knowledge about my rights in a family matter	782 (NR=1) 100%	119 (15%)	237 (30%)	426 (54%)	5.3
3. If necessary I would know where to go to get the legal assistance I need in a family matter	782 (NR=1) 100%	109 (14%)	167 (21%)	506 (65%)	5.6
4. I feel that my legal rights would be adequately addressed in a new family matter if I received the same type of services provided by Legal Aid again.	780 (NR=3) 100%	179 (23%)	211 (27%)	390 (50%)	5.0

- As shown in Tables 33 and 34, mean responses to all questions are consistently higher for women than for men and for Aboriginal respondents than for non-Aboriginal respondents. Respondents who reported “some high school” as their current education level consistently rated their knowledge and confidence higher than respondents reporting other education levels. Those who reported “graduated high school” had the second highest ratings for 3 of the 4 questions. Among the six services included in the study, the ACLWs consistently had the highest ratings on all four questions, followed by Legal Aid Representation and the Out of Court Advice lawyers. Family LawLine and Family Duty Counsel interchanged their order in ratings for four of the six services, and LIOWs consistently had the lowest ratings.

**Table 33: Mean Client Ratings of Statements about Knowledge and Confidence outcomes by Demographics**

Statement	Level of Agreement Mean Rating on a 7-point scale where 1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree							
	Gender		Ethnicity		Education			
	Male	Female	Aboriginal	Non-Aboriginal	No high school	Some high school	Graduated high school	Post high school
<b>As a result of the legal services I received for the issues in this case ...</b>								
1. I am more confident about recognizing when a family matter is at least partly a legal problem	5.2 N=266 (NR=1)	5.5 N=514 (NR=2)	5.7 N=50	5.4 N=721 (NR=3)	5.6 N=11	5.9 N=98	5.4 (N=212 (NR=1)	5.4 N=432 (NR=2)
2. I feel I have more knowledge about my rights in a family matter	5.1 N=267	5.4 N=515 (NR=1)	5.4 N=50	5.3 N=723 (NR=1)	4.9 N=11	5.6 N=98	5.4 N=213	5.3 N=433 (NR=1)
3. If necessary I would know where to go to get the legal assistance I need in a family matter	5.4 N=267	5.7 N=515 (NR=1)	6.1 N=50	5.6 N=723 (NR=1)	5.5 N=11	6.1 N=98	5.8 N=213	5.5 N=433 (NR=1)
4. I feel that my legal rights would be adequately addressed in a new family matter if I received the same type of services provided by Legal Aid again.	4.7 N=267	5.1 N=513 (NR=3)	5.3 N=50	5.0 N=721 (NR=3)	4.9 N=11	5.3 N=98	5.1 N=212 (NR=1)	4.9 N=432 (NR=2)

Note:

- Gender and ethnicity ratings (based on the complete data) have statistically significant differences at the .05 level for statement #1 only. There are no other statistically significant differences.

**Table 34: Mean Client Ratings of Statements about Knowledge and Confidence outcomes by Services**

Statement	Level of Agreement Mean Rating on a 7-point scale where 1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree					
	Service					
	Family LawLine	Family Duty Counsel	Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	Legal Aid Representation	LIOW	ACLW
1. I am more confident about recognizing when a family matter is at least partly a legal problem	4.9 N=86 (NR=1)	5.2 N=281 (NR=1)	5.7 N=163	6.0 N=180	4.7 N=52 (NR=1)	6.5 N=18
2. I feel I have more knowledge about my rights in a family matter	5.2 N=87	5.1 N=281 (NR=1)	5.6 N=163	5.6 N=180	4.5 N=53	6.4 N=18
3. If necessary I would know where to go to get the legal assistance I need in a family matter	5.2 N=87	5.3 N=281 (NR=1)	6.0 N=163	6.1 N=180	4.8 N=53	6.8 N=18
4. I feel that my legal rights would be adequately addressed in a new family matter if I received the same type of services provided by Legal Aid again.	4.8 N=87	4.8 N=281 (NR=1)	5.3 N=163	5.3 N=180	4.0 N=51 (NR=2)	6.6 N=18

## 10.0 CONCLUSIONS

The objectives of this study listed in Section 2.1 were tied to highly focused, data-intensive questions. The summaries of findings from the data tables in each section of the report serve as conclusions or answers to those questions, and will not be repeated here.

However, there are more general conclusions that can be advanced that reflect on the methodology and on the broader significance of the findings as a whole.

1) *The findings of the current survey broadly confirm those of the 2006 survey*

As noted earlier in the report, the configuration of LSS services in this study differs from that of the 2006 report, as do services in the external environment. The number and proportion of clients from each service also varies. It is therefore not possible to talk of the 2006 survey as a baseline in the strict sense of the word.

Nonetheless, in a broad sense the findings of this study confirm many of the findings of the 2006 report, such as:

- the proportion of custody, access and child support issues among all case issues;
- the number of family issues per case;
- rates of overall satisfaction with outcomes;
- client perception of helpfulness of services;
- the rough order in which services are used (“front-end” vs. “later” services);
- “networking” services that tend to refer clients for further assistance;
- reasons for non-resolution of issues.

