Virginia Commonwealth University

VCU Scholars Compass

2010

An Exploration of the Influences of Race, Class and Gender Identity on the Help-Seeking Behavior of LGBTQ Survivors of Violence

Xavier Guadalupe
Virginia Commonwealth University

www.manaraa.com

SIGNATURE PAGE

L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by <u>Xavier Luciano Guadalupe-Díaz</u> entitled AN EXPLORATION OF THE INFLUENCES OF RACE, CLASS, AND GENDER IDENTITY ON THE HELP-SEEKING BEHAVIORS OF LGBTQ SURVIVORS OF VIOLENCE has been approved by his committee as satisfactory completion of the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Director: Sarah Jane Brubaker, Ph.D., L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs

_____

Julie Honnold, Ph.D., L Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs

_____

Elizabeth Cramer, Ph.D., School of Social Work

_____

Deborah Brock, Ph.D., Interim Director of the L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs

_____

Fred Hawkridge, Ph.D., Interim Dean of the College of Humanities and Sciences

_____

F. Douglas Boudinot, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate School

An Exploration of the Influences of Race, Class and Gender Identity on the Help-Seeking
Behavior of LGBTQ Survivors of Violence

by

Xavier Luciano Guadalupe-Díaz
MS, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2010
Certificate in Gender Violence Intervention, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2010
BS, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2009

Director: Sarah Jane Brubaker, PhD, Associate Professor and Graduate Program Director
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
May 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

conducive work environment for the exploration of these ideas. I would also like to thank all of the faculty who have supported me throughout the years; Dr. John Mahoney, Dr. Jennifer Johnson, Tammy McKeown, Gay Cutchin, and Dr. Linda Hancock. I would especially like to thank Dr. Brubaker for taking so much time out of her busy schedule to provide me the guidance, support and advice that helped shape this project. Finally, I would like to thank my thesis committee, Dr. Honnold and Dr. Cramer who have been amazingly supportive and helpful in making this a reality.

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATION OF THE INFLUENCES OF RACE, CLASS AND GENDER IDENTITY ON THE HELP-SEEKING BEHAVIOR OF LGBTQ SURVIVORS OF VIOLENCE

By Xavier Luciano Guadalupe-Díaz

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Science at Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2010

Director: Sarah Jane Brubaker, PhD. Associate Professor and Graduate Program Director, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs

Without a doubt, violence continues to be a brutal reality in our society. It reaches and affects millions across our nation and around the world. For centuries, scholars, researchers and academics have studied and analyzed the existence of violence in many capacities. While violence affects every individual, group, and community the dynamics and the realties that are carried out vary tremendously across race, income levels, gender, gender identity and expression, sexual orientation and national origin to name a few. The existence, impact and repercussions of violence in different communities carry varying meanings, perceptions and significance. This paper explores the influences of race, class, and gender identity on the help-seeking behavior of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) survivors of hate motivated and intimate partner violence utilizing data collected by the Virginia Anti-Violence Project (VAVP) Community Violence Survey. Utilizing a target sampling method, nearly 1,000

LGBTQ identified individuals from across the Commonwealth responded to the community survey. Only a descriptive analysis had ever been done on this data set; this more complex analysis was the first to be done.

Patricia Hill Collins' theoretical framework of intersectionality was applied in the analysis of the influences of race, class and gender identity. Concepts and propositions from Collins' general theoretical framework have been utilized to examine how the three social locations intersect and shape distinct realities that influence how LGBTQ survivors of violence seek assistance if at all. The exploratory nature of this examination provides a glimpse into the many factors that influence the help-seeking behaviors of LGBTQ survivors of violence.

Chapter 1 Introduction

A multitude of studies indicate that intimate partner effects the LGBTQ

population at rates similar to those of heterosexual women (Renzetti, 1992; Renzetti &

Miley, 1996 Cruz & Firestone, 1998; Cruz, 2003; Hamberger, 1996; Island & Lettellier,

1991; McClennen, Summers, & Vaughan, 2002; Merrill & Wolfe, 2000; Owen & Burke,

2004). In a probability based sample of men who have sex with men, it was estimated

that gay and bisexual men experience intimate partner violence at rate of approximately 2

in 5 (Greenwood, 2002). Similarly, in national surveys, lesbian women have been

reported to experience intimate partner violence at rates of up to 50% (NCAVP, 2006).

Transgender individuals experience rates of domestic and sexual violence at shockingly

higher rates. In a 1998 study, "50% of transgender respondents had been raped or

assaulted by a romantic partner, though only 62% of those raped or assaulted, 31% of

them also identified as survivors of domestic violence when explicitly asked" (White &

Goldberg, 2006).

