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Introduction

- Sexual assault is estimated to affect one out of every six women (Kilpatrick et al., 2007) and results in long-lasting psychosocial effects.
- Legal advocacy may be one important source of social support for victims of sexual assault. King County Sexual Assault Resource Center (KCSARC) provides such a legal advocacy program throughout the legal process for people who have experienced sexual assault.
- Coping self-efficacy (CSE) is the ability to adapt to stressful situations (Bandura, 1993). It decreases in response to stressful situations following trauma (Kushner, Riggs, Foá, & Miller, 1993). Lower coping self-efficacy predicts PTSD and mediates the effect of trauma on PTSD symptomology (Benight & Bandura, 2004; Cieslak, Benight, & Lehman, 2008).
- The Sexual Assault Coping Self-Efficacy Scale was adapted from items from the Modified Domestic Violence Coping Self-Efficacy Measure (Benight, Harding-Taylor, Midbøe, & Durham, 2004) to reflect coping self-efficacy following sexual assault.
- The original measure has excellent internal consistency and convergent validity with positive coping measures.

Current Study

- Test the structural validity of the Sexual Assault Coping Self-Efficacy measure.
- Provide information on the effectiveness of the Sexual Assault Coping Self-Efficacy measure for measuring CSE in people who have experienced sexual assault.
- Provide information that will allow for improvement and continued evaluation of KCSARC’s legal advocacy program.

Participants and Procedures

Participants
- Data were collected as part of the ongoing program evaluation of KCSARC legal advocacy.
- KCSARC clients who requested a legal advocate to assist them through legal prosecution.
- All included participants were females over the age of 18.
- Predominantly Caucasian and in the range of very low income or low income.
- Majority had some high school and some college or technical training.

Measures
- Participants were administered up to three survey packets total. Surveys were administered once per fiscal quarter (i.e., approximately three months apart).
- Data were collected by KCSARC either via paper surveys at the KCSARC main office or online surveys via SurveyMonkey. Data were de-identified and then sent to the researchers.
- Measures used:
  - Sexual Assault Coping Self-Efficacy (Gibbs, Agatonovic, & Bikos, 2011; Benight et al., 2004). Measures capability to manage problems after sexual assault (S-point Likert scale ranging from 1 [completely incapable] to 5 [completely capable]).
  - Sample Item: Dealing with feelings of shame concerning the assault.

Analysis

- Longitudinal program evaluation since 2013.
- Multiple imputation (with 5 sets) was used to minimize missing data.
- Data were first analyzed via exploratory factor analysis and then confirmatory factor analysis to evaluate model fit. Internal consistency and test-retest reliability were analyzed using SPSS.

Results & Discussion

- Data were first analyzed via exploratory factor analysis and then confirmatory factor analysis to evaluate model fit. Internal consistency and test-retest reliability were analyzed using SPSS.
- Multiple imputation (with 5 sets) was used to minimize missing data.
- KMO = .948
- Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity: χ² (171) = 2646.696, p < .001
- Eigenvalues greater than one = 2
- Scree plot suggested one factor
- In the component matrix, only one item loaded onto the second factor but also significantly cross loaded onto the first factor
- Proceeded testing one-factor model of SACSEM

Analyses:

- Internal Consistency:
  - Internal Consistency at Time 1 is .965
  - Internal Consistency at Time 2 is .966
  - Internal consistency at Time 3 is .975

CFA Analyses:

- Made three modifications
- Final analyses: χ² (148) = 368.804, CFI = .915, RMSEA = .097
- All items were significantly regressed upon the latent variable

Conclusions:

- Results supported a one-factor, 19-item measure
- Good structural validity; excellent internal consistency
- Ongoing program evaluation and way to evaluate benefit of program

Limitations:

- Primarily Caucasian and younger clients; only analyzed female data
- Sexual and gender identity not asked (LGBTQ+ individuals experience higher rates of violence; Langenderfer-Magruder, Wallis, Katsar, Whitefield, & Ramos, 2016)
- Measure was originally not available for non-English speakers or those who are visually impaired
- Small sample size, participants excluded because of age and gender criteria, and missing data (attrition)

Future Research:

- Translate measure in different languages; have text-speak option for the measure
- Modify data collection to evaluate and compare marginalized communities (i.e., LGBTQ+ and PoC)
- Compare psychometrics for different groups of women (invariance testing)
- Investigate factors that reduce secondary victimization throughout the legal process
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