By taking into consideration the impact of the age of the samples in the respective surveys, it is also possible to state that the rate of re-emergence of the original issue, or the advent of new issues, is similar in both surveys.

There are also differences to be considered between the two surveys:

- satisfaction with outcomes in the current survey is lower than in the 2006 survey;
- the satisfaction rate for completed issues that re-emerged is lower than in the 2006 survey.

In combination, therefore, those two reports would seem to provide a solid basis of understanding about client usage of family legal services, which in turn could help LSS to appreciate the impacts that changes might have on clients, and how best LSS services might respond to client needs.

- 2) *The consistent gathering of client consents and contact information from as early a date as possible in the life of an LSS service (or LSS-funded service) is critical to successful outcome studies*

Outcome studies require cases that have been “completed” for a significant period of time, so that one can assess if the resolution has broken down, original issues have re-emerged, and/or new but related issues have developed. The experience with this study, which overall had fewer “old” cases than in the 2006 survey, has reinforced the importance of this issue. For example, the 2006 survey likely contains more accurate data on the rates of re-emergence of issues, and development of new issues. This requires that both studies be considered together. Planning for future LSS outcome evaluation studies should involve, as early as possible, the identification of case sample time periods and collection of consents from clients of services where this practice is not currently routine.

- 3) *Statistical tests were performed for a range of questions to determine the significance of differences in response based on key demographic variables. In almost no case was there a statistically significant difference between demographic variables for the same question in both the 2006 survey and the current survey. The sole exception was that female respondents have shown significantly more positive satisfaction ratings about outcomes in both surveys. Although the results of statistical significance tests based on demographic variables are not fully conclusive, ongoing collection of key demographic data remains important.*

Tests for statistical significance related to three demographic variables have shown that:

- Female participants have shown significantly more positive assessments of satisfaction with outcomes in both the 2006 and current survey ([Table 11](#)).
- There were significant differences based on education levels between respondent assessment of satisfaction with outcomes in the current survey, but not in 2006 ([Table 11](#)).
- There were significant differences based on ethnic status between respondent assessment of satisfaction outcomes in the 2006 survey, but not in the current survey ([Table 11](#)).
- There were significant differences based on ethnic status between the degree of completion of issues in both 2006 and the current survey, but in 2006 non-Aboriginal respondents had more positive results, whereas in the current survey Aboriginal respondents have more positive results ([Table 8](#)).
- There were no significant differences in regard to degree of completion in either survey based on gender or education ([Table 8](#)).
- The only statistically significant result in regard to the series of statements about case outcomes in [Table 32](#) was in regard to gender, where female respondents gave higher average ratings.
- Although not statistically significant, there were consistent patterns of more positive ratings by both female and Aboriginal respondents for all other statements.

While these results are not fully conclusive, over time they may show the consistency of or changes in patterns. This information can draw attention to the needs of certain demographic groups, reflect progress that is being made for them, or simply develop our understanding of differences. The principle of access to justice should be consciously considered in the way legal services are provided, and the consistent collection of demographic data for all services facilitates the measurement of how certain populations may be advantaged or disadvantaged in achieving access.

- 4) *The client needs to be understood as a navigator of services who is responding to a variety of pressures and circumstances while attempting to find a resolution to his/her problem*

Many tables in this report help delineate parameters around which service providers can more fully understand clients. For example:

- Clients rate services quite differently in terms of their helpfulness in getting them close to a resolution ([Table 18](#)). The most valued services are ones that advocate for, or represent them.
- They use more than one service to resolve an issue; knowing where they have been can therefore be helpful.
- They frequently use a service more than once for the same issue ([Table 17A](#)) and may have used Legal Aid services previously over a long period of time ([Table 29](#)).
- They tend to re-use a higher level service if an issue opens up again, rather than a lower level one. ([Table 23](#))
- A significant percentage of clients have major social, health, economic and other issues that can directly impact their family legal issue ([Table 31](#) and examples on [page 56](#)). Understanding these pressures and how they affect the legal problem may help service providers give advice that can and will be followed, and/or help them to make appropriate referrals to resources in or outside the legal system to resolve these other issues.

# **A P P E N D I X 1:**

## **CLIENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

### FILE REFERRAL DATA

1. Name of Client: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Identifier #: (if available) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Gender:     1. Male   2. Female
4. Ethnic Status:     1. Aboriginal   2. Non-Aboriginal   3. Not declared  
Note: confirm accuracy of ethnic status with the respondent, either at beginning or end of interview. Correct if necessary. (Then check here only if you did change the response. Needed to change? \_\_\_\_\_)
5. Is a translator required for the telephone interview?
  1. No
  2. Yes

5.1 (If Yes), for what language? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Education:
  1. no high school
  2. some high school
  3. graduated high school
  4. post high school
  5. unknown/not recorded
7. Region
  1. Interior/East Kootenays
  2. North
  3. North West
  4. Okanagan/West Kootenays
  5. Surrey/Fraser Valley
  6. Vancouver Island
  7. Vancouver/Sunshine Coast
8. Service used by client from which he/she was referred to evaluation:
  1. Family LawLine
  2. Family Duty Counsel
  3. Out-of-court Advice Lawyer
  4. Legal Aid (representation)
  5. Legal Information Outreach Worker
  6. Aboriginal Community legal worker
9. (For Legal Aid Representation service only, ie. only #4 in Q8) Number of referrals up to and including the date of the sample: \_\_\_\_\_
10. (For referral services only) Name of Lawyer \_\_\_\_\_
11. Date of Service: \_\_\_\_\_
12. File Description of Problems and Outcomes

Legal Problem(s)	Outcome(s)
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.
6.	6.
7.	7.