In 2007, the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) released their annual Hate

Crimes Statistics that showed a 6% increase in homophobic violence in just one year

(FBI Annual Hate Crimes Report, 2008). Research is continuing to show that hate crimes

against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals is the fastest growing type of

hate crime in the country (Human Rights Campaign-*About Hate Crimes*, 2009). As a

whole, 1 in 5 sexual minorities in America will be a victim of crime based on their actual

or perceived sexual orientation (Herek, 1989).

Domestic and sexual violence shelters, anti-violence programs and services across the country continue to struggle with providing inclusive services to historically marginalized communities. Of particular interest in this exploration will be the intersectionality of race, class and gender identity in providing a glance into the realities of many LGBT survivors of violence. A specific focus will be lent to examining how these varying social localities influence whether or not survivors seek help.

Background and Purpose

In 2005, the Virginia Anti-Violence Project (VAVP) was developed by a group of individuals who saw a tremendous need for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer survivors of sexual and/or intimate partner and hate motivated violence. Through a collaborative effort with the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action Alliance (VSDVAA) and Equality Virginia, the VAVP received funding through the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Victim Fund of the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. The team moved forward with an assessment that would assist and shape the goals for the organization. In order to more accurately determine what needed to be done with the community, they would have to examine what was occurring and what was being experienced. A group of LGBTQ and allied members of the VAVP designed, implemented and analyzed the community survey over the course of 10 months. From June 2007 to March 2008, the VAVP conducted a statewide community survey to assess the need for and availability of services for LGBTQ survivors of violence.

The purpose of this project is to examine the relationships, if any, between race, class, and gender identity and the experience of intimate partner and hate-motivated violence. Specifically, it examines whether there are any relationships between these social demographic variables and whether or not survivors sought help for their victimization. Through a quantitative analysis of secondary data, this project sought to identify influential relationships between variables and explain or interpret the findings given the limitations.

Literature Review

The extent of research available on how survivors of violence perceive and interpret their experiences is relatively plentiful. Even when considering how their perceptions and interpretations influence their help-seeking behavior, extensive research is available. What makes the particular research question addressed in this paper drastically different from these available resources is its specific emphasis on the LGBTQ community. Due to the nature of our hostile and homophobic social climate, it is not only difficult to access the community but even more of a challenge to accurately sample from and investigate its internal experiences. When narrowing the interest to survivors of violence within the community, the target population becomes even smaller and highly inaccessible. Essentially, the body of knowledge available on the impacts various identities may have on the help-seeking behavior of LGBTQ survivors of violence is limited.

Given the difficulty of researching and theorizing around this specific topic, many strides have been made over recent years. The varying theoretical approaches have vastly

broadened the scope of violence victimization research. By advancing the way scholars think about the experiences of violence, researchers have been able to assess different dimensions of the problem that have been largely understudied. The attention and interest directed to capturing and measuring these perceptions and experiences within layers of oppression has lead to the development of more scholarly research on the topic (Meyers, 2008). While there remains a large gap in the knowledge we have acquired thus far, the advances made certainly shape the specific purpose of the proposed research question.

Within the available literature, there are clear differences among the analyses utilized. Most of the existing knowledge utilizes a dominant family violence or feminist theoretical framework to investigate heterosexual experiences of violence. There is a more recent significant emphasis on the experiences of women of color and the influences of race and class with little attention to sexuality or gender identity. In addition, most focus on a single dimension of gender violence, i.e. sexual, domestic, or homophobic violence. The literature reviewed in this section will shape the research question by integrating different approaches to the study of violence committed against and within the LGBTQ community. This section will review and examine significant contributions to the current body of knowledge on violence experienced by members of the LGBTQ community to explore the impacts of the multiple social locations of these survivors, particularly on their help-seeking behaviors. The literature featured is organized to highlight the intersectional qualities within anti-queer violent experiences,

intimate partner violence and intersectionality with a specific emphasis on help-seeking behaviors.

Intersectionality and Anti-Queer Violence

Hate-motivated violence against LGBTQ individuals can be understood as "anti-queer violence" (Meyer, 2008). Meyer (2008) conducted 44 in-depth interviews in New York City with LGBTQ identified survivors of anti-queer violence. Through semi-structured open-ended questions, Meyer sought to explore how LGBTQ individuals determine that violence is based on their sexuality or gender identity.

Of particular interest to Meyer was the victims' perspective. In spite of the increased attention to hate-motivated violence in academic research, rarely does it include studies of the hate crime victims (2008). Even literature available on the studies of hate crime victims, tends to focus primarily on the psychological effects of victimization. This leaves little to no knowledge about how victims experience hate-motivated violence – specifically in this case, anti-queer violence. In addition, Meyer claimed that the study of the influences of race, class, gender and sexuality on how victims structure their violent encounters has remained entirely absent from studies of hate crime victims (2008).