## CLIENT INTERVIEW

Our records show that on   (date)   you visited/called/used   (type of service)   to get help with   (type(s) of problems)  .

1. Is this correct? (*probe both for correct issue identification and number and type of issues*)

1. No (explain) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Yes

2. Can you tell me what happened with your problem(s) when you went to (type of service in Q 8 of p.1)?

2.1 Issue Type	2.2 Degree of Completion	2.3 (Only if answered #4 or #5 to Q 2.2.) Was the original outcome what you hoped for, i.e. what you hoped would happen?	2.4 (Only if answered #4 or #5 under "degree of completion") Type of Resolution
<b>1. Restraining order to prevent violence</b> <b>2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets</b> <b>3. Custody</b> <b>4. Access</b> <b>5. Order forbidding removal of child from province</b> <b>6. Guardianship</b> <b>7. Child maintenance, support,</b> (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity) <b>8. Spousal maintenance, support</b> (including arrears and enforcement) <b>9. Property division</b> <b>10. Possession of family home</b> <b>11. Divorce</b> <b>12. Other</b> (specify) <b>Notes:</b> 1. If response is "ex parte order", ask what type of issue the order was for. 2. If response is "separation agreement", ask for what type(s) of issue(s).	1 = no resolution 2 = situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue 3 = still pending 4 = completely finished 5 = appeared to be completely finished at one point, but then issue re-emerged later  <b>Notes:</b> 1. These choices are <u>not</u> related to satisfaction or whether client "won," but just whether issue was brought to a conclusion. 2. "No resolution" is not having either an informal or formal resolution to the issue, but conflict around the legal issue still exists.	1 = not at all 2 = only partly 3 = mostly 4 = completely	1 = verbal or de facto 2 = written agreement, but not reviewed by a lawyer 4 = court order by consent, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer 5=court order decided by judge after a court hearing (i.e. litigation is involved) 6=not sure  <b>Notes:</b> -"de facto" means a routine that just evolves - #2 might include an agreement drafted by the parties themselves, or an agreement developed by a family justice counsellor or through mediation, but <u>not</u> formally reviewed by a lawyer.
1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.	5.
6.	6.	6.	6.
7.	7.	7.	7.

2.5 If issue(s) is/are "still pending", approximately when do you think the problem will be resolved?

1. Before February 1, 2012 (specify month \_\_\_\_\_, and ask if it is ok to call again about the outcome)
2. February 1 or later
3. Don't know

## SERVICES USED AND OUTCOMES

3. Either before or after you visited/called/used this service did you use any other type of legal service to help you solve this/these legal problems? For example, did you use \_\_\_\_\_ (mention services in the list below, and include ratings for the main service the sample was drawn from.)
- 3.1 As best as you can remember, when did you use this service?
- 3.2 Did you use it more than once for this problem?
- 3.3 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = not at all helpful and 5 = very helpful, how helpful was this service in terms of helping you get closer to a resolution?
- 3.4 **Only for users of service #4 (representation) and where answer to helpfulness is 1, 2 or 3, ask: Why did you find this service not very helpful?**
- 3.5 Did this service mention or refer you to one of the other services?
- 3.6 If so, to which ones?

Service	3.0. Did you use this service? 1 = no 2 = yes	3.1 Did you use this service ... 1. Before 2. After 3. Before and after the service on page 1? (Note: record N/A for the service sample is drawn from)	3.2 Did you use this service more than once for this problem? 1=no 2=yes 3=can't remember	3.3 How helpful was this service in getting you closer to a resolution? (only if service was used) 1 = not at all helpful 5 = very helpful	3.4 (only if service #4 & answer to Q 3.3 is 1, 2 or 3) Why was it not very helpful? (see choices at foot of page)	3.5 Did this service mention or refer you to any other legal service? 1 = no 2 = yes 3 = Can't remember	3.6 If yes, to which service(s)?  Note: Use same number(s) as in first column
1. Family LawLine					n/a		
2. Family Duty Counsel					n/a		
3. Out-of-court Advice Lawyer					n/a		
4. Legal Representation							
5. Legal Information Outreach Worker					n/a		
6. Aboriginal Community Legal Worker					n/a		
7. Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)					n/a		
8. Internet: ClickLaw					n/a		
9. Internet: used, but can't remember site					n/a		
10. Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)					n/a		
11. Legal Aid Intake					n/a		
12. Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)					n/a		
13. Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)					n/a		
14. Family Justice Counsellor					n/a		
15. Private Lawyer					n/a		
16. Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre					n/a		
17. Other (specify)					n/a		

### Choices for Q 3.4 (More than 1 answer possible)

1. Lawyer perceived as giving client low priority (little/no communication, slow service).
2. LSS criteria for eligibility and/or coverage perceived as too restrictive.
3. Lawyer perceived as rude/unsympathetic/inattentive/lacked cultural understanding.
4. Lawyer perceived as incompetent/dishonest.
5. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

3.7 (If used legal aid representation) Did you have more than one legal aid lawyer for this issue?

1. No 2. Yes.

3.8 (If Yes to Q 3.7) How many? \_\_\_\_\_

3.9 (If yes to Q 3.7) Why did you have different lawyers? \_\_\_\_\_

## ISSUES THAT ARE NOT RESOLVED

4. (Ask this question if client answered “1” (no resolution) for “degree of completion (column 2.2) for any of the issues in column 2.1). You said that (issue) was not resolved. Why did this issue not get resolved?

4.1 Issue Type	4.2 Reason why not resolved (more than 1 answer possible)
<b>1. Restraining order to prevent violence</b> <b>2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets</b> <b>3. Custody</b> <b>4. Access</b> <b>5. Order forbidding removal of child from province</b> <b>6. Guardianship</b> <b>7. Child maintenance, support</b> , (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity) <b>8. Spousal maintenance, support</b> (including arrears and enforcement) <b>9. Property division</b> <b>10. Possession of family home</b> <b>11. Divorce</b> <b>12. Other</b> (specify)	<b>Systemic barriers</b> 1. Client couldn't afford lawyer 2. Client willing to represent self, but couldn't afford extra expenses (e.g. filing fees, hearing fees, reports, expert witness costs, land title fees, etc) 3. Client felt intimidated, confused, or overwhelmed by court system 4. Time delays made it pointless to continue. 5. Error or lack of quality assistance on part of service provider <b>Relationship dynamics and barriers</b> 6. Client felt worn down by opposing party 7. Client felt threatened by opposing party <b>Client personal circumstances or reaction</b> 8. Client illness or other personal circumstances meant client could not continue. 9. Client felt it wasn't worth the hassle to continue <b>Other</b> 10. Other (specify)
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.
6.	6.
7.	7.

## RE-EMERGING ISSUES

5. (Ask this question if respondent answered "5" (appeared to be completely finished, but then re-emerged) in column 2.2 for any issue in column 2.1) You said that (issue[s] identified in question 2) started up again after you thought that they had been resolved.

(For each issue ask):

5.1 How long (how many months) after you thought it had got resolved did it start up again as a legal issue?

5.2 Why did it become an issue again?

5.3 How did you try to resolve this/these issue(s)? What service did you go to? (If answer is "none, see 5.7)

5.4 Did you get this/these issue(s) resolved again?

5.5 (If completely resolved or finished) Was the outcome what you hoped would happen?

5.6 (If applicable, i.e. matter is completely finished) Type of resolution

5.7 (If answer to 5.3 is "none" and answer to 5.4 is "no resolution" or "still pending", ask:) Why did you not seek help from any service?

5. Issue type	5.1 How long after you thought it had got resolved did the issue start up again?	5.2 Why did it become an issue again? (2 possible)	5.3 Service(s) Accessed	5.4 Degree of Completion of the issue that re-emerged.	5.5 (Only if matter is completely finished) Was this outcome what you hoped to achieve, i.e. what you hoped would happen?	5.6 (Only if matter is completely finished) Type of Resolution	5.7 (If answer to Q 5.3. is "none" and to 5.4 is "no resolution" or "pending")  Why didn't you use a service?
1. Restraining order to prevent violence 2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets 3. Custody 4. Access 5. Order forbidding removal of child from province 6. Guardianship 7. Child maintenance, support, (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity) 8. Spousal maintenance, support (including arrears and enforcement) 9. Property division 10. Possession of family home 11. Divorce 12. Other (specify)	1,2,3,4,5 months, etc	1. Refusal to comply with court order or separation agreement 2. Refusal to comply with informal agreement 3. Arrears order could not be enforced 4. Situation changed, need to vary order (amount or conditions) 5. Mobility issue; threat of removal of child from province or region. 6. Need to make temporary order into permanent 7. Other (specify)	1. Family LawLine 2. Family Duty Counsel 3. Out-of-court Advice Lawyer 4. Legal representation 5. Legal Information Outreach Worker 6. Aboriginal Community Legal Worker 7. Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site) 8. Internet: ClickLaw 9. Internet: used, but can't remember site 10. Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets) 11. Legal Aid Intake 12. Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer) 13. Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic) 14. Family Justice Counsellor 15. Private Lawyer 16. Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre 17. Other (specify) 18. None (ask Q 5.7)	1 = no resolution 2 = situation changed, so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue 3 = still pending 4 = completely finished  <b>Notes:</b> 1. These choices are <u>not</u> related to satisfaction or whether client "won," but just whether issue was brought to a conclusion. 2. "No resolution" is not having either an informal or formal resolution to the issue, but conflict around the legal issue still exists.	1 = not at all 2 = only partly 3 = mostly 4 = completely	1 = verbal or de facto 2 = written agreement, but not reviewed by a lawyer 3 = court order, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer 4 = not sure  <b>Notes:</b> - "de facto" means a routine that just evolves - #2 might include an agreement drafted by the parties themselves, or an agreement developed by a family justice counsellor or through mediation, but <u>not</u> formally reviewed by a lawyer.	(see choices below this table)
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.	2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.	3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.	4.	4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.