Intersectional Influences

Meyer designed a qualitative research project to examine how victims of hate-motivated violence experienced and interpreted their encounters. He interviewed 44 individuals who identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender who had experienced violence because of their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity. His

sample was obtained through various LGBT organizations in New York City. Through semi-structured, open-ended questions, the participants were given the opportunity to describe their violent experiences and how they responded to it. Meyer argued that by utilizing this method he could more accurately capture the perceptions of violence by allowing victims to actively recreate their own narratives (2008).

Through qualitative analysis, Meyer sought to explore how the respondents determined that the violence was based on their sexuality. One of the ways the respondents determined this was by what the perpetrator said about gender during the attack. The respondents determined the "violence directed against their gender identity was rooted in homophobia" (2008, 22). By acknowledging this, the respondents are also recognizing the societal process that links gender non-conformity with homosexuality (2008). Meyer discovered that the respondents had been routinely victimized for violating gender norms and they perceived these attacks on their gender identity as homophobic. Even when the perpetrators say nothing about their sexuality, the victims linked the attacks on their gender as directly correlated with homophobia. "When queer people made this determination, they perceived attempts to punish their gender performance as attempts to regulate their sexuality"(2008, 22). Gender and sexuality were vividly interlocked in these accounts.

Meyer also stated that queer people of color determined that violence directed against their racial identities was in some way rooted in homophobia as well. He described the experience of Andre, a 24 year old Black gay man who was sexually assaulted by a police officer in New York City. Andre determined that he was called the

"n-word" and sexually assaulted because of his perceived sexual orientation. He claimed that had he been heterosexual, he would have not been called the n-word or sexually assaulted. Many other queer people of color described similar perceptions such as the stories of black lesbian women which carried similar themes of perception. Black lesbian women reported that their experiences cannot be understood or explained by only factors; they are not "necessarily about one category" (Meyer, 2008). Aisha, a 53 year old Black lesbian woman described her violent experiences as being impossible to reduce to a few parts of her identity. She described homophobic violence as occurring within the context "of a racist, male-dominated, and capitalist society" that shaped the violence against her as occurring through various identities that are simultaneously present. An attack against her is not an attack directed towards a distinct identity but that an attack against her is directed toward all of the identities that she encompasses.

Differences Along Racial, Class, and Gender Lines

Meyer's data reflected major differences along the lines of race, class and gender in terms of how queer people determined that the violence they experienced was at least partially rooted in homophobia. He discovered that many of the respondents simply answered that they "didn't know" if the violence was based on their sexuality. Of the participants who demonstrated this uncertainty, there were two commons reasons given for this perception: "(1) the violence occurred in situations in which the perpetrator insulted many aspects of the victim's identity; or (2) the violence occurred in situations in which the perpetrator said very little about the victim's sexuality" (2008, 24). He conceptualized these two reasons as total opposites; one in which the perpetrator attacks

multiple identities and the other in which the perpetrator says nothing or very little. Either way, both of these reasons clearly made it more difficult for victims to make sense of their violent experiences. Meyer noted that queer people of color had the most difficulty in determining if the violence was directed towards their sexuality. Because queer people of color embody multiple oppressive identities, the attacks were perceived as being against all of what they are. On the other hand, Meyer reported that White gay men found it much easier to determine their violent experiences as being rooted in homophobia. For queer people of color, in situations in which the perpetrators were of the same race, they found it easier to determine the violence as homophobic. However, in cases of inter-racial violence, queer people of color expressed uncertainty in determining the violence as just homophobia. In many cases, the queer people of color were exposed to various insults that attacked not only their sexuality or gender identity but also their racial or ethnic identities. This confirmed his theoretical application of intersectionality as it demonstrated how intersecting identities shape distinct perceptions in the experiences of violence.

Queer respondents who were female and a racial minority, experienced verbal attacks against them that embodied misogynistic, sexist, racist and homophobic resentments. The experiences of sexual violence against these respondents demonstrated attacks against intersections of race, gender and sexuality. Within the sample of queer people of color, Meyer reported a difference between gay men of color and lesbian women of color. He noted that gay men of color experienced violence in which the perpetrators explicitly mentioned homophobic insults such as "homo" or "fag" while the

perpetrators against lesbian women of color used sexist insults instead. The lesbian women of color found it more difficult to determine the violence as being driven by homophobia though they typically made a connection between the sexist insults and homophobia. Meyer determined that because heterosexual men were the perpetrators, gay men of color experienced more homophobic insults as they attempted to distance themselves from homosexuality. "It allows heterosexual men to construct themselves in opposition to the deviant men – the -"fags"- or "homos" – whom they attack" (2008,24). Meyer thus concluded that the gender of both the victim and the perpetrator affected how the victims experienced their violent encounters.