### Choices for Q 5.7 (more than 1 answer possible)

- Client worn out, no more energy to pursue issue (but would if could be represented by a lawyer).
- Client worn out, no more energy, and wouldn't pursue even if represented by a lawyer.
- Client has particular family circumstances that do not relate to the justice system, nor to intimidation, fear or enforcement issues, and that make it hard to pursue the issue at this time. Client may or may not pursue in the future. (examples include family events, holidays, schedules, illnesses)
- Time involved in pursuing the issue would not make it worthwhile, given the possible gains (e.g. spouse always brings child back an hour later than agreed and this represents a significant inconvenience, but is too much trouble to take back to court)
- Client feels fear or intimidation, and doesn't feel confident about being able to protect herself
- Lack of enforcement (e.g. got an order, but spouse does not comply, and it is likely to be an ongoing problem that client feels won't get resolved)
- Other (please describe)

## NEW FAMILY ISSUES

6. Did any new family legal issues related to those you've already described arise? (Note: new issues must only be family issues, but are different from the original issues.)
1. No, new family issues did not arise.      2. Yes, new family issues did arise
7. (If answer to #6 is "2"). What was/were the issue(s)?
- 7.1 Which services did you use?
- 7.2 Did the issue get resolved?
- 7.3 (If finished) How satisfied were you with this outcome?
- 7.4 What type of resolution was it?
- 7.5 (If answer to service used is "none" and answer to degree of completion is "no resolution" or "still pending", ask:) Why did you not seek help from any service?

7.0. Issues	7.1 Which Services Used? (more than 1 possible)	7.2 Overall Degree of Completion	7.3 (Only if matter is completely finished) Satisfaction with Outcome Was the outcome to this related issue what you hoped to achieve, i.e. what you hoped would happen?	7.4 (Only if matter completely finished) Type of Resolution	7.5 (If answer to Q 7.1. is "none" and to 7.2 is "no resolution" or "pending") Reason for not seeking help
1. Restraining order to prevent violence 2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets 3. Custody 4. Access 5. Order forbidding removal of child from province 6. Guardianship 7. Child maintenance, support, (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity) 8. Spousal maintenance, support (including arrears and enforcement) 9. Property division 10. Possession of family home 11. Divorce 12. Other (specify)	1. Family LawLine 2. Family Duty Counsel 3. Out-of-court Advice Lawyer 4. Legal Representation 5. Legal Information Outreach Worker 6. Aboriginal Community Legal Worker 7. Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site) 8. Internet: ClickLaw 9. Internet: used, but can't remember site 10. Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets) 11. Legal Aid Intake 12. Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student, not lawyer) 13. Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic) 14. Family Justice Counsellor 15. Private Lawyer 16. Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre 17. Other (specify) 18. None (ask Q 7.5)	1 = no resolution 2 = situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue 3 = still pending 4 = completely finished <b>Notes:</b> 1. These choices are <u>not</u> related to satisfaction or whether client "won," but just whether issue was brought to a conclusion. 2. "No resolution" is not having either an informal or formal resolution to the issue, but conflict around the legal issue still exists.	1 = not at all 2 = only partly 3 = mostly 4 = completely	1 = verbal or de facto 2 = written agreement, but not reviewed by a lawyer 3 = court order, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer 4 = not sure <b>Notes:</b> - "de facto" means a routine that just evolves - #2 might include an agreement drafted by the parties themselves, or an agreement developed by a family justice counsellor or through mediation, but <u>not</u> formally reviewed by a lawyer.	(see choices below this table)
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.	4.	4.

### Choices for Q 7.5 (more than 1 answer possible)

- Client worn out, no more energy to pursue issue (but would if could be represented by a lawyer).
- Client worn out, no more energy, and wouldn't pursue even if represented by a lawyer.
- Client has particular family circumstances that do not relate to the justice system, nor to intimidation, fear or enforcement issues, and that make it hard to pursue the issue at this time. Client may or may not pursue in the future. (examples include family events, holidays, schedules, illnesses)
- Time involved in pursuing the issue would not make it worthwhile, given the possible gains (e.g. spouse always brings child back an hour later than agreed and this represents a significant inconvenience, but is too much trouble to take back to court)
- Client feels fear or intimidation, and doesn't feel confident about being able to protect herself
- Lack of enforcement (e.g. got an order, but spouse does not comply, and it is likely to be an ongoing problem that client feels won't get resolved)
- Other (please describe)

## FINAL QUESTIONS

8. Before the case we've been talking about (i.e. the one identified in Q 2.1), had you ever used a legal aid service for a family matter (e.g. legal aid lawyer, duty counsel in court, advice counsel)?

1. No
2. Yes
3. Can't remember

8.1 (If yes), approximately how many times? \_\_\_\_\_

8.2 (If yes to Q. 8) Roughly how long ago did you use the oldest of these services? \_\_\_\_\_ (to nearest year)

9. Are there other types of issues (e.g. income, housing, debt or criminal charges) that have had an impact on the main family legal issues that we have talked about in this interview? (Note: issues can have arisen either before or after the family issue.)

1. No
2. Yes

9.1. (If yes) What type of issues? (circle any that apply)

1. Debt
2. Foreclosure
3. Housing (e.g. eviction)
4. Entitlement to benefits (pension or social assistance)
5. Immigration proceedings
6. Criminal
7. Other issues (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

9.2. Please explain the type of impact they are having on your family issues.

---

---

9.3. Did you get help from legal aid or other service for this/these issue(s)?

1. No – didn't ask
2. No – asked, but none available
3. Not from legal aid, but did get help from another service
4. Yes – from legal aid

9.4. (If response to Q. 9.3 was "2" or "3") Even though legal aid couldn't help you, did they refer you to another service?

1. No
2. Yes

10. Finally, can you rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

Question: As a result of the legal services I received for the issues in this case (i.e. in Q. 2.1) ...

10.1 I am more confident about recognizing when a family matter is at least partly a legal problem. Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

10.2 I feel I have more knowledge about my legal rights in a family matter. Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

10.3 If necessary, I would know where to go to get the legal assistance I need in a family matter. Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

10.4 I feel that my legal rights would be adequately addressed in a new family matter if I received the same types of services provided by Legal Aid again. (Note: "same types of services" for this statement refers to any services directly provided by LSS, i.e. 1-7, 11 and possibly 10 in Q. 3) Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

11. \*\*\*\*\*Remember to confirm accuracy of response to ethnic status on page 1, and correct if necessary. Also gather education data if not originally recorded.

12. Confirm that respondent wishes to be included in draw for one of three iPod Shuffles. (Draw in Feb 2012) 1. No 2. Yes

12.1 (If yes) Confirm best telephone number to phone if they win a prize: \_\_\_\_\_

## **APPENDIX 2:**

### **SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES**

**Table S1: Comparison of Legal Aid Representation population and Survey Sample for Selected Demographics**

<b>Demographic</b>	<b>CMS Family Law Legal Aid Representation Clients (N=768)</b>	<b>Survey Sample (N=180)</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>Gender</b> Male Female	221 (29%) 547 (71%)	45 (25%) 135 (75%)	No significant difference at .05 level of significance (p=0.3566)
<b>Ethnicity</b> Aboriginal Non-Aboriginal	(NR= 63) 137 (19%) 568 (81%)	(NR=4) 15 (9%) 161 (91%)	Significant difference at .05 level of significance (p=0.0006)
<b>Education</b> No High School Some High School Graduated High School Post High school	(NR= 136) 16 (3%) 260 (41%) 182 (29%) 174 (28%)	(NR=5) 5 (3%) 46 (26%) 69 (39%) 55 (31%)	Significant difference at .05 level of significance (p=0.0033)

Notes:

- Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
- The population parameters include only Family Law clients who
  - were approved for legal aid under the Family Law Tariff for either extended or emergency representation services
  - had interview dates from January 1, 2010 to February 28, 2010.

Demographic information for the population was collected by an intake worker at time of intake. The above population figures were generated using data from the intake database and cross referenced with reports from the central reporting system. It is important to note there may be systematic reliability issues due to the large number of intake workers and varying data collection practices when asking clients for demographic information. For both education and ethnicity, some clients were either not asked or would not reveal these demographics. These omissions could affect the reliability of the data.



**Table S2: Usage of Services by LSS Program Clients (completed interviews only)**

Overall Services Used	Total # of Users	Family Lawline	Family Duty Counsel	Out-of-Court Advice Lawyer	Legal Aid representation	LIOW	ACLW	Overall Users Divided by Sample Group Clients
Family LawLine	<b>96</b>	<b>87</b>	3	2	4	0	0	1.10
Family Duty Counsel	<b>391</b>	23	<b>282</b>	38	37	8	3	1.39
Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	<b>175</b>	2	2	<b>163</b>	4	2	1	1.07
Legal Representation	<b>236</b>	14	24	10	<b>180</b>	2	6	1.31
Legal Information Outreach Worker	<b>54</b>	0	1	0	0	<b>53</b>	0	1.01
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	<b>20</b>	0	1	1	0	0	<b>18</b>	1.11
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	155	30	51	39	14	20	1	na
Internet: ClickLaw	11	4	2	4	0	1	0	na
Internet: used, but can't remember site	29	1	11	10	6	1	0	na
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	60	3	17	13	14	13	0	na
Legal Aid Intake	244	11	34	9	179	4	7	na
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	45	7	12	7	13	4	2	na
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	29	5	9	8	6	1	0	na
Family Justice Counsellor	160	14	47	55	37	7	0	na
Private Lawyer	106	20	44	19	18	5	0	na
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	16	1	6	7	0	2	0	na
Other (specify)	14	0	5	2	7	0	0	na

Notes:

- The last column shows how much greater the number of overall users in the six LSS services is compared to the number of clients in that service's sample group. For example, Family LawLine was used by 96 users, 87 of whom were the clients of the service used for the original survey contacts. This means that another 9 clients of other services also used the Family LawLine service. The ratio is  $96/87 = 1.1$ . The numbers used in each calculation are in bold on each line.