Finally, Meyer stated that the social class of the victims affected the uncertainty they expressed in determining whether the violence they experienced was directed towards their sexuality or gender identity. He found that middle and upper class queer people were more willing to state that their violent experiences were rooted in homophobia than queer people of lower classes. Meyer reported that working-class and low-income queer people "may have more pressing concerns than determining whether the violence was rooted in bias" (2008). Poverty and financial concerns drastically obstruct the victim from even determining if the violence was based on their sexuality or gender identity. Meyer even discovered that many of the lower income respondents began to contemplate during the interview process if their experiences were indeed rooted in homophobia or transphobia. In a sense, they felt as if they had not had the "luxury" to even try to interpret their victimization. On the other hand, respondents of higher classes came into the interview having already contemplated their victimization; they came in

knowing that their experiences were rooted in homophobia. Essentially, "social class affected the degree to which queer people were willing to determine whether violence was based on their sexuality or gender identity" (2008, 26).

Help-Seeking Behaviors and Intimate Partner Violence

When examining the available literature on violence within and against the LGBTQ community, help-seeking behaviors are rarely mentioned – in particular in literature with an intersectional perspective. While prominent studies on intimate partner violence within the LGBTQ community have illustrated common patterns of help-seeking behaviors, they have been limited to gay and lesbian experiences. For example, examining the dynamics of same-sex partner abuse, McClennen, Summers and Vaughn (2002), reported that the most common form of help-seeking among gay and lesbian survivors was from friends. In similar studies, Merrill & Wolfe (2000), Renzetti (1992) (1996), and Scherzer (1998) also found that seeking help from friends was the most common form of help-seeking among gay and lesbian survivors of intimate partner violence. These largely descriptive studies examined the prevalence of intimate partner violence in their samples and examined what resources survivors sought during their experiences. While insightful, these studies failed to examine correlations between varying identities and social localities with help-seeking behaviors. In fact, McClennen urged in her study that future research on same-sex intimate partner violence should aim to examine these types of correlations.

The lack of trust in the criminal justice system is a well documented sentiment among LGBTQ survivors of intimate partner violence. Pattavina, Hirschel, and Buzzawa,

(2007) examined police responses to both same-sex and heterosexual domestic violence situations and discovered that these beliefs are rooted in reality. Several studies have continued to demonstrate that seeking help from the police is the least likely form of help sought by survivors of same-sex intimate partner violence (Pattavina et al, 2007) (Renzetti, 1992, Merrill, 1998 and Renzetti, 1998). The perception of extreme homophobia by law enforcement against gay and bisexual men in particular has been found to prevent them from reporting victimization to police (Kuehnle, Sullivan, 2003).

A gap in the literature exists as there is no significant contribution to the examination of race, class and gender on the help seeking behaviors of LGBTQ survivors of violence. Studies that have examined varying experiences, dynamics or help seeking across race, class or gender have only been done so in the context of gay or lesbian relationships (Butler, 1999; Kanuha, 1990; Mendez, 1996). These studies have demonstrated support for an increased lack of trust in the police among gay and lesbian survivors of color and gay and lesbian survivors of lower socioeconomic statuses. In the proceeding section, I examine contributions to intersectional applications in help-seeking behavior research on heterosexuals. I then examine, in greater detail, one of the most significant contributions to the exploration of the influences of varying social localities on help-seeking behaviors within the LGBTQ community.

Influences of Race, Income and Gender on Help-Seeking Behaviors

Intersecting identities and interlocking systems of oppression may have an impact on the help-seeking behavior of LGBTQ survivors of violence. While intersectional applications to the help-seeking behaviors of LGBTQ survivors are scarce, it is

imperative to mention that some contributions have been made in the application of *interactional* perspectives on the help-seeking behaviors of heterosexual female survivors of intimate partner violence. Interactional perspectives in intimate partner violence research seek to examine how varying social localities interact with one another and influence help-seeking behaviors. Vatnar & Bjørkly's (2009) work analyzed a representative sample of heterosexual female survivors of intimate partner violence and their help-seeking patterns on the basis of a multitude of social localities. They asked, "do different sociodemographic groups of IPV survivors (age, duration of partnership, education, employment, income, social status, religion, health) use different professional support and treatment agencies? (2009, 233). Analysis of the data revealed that a statistically significant relationship existed between three of the seven sociodemographic variables and help-seeking: income, educational level and religion (2009). Vatnar & Bjørkly (2009) cited earlier works, (Arriaga,W. B., & Capezza, N. M. 2005, Briere, J., & Jordan, C. E. 2004, Heckert, D. A., & Gondolf, E. W. 2004) that attempted to make similar interactional analyses but fell short of making any correlative analyses on the basis of race, gender or class. Instead, they sought to analyze factors of life stress, occupation and other variables. These projects while limited to the heterosexual experience, highlight the importance of examining the intersecting qualities of our social realities and their potential significance in influencing help-seeking.