**Table S3: Client Rating of Helpfulness of the Service in Getting Them Closer to a Resolution**

Demographics	Total	Client rating of helpfulness of service in getting them closer to a resolution					Mean Rating	Mean Rating (2006 Survey)
		Not at all helpful 1	2	3	4	Very helpful 5		
<b>Gender</b> (N=1824)								
Male	583 (100%)	65 (11%)	48 (8%)	144 (25%)	121 (21%)	205 (35%)	3.60	3.64
Female	1241 (100%)	107 (9%)	71 (8%)	238 (19%)	281 (23%)	544 (44%)	3.87	3.76
<b>Education</b> (N=1779, NR=45)								
No High School	25 (100%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	5 (20%)	3 (12%)	13 (52%)	3.96	3.76
Some High School	211 (100%)	11 (5%)	14 (7%)	31 (15%)	47 (22%)	108 (51%)	4.08	3.87
Graduated High School	481 (100%)	46 (10%)	23 (5%)	113 (23%)	92 (19%)	207 (43%)	3.81	3.70
Post High School	1062 (100%)	109 (10%)	178 (7%)	220 (21%)	248 (23%)	407 (38%)	3.72	3.76
<b>Ethnicity</b> (N=1798, NR=26)								
Aboriginal	109 (100%)	9 (8%)	10 (9%)	18 (17%)	17 (16%)	55 (50%)	3.91	3.92
Non-Aboriginal	1689 (100%)	160 (9%)	108 (6%)	359 (21%)	379 (22%)	683 (40%)	3.78	3.71

Notes:

1. Percentages total horizontally. They may exceed 100% due to rounding.
2. There are no statistically significant differences between categories of the ethnicity and education measures at the .05 level of significance. The differences in responses between male and female respondents is significant at the .05 level of significance. Note, however, that if “no high school” and “some high school” results are combined as one row, and a 3 row by 5 column table is produced, there is a statistically significant difference.

**Table S4: Which Services were Mentioned or Involved Referrals**

Service that mentions or refers to another service	Number of clients who say they were referred from this service	Service to whom client is referred or mentioned (more than 1 possible). Percentages are based on the number of <u>people</u> who answered the question																
		Family LawLine	Family Duty Counsel	Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	Legal Representation	Legal Information Outreach Worker	Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	Internet: ClickLaw	Internet: used, but can't remember site	Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	Legal Aid Intake	Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	Family Justice Counsellor	Private Lawyer	Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	Other
Family LawLine	48		15 (31%)		4 (8%)			21 (44%)	3 (6%)		1 (2%)	7 (15%)	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	7 (15%)	11 (23%)		1 (2%)
Family Duty Counsel	98 (NR=5)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	6 (6%)			29 (30%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	8 (8%)	26 (27%)	4 (4%)	4 (4%)	19 (19%)	13 (13%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	37 (NR=2)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)		2 (5%)			20 (54%)			4 (11%)	4 (11%)		1 (3%)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)	
Legal Representation	23	1 (4%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)				8 (35%)		1 (4%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	4 (17%)		
Legal Information Outreach Worker	39		8 (21%)	5 (13%)				22 (56%)	1 (3%)		13 (33%)	5 (13%)	4 (10%)	1 (3%)	5 (13%)	1 (3%)	4 (10%)	
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	7		2 (29%)	1 (14%)		1 (14%)		1 (14%)				3 (43%)						
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	19 (NR=1)	7 (37%)	9 (47%)		1 (5%)							4 (21%)			2 (11%)	1 (5%)		2 (11%)
Internet: ClickLaw	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)															
Internet: used, but can't remember site	0																	
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	3		1 (33%)		1 (33%)			1 (33%)										
Legal Aid Intake	192 (NR=1)		5 (3%)		177 (92%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)				2 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)		2 (1%)		2 (1%)
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	21	3 (14%)	6 (29%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)		2 (10%)	2 (10%)				1 (5%)			3 (14%)			1 (5%)
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	9		2 (22%)	1 (11%)							1 (11%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)			
Family Justice Counsellor	56 (NR=1)		12 (21%)	30 (54%)	4 (7%)	2 (4%)		1 (2%)			1 (2%)	6 (11%)		1 (2%)		1 (2%)		3 (5%)

Service that mentions or refers to another service	Number of clients who say they were referred from this service	Service to whom client is referred or mentioned (more than 1 possible). Percentages are based on the number of <u>people</u> who answered the question																
		Family LawLine	Family Duty Counsel	Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	Legal Representation	Legal Information Outreach Worker	Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	Internet: ClickLaw	Internet: used, but can't remember site	Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	Legal Aid Intake	Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	Family Justice Counsellor	Private Lawyer	Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	Other
Private Lawyer	9		4 (44%)		2 (22%)			1 (11%)				2 (22%)						1 (11%)
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	1		1 (100%)															
Other	3		2 (67%)									1 (33%)						
Total	567	14 (2%)	76 (13%)	43 (8%)	199 (35%)	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	106 (19%)	5 (1%)	2 (0%)	32 (6%)	63 (11%)	12 (2%)	15 (3%)	42 (7%)	37 (7%)	6 (1%)	12 (2%)

Notes:

1. Since a service could refer an individual to several other services, the total number of referrals (672) exceeds the number of persons referred (567). Percentages are based on the number of persons referred (567) and therefore exceed 100%.

**Table S5: Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution**

Reason why issue restarted after original resolution	Frequency (more than 1 reason possible)	Type of Issue									
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Access	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Divorce	Guardianship	Division of Property	Other
Refusal to comply with Court Order or separation agreement	57 (40%)	2	9		31	13	1			1	
Situation changed, need to vary order (amount or conditions)	62 (44%)		14		11	28	3	1	4		1
Arrears Order could not be enforced	5 (4%)				1	4					
Refusal to comply with an informal agreement	4 (3%)		1		1	1			1		
Need to make temporary order into permanent	7 (5%)		1	2	3	1					
Mobility issue; threat of removal of child from province or region	2 (1%)				2						
Other	5 (4%)		1		2				1	1	
Total of Reasons	142 (100%)	2	26	2	51	47	4	1	6	2	1

**Table S6: Services Used for Cases that Start Up Again, by type of Issue Involved**

Service	Frequency & percentage of clients who used this service to deal with restarted issues	Type of issue									
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Access	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Divorce	Guardianship	Property division	Other
Family LawLine	4 (4%)		1		2	1					
Family Duty Counsel	17 (17%)		1	1	4	9				1	1
Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	4 (4%)				4						
Legal Representation	44 (44%)	1	16		16	6	1	1	3		
Legal Information Outreach Worker	0 (0%)										
Aboriginal Community Legal Worker	3 (3%)		2		1						
Internet: Family Law in BC (LSS site)	5 (5%)				1	4					
Internet: ClickLaw	0 (0%)										
Internet: used, but can't remember site	0 (0%)										
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	0 (0%)										
Legal Aid Intake	1 (1%)		1								

Service	Frequency & percentage of clients who used this service to deal with restarted issues	Type of issue									
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Access	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Divorce	Guardianship	Property division	Other
Community advocacy service or clinic (advocate or law student; not lawyer)	3 (3%)				1	2					
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	0 (0%)										
Family Justice Counsellor	13 (13%)		2	1	5	3	1		1		
Private Lawyer	17 (17%)		2		8	5	1		1		
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	2 (2%)					2					
Other	8 (8%)		1		1	6					
<b>Total Contacts with services</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Total restarted issues</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total issues where clients did contact a service</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total issues where clients did not contact any service</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total issues with no response</b>	<b>5</b>		<b>1</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>

Notes:

1. 106 clients had issues that re-emerged; 101 of these identified services they used. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a problem that had restarted, so percentages do not total 100%
2. Clients in 23% (33/143) of issues did not contact any service when an issue restarted.
3. The clients with the 110 issues who did contact a service for their problem contacted 1.1 services (121/110) per issue.
4. Issues that did not restart are not included in this table. In 5 restarted issues, the client did not respond to this question.

**Table S7: Types of Issues and Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues**

	Number of clients who used this service (N=103)	New Issues										
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Guardianship	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Property division	Possession of family home	Divorce	Other
Family LawLine	1	1										
Family Duty Counsel	14	2	1	1	1		5				4	
Out-of-court Advice Lawyer	2	1					1					
Legal Aid Representation	30	2	1	2	1		10	1	1		8	4
LIOW	0											
ACLW	5				1		2				2	
Internet: Family Law in BC	17	1	1	1			1	1	2	1	9	
Internet: ClickLaw	1										1	
Internet: used, but can't remember site	0											
Printed materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)	2										2	
Legal Aid Intake	1			1								
Community advocacy service or clinic	1										1	
Pro Bono clinic (lawyer at a clinic)	0											
Family Justice Counsellor	7			1		1	3				1	1
Private Lawyer	18	2		3			3		2		8	



	Number of clients who used this service (N=103)	New Issues										
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Guardianship	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Property division	Possession of family home	Divorce	Other
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	5	2							1		2	
Other	11	1	1	4			1	1			1	2
<b>Total Services Used</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Total Clients for this issue</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Total Clients who did Contact a Service for this issue</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Total Clients who did <u>not</u> Contact a Service for this issue</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

Notes:

1. 103 clients had new but related problems. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a new problem, so percentages do not total 100%.
2. Six percent (6/103) of clients did not contact any service when the new issue arose.
3. Overall, the 103 clients contacted 1.1 services (115/103) each.