In a groundbreaking research initiative, Turell (2008) sought to collect empirical data on survivors of emotional, physical, and/or sexual abuse within the context of a same-sex intimate relationship that examined the help-seeking behavior of the

community. While very little research had been conducted on these behaviors, even less

research had been done on the variances according to age, income, gender, sexual

orientation and ethnicity *within* the LGBTQ community. Turell was critical of the many

shortcomings evident in most published research on survivors of violence within the

LGBTQ community. She cited that most of the studies relied on convenience samples,

were limited to the experiences of white middle class lesbians, and that they largely

disregarded bisexual and transgender survivors (Turell, 2008). In addition, she argued

that the only studies with empirical consistency on help-seeking behaviors were limited

to white lesbian women, even claiming that research on the help-seeking behavior of

bisexual and transgender survivors was "virtually non-existent" (2008,287). Her research

served to represent a larger and more diverse sample that not only reported what was

known about help-seeking behaviors but also how they varied by age, income, gender,

sexual orientation and ethnicity.

Turell cited her own 1999 study finding that just over half (54%) of the LGBT

population sought support related to their abusive relationship experiences; she reported

other estimates that stated numbers as high as 83-85% (2008). Commonly, these LGBT

survivors sought help from friends, counselors, and relatives over more formal structural

sources such as the criminal justice system or domestic violence agencies (McClennen et

al., 2002; Merrile & Wolfe, 2000; Renzetti, 1992, 1996; Scherzer, 1998; Turell, 1999).

The literature also indicated that not only were these methods more common but it also

revealed they were the most helpful (Coleman, 1990; Dutton, 1994; Hamberger, 1996;

Hammond, 1988; Leeder, 1994; Letellier, 1994; McClennen et al., 2002; Merrill & Wolfe, 2000; Sherzer, 1998; Turell, 1999).

Turell emphasized in her research that the LGBT community represents four different, heterogeneous communities that often get lumped into one when examining help-seeking behaviors. An essential investigative question that guided her research was how having multiple identities shaped unique support needs within the LGBT community; she conceptualized these as "within-group differences" (2008,284). While she claimed that these differences have remained absent from the present literature, she did cite Kanuha (1990) as having pioneered the concept of the "triple jeopardy" (racism, sexism and homophobia) in the lives of battered lesbian women. She recognized and emphasized the significance of the social context in which the lesbian women were experiencing their abusive situations. Turell claimed that the literature available on the impacts of ethnicity and help-seeking behavior within the community was scant. She cited scholarly research that found no relationship between ethnicity and seeking help within a sample of lesbian survivors of violence (Sherzer, 1998). However, she utilized her own data from a diverse sample of men, women and transgender individuals and discovered that African Americans felt the strongest preference for getting help from someone of the same ethnicity (Turell, 2000). She stated that other research initiatives that have been conducted on the help seeking behaviors of LGBT survivors have not included race or ethnicity as a possible variation. Given this lack of exploration, she stated that these studies carry the assumption "that the experience of white lesbians and gay men are normative" (2008, 11).

Turell conducted an LGBT survey research project that collected data on "demographic information and a checklist of behaviors that characterized emotional, physical, and sexual abuses for both past and present relationships" (2008, 11). The survey included questions that measured the respondents' ability to seek help, how they went about seeking help and whether or not it was perceived as being helpful. The instrument was developed by a collaborative effort of domestic violence agencies across the state of Texas. Three thousand surveys were distributed over the span of a year in urban areas of Texas through a variety of LGBT advocacy organizations. What resulted was a 25% response rate overall which meant a relatively large sample was achieved. Even more important was the diversity of the sample obtained. Given that the surveys were distributed in urban localities, Turell's respondents came from various self-identified ethnic backgrounds consisting of 9% Latino, 7% African American, 4.5% bi- or multi-racial, 3% Native American, and 0.6% Asian. While the sample was indeed diverse, geographic location was not. Even though geographic location was not part of the survey, given that the measuring instrument was distributed at only urban areas, Turell only achieved capturing the help-seeking behaviors of *urban* LGBT survivors. This poses a major problem because urban areas typically have more available resources to LGBT individuals and communities, better social support networks among a variety of other factors that go unaccounted for in this research (Skoloff, 2007). She does include this as a limitation at the end of her report.

When measuring the impact of gender and sexual orientation on whether or not survivors sought help, Turell discovered that those who identified as lesbian women were

significantly more likely to seek help than those who identified as gay men, gay women or bisexual. No other demographic factor correlated with seeking help. Turell then moved on to analyzing the data for correlations between the demographic variables of age, ethnicity, class, gender, and sexual orientation and the sources of help sought. She discovered that lesbian women were significantly more likely than others to seek help from mental health professionals such as counselors. Native American respondents were more likely than Latinos, African Americans, and Caucasians to seek help from medical doctors but no statistically significant correlation existed between the demographic variables of the subsample and the perceived helpfulness of this source. The only statistically significant correlation that arose from seeking help from the police was age; older LGBT people were more likely to report abuse to the police than younger. This inverse relationship was the only one found across gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, income and age. Domestic violence agencies yielded difference only by ethnicity as Asian respondents were more likely to seek help from these sources. There were no statistically significant differences in utilization according to age, income, or gender. In addition, there were no statistically significant differences in the perceived helpfulness of these sources. However, domestic violence *shelters* were more likely to be used by those who identified as heterosexual but no other correlations were found regarding their perceived helpfulness. Respondents of lower incomes and of younger age were more likely (by weak statistical significance) to seek help from parents, friends, or family members but no correlations between ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation were found even regarding their perceived helpfulness. Transgender individuals were more likely

than other genders to seek religious resources but Turell did not mention correlates of the perceived helpfulness. Finally, she reported that there were no statistically significant differences for either those who sought crisis hotlines or their perceived helpfulness based on gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age or income.

While Turell's discoveries revealed more similarities within the community than differences, she did find significant differences in some forms of help seeking behaviors. The gender differences in even beginning to seek help from abusive situations reflects a long standing history of the involvement of lesbian women in domestic violence and feminist movements. Turell reported that "the previous literature yielded common patterns regarding help-seeking behaviors of people who had experienced domestic violence in same sex relationships. Both battered lesbians and gay men most frequently sought support from friends, counselors, and relatives (McClennen et al., 2002; Merrill & Wolfe, 2000; Renzetti, 1992; Renzetti & Miley, 1996; Scherzer, 1998; Turell, 1999). Of the services sought, services received from friends, family, and counselors were considered the most helpful (Coleman, 1990; Dutton, 1994; Hamberger, 1996; Hammond, 1988; Leeder, 1994; Letellier, 1994; McClennen et al., 2002; Merrill&Wolfe, 2000; Sherzer, 1998; Turell, 1999)". Turell's study supported these previously found patterns of behavior. Turell interpreted the differences according to age and income in seeking help from friends, parents and family as being heavily reliant on being economically independent. Those who are younger typically have fewer economic resources and stability and of course those who report lower incomes do as well. Even when considering these findings, Turell reported that those of higher incomes reported

friends, parents and families as being more helpful. Additionally, Turell reported

bisexuals as finding family resources the least helpful. She interpreted this finding as

being linked to the fluid nature of bisexuals relationships; they may be with someone of

the same sex or someone of the opposite sex. Given that fact, she stated that family

members were probably only the most supportive when the individual was paired with

someone of the opposite sex.

Turell claimed this study confirmed the theoretical arguments of Kanuha (1990)

and Waldron (1996) that the intersections of racism and homophobia do affect the help-

seeking behaviors of LGBT ethnic minorities. "Where ethnic differences were

statistically significant, African American and Latino people utilized the services the

least, with less than 5% seeking medical help" (2008, 287). Turell interpreted these

correlations as resulting from the theoretical concepts of double and triple jeopardy

conceptualized by Kanuha (1990) in which the respondents were likely affected by fears

of racism and homophobia by medical professionals. This was the case as well for

domestic violence agencies as African Americans and Latinos were the least likely to

view these as potential resources. Turell emphasized that her results strongly support the

notion of double or triple jeopardy in seeking services for LGBT people of color. She

proposed that "if wanting to provide services to LGBT people of color, the professional

service providers, such as DV agencies and medical/legal personnel, must deal with the

perceptions and realities of the *interaction* of homophobia/heterosexism and racism, as

well as the homophobia within ethnic groups" (2008, 17). Because Turell stated that the

interactions of these systems of oppression *do* have an impact on the help-seeking

behavior of LGBT survivors of violence, she has proposed an intersectional argument supported by quantitative empirical research data.

Summary

In sum, while little attention has been given to the impacts of violence in LGBTQ community and their help-seeking behaviors, it is evident in the review of the literature that the impacts are real. When examining violence against and within the LGBTQ community, dominant theoretical explanations fall short of encompassing the varying experiences within the population. The literature available illustrates a demand for a comprehensive understanding of the intersectional qualities of our social and cultural contexts. The research question of this study is firmly grounded in the available literature that demonstrates the need for a thorough inclusion of the influences of social locations on the experiences of violence. Of particular interest are the common themes that arise from an evaluation of the literature that examines the influences of race, class, gender and sexuality on the experiences of violence; that is a theoretical framework of intersectionality. From an abstract argument of macro interlocking systems of oppression, intersectionality can and has been utilized in the exploration of the impacts of race, class, gender, sexuality, and age on survivors of violence. The research has consistently shown that perceptions and experiences of violence vary tremendously along the lines of these demographic variables and has the power to influence help-seeking behavior. The connection between the larger, macro level systems of racism, homophobia/heterosexism, sexism and classism to the community and individual patterns

of behavior is a powerful argument that is not only theoretically grounded but has been empirically driven.

When considering LGBT survivors of anti-queer violence, it was evident that race, class and gender were influential components in shaping the realities of these survivors' experiences. The impact of the perceptions and interpretations shaped by our hostile social and cultural contexts are evident in the accounts of the hate-motivated violent experiences of the respondents in Meyer's (2008) study. The exploration of the intersecting qualities of various oppressive identities is essential in understanding how victims interpret the violence they experience. By utilizing an intersectional perspective, researchers have much knowledge to gain regarding not only whether or not hate crime victims seek help but which categories of victims seek help, why they do, how they do, and how effective their resources are.

Turell's (2008) contribution to the exploration of the impacts of intersecting identities within the LGBT survivor community through empirical data has demonstrated strong support for the use of intersectionality in help-seeking behavior research. Through surveying a large sample of the LGBT community, Turell was able to investigate correlations between the demographic variables of ethnicity, class, gender, age, and sexual orientation and help-seeking behavior. Given the high percentage of survivors of violence in her LGBT sample, she was able to draw interpretations from statistically significant correlates between the demographic variables and help sought. Discovering the correlations between gender and utilizing counseling services as well as ethnicity and medical professions to name a few, Turell was able to support the intersectional

theoretical concepts of double and triple jeopardy experienced by LGBT survivors of color.

Meyer and Turell have each implemented an intersectional framework that guided the analyses of their data and shaped their theoretical propositions on the influence of social locations on experiences of violence. Given the scarcity of the literature available on how intersectional identities shape patterns of help-seeking behavior for LGBT survivors of violence, the advancement of these forms of analysis is justified. Further contributions are needed in this exploratory field of study that could advance not only our understanding of how LGBT survivors perceive, interpret and experience violence but also the prevention and intervention services provided for the community. The literature demonstrates the need for further investigation and merits the central research question of this paper. Through an analysis of the data being proposed, further examination of these issues can be possible.

Theoretical Framework

The primary framework guiding this analysis is inspired by the theory of intersectionality. In its original articulation, intersectional theory was developed by civil rights lawyer Kimberle Crenshaw with the purpose of making domestic and sexual violence theories more inclusive. Patricia Hill Collins further developed intersectional theory to provide a thorough analysis of how systems of oppression interlock and work dynamically to shape distinct social realities that had been largely ignored in academia. Collins argued that gender alone was not the foundational social element from which to analyze gender violence but that race, class, gender, and sexual orientation all play an

intersectional role in how violence is perceived and how it exists. A major "guiding principle of race, class, and gender analysis is its focus on the simultaneous, multiple and interlocking oppressions of individuals" (Mann & Grimes, 2001, 8). Through this perspective, Collins sought to incorporate and validate the experiences of women of color into the general feminist paradigm. By challenging mainstream feminist dialogue, Collins conceptualized structural intersectionality in an attempt to explore the varying experiences of violence in female communities of color, low socioeconomic statuses and minority sexual orientations.

The analysis that I propose utilizes intersectional theory and its related concepts to guide the research question at hand. This study seeks to explore the influences of race, class and gender identity on the help-seeking behavior of LGBTQ survivors of violence. Intersectional theory will provide a foundation from which to analyze these variables and explore their relative impacts on the experiences of LGBTQ survivors of violence. I believe that through the adaptation of this theoretical framework on the exploration of these experiences, gender violence theories could be strengthened and expanded.

Intersectionality

The 1960's and 70's witnessed a revolutionary development of feminist thought and ideology that inspired a new movement. The second wave of feminism brought to the public sphere the issues of sexism and gender inequality. The movement, which began as dialogues between women who shared similar experiences of gender oppression, challenged society to view domestic and sexual violence as social problems, reproductive choice as a civil right and sexual harassment as employment discrimination.

As innovative and ground breaking as this movement was, it relied heavily on the assumption that gender was the primary form of oppression for all women. It assumed that all women faced the same sexism, the same gender based oppression and the same social inequalities or at least that they all shared parallel experiences. White, heterosexual, middle class women were not only vastly in control of the mainstream movement, but they largely shaped their political and social agendas based upon their experiences. African American women saw little of their experiences validated through this feminist dialogue and thus the formation of the womanist movement began. While womanist thought has no specific founder, Alice Walker was among the first to publish such ideas. Through the womanist perspective, African American women theorized, discussed and described their experiences through their own eyes.

In the late 1980's sociologist Patricia Hill Collins advanced intersectionality theory by proposing a new wave of black feminist thinking. In her application of intersectional theory, Collins sought to analyze the social and political identity of black women in America. Grounded in a sociohistorical analysis of black women, Collins explored the dynamics of intersecting identities. According to Collins, race, class, gender and sexuality function interdependently within social structure to maintain hierarchal oppression and hegemonic domination. This theoretical perspective views the experiences of sexual violence against black women as tied directly to racism; similarly this analysis provides an intersected approach to the social construct of work, sexuality, marriage, motherhood, and more. Its vastly applicable conceptualization makes it a strong theoretical foundation for the evaluation of various social phenomenon.

Intersectionality can be defined as "the view that women experience oppression in varying configurations and in varying degrees of intensity" (Ritzer, 2007, pg. 204). Working from Crenshaw's theoretical foundation, Collins expanded the application of intersectionality and gained wide spread attention. Much like Crenshaw, Collins viewed cultural and societal patterns of oppression as "interrelated and tied together by the intersectional systems of society" (Collins, 1990, 31). Intersectionality emphasizes the relevance of social context in the exploration of individual and collective experiences. By conceptualizing systems of oppression as interlocking, intersectionality provides a perspective that differential contexts shape distinct social realities.

Intimate Partner Violence and Intersectional Identities

Michele Bograd's (1999) theoretical contribution to the study of intimate partner violence brought forth many challenges to the assumptions underlying current feminist domestic violence theories. Bograd's theoretical piece confronted contemporary domestic violence theories' dependence on conceptualizing gender as the primary source of oppression for all women. While her intention was directed towards improving theoretical understandings of domestic violence for women, her theoretical contribution are relevant to the purposes of this paper as it employs an expansion in the study of domestic violence to include the experiences of LGBTQ survivors. By theorizing the intersections of race, class, sexual orientation and gender on the experiences and perceptions of domestic violence, Bograd hoped to inspire an expansion in the theoretical explanations of this social problem. This direct application of intersectionality

demonstrates the effectiveness of theorizing that includes interlocking systems of oppression that shape distinct social localities and shape help-seeking behaviors.

Bograd conceptualized intersectionality within the study of domestic violence as having the ability to "color the meaning and nature of domestic violence, how it is experienced by self and responded to by others, how personal and social consequences are represented, and how or whether escape and safety can be obtained" (Bograd, 1999). Bograd saw social reality as being a complex intersection of dynamic systems that are patterned in nature and mutually reinforcing. She claimed that most theories of domestic violence did not address these many dimensions of our social context. She stated that "an implicit assumption of many theories and practices is that domestic violence posed a central threat to the boundaried, protected, inner space of the family" (1999, 53). These theories typically relied on gender inequality as the main explanatory factor in the existence of domestic violence and conceptualized other factors as mere "stressors" (1999). She argued that these understandings of domestic violence reflected primarily white middle class heterosexual families and did not encompass the realities of other members of society. These theoretical processes did not take into account the social context that domestic violence occurs in. The racist, heterosexist and classist dimensions of our social and cultural contexts cannot be removed from the experiences of domestic violence. Similar to Meyer's approach in the examination of anti-queer violence, Bograd argued that "intersectionality suggests that no dimension, such as gender inequality, is privileged as an explanatory construct of domestic violence, and gender inequality itself is modified by its intersection with other systems of power and oppression" (1999, 55).

Intersectionality and Victims of Domestic Violence

Bograd utilized domestic violence statistics to provide an overview of what she called "consequences of intersectionality" (1999). She cited many national domestic violence surveys that included research on "minority" populations but offered no insight into Latino communities. She claimed that current research on race is extremely ineffective as it attempts to collapse diverse ethnic groups into particular, boiled-down categories. She cited how major researchers have studied Mexican American populations and overgeneralized the findings to all Hispanics; many of the studies on Asian populations have had the same occurrences. By failing to produce accurate data on minority populations, accurate generalizations cannot be made. Domestic violence experiences and perceptions differ across racial and ethnic lines; without an intersectional perspective that can capture the complexities of multiple identities, Bograd claimed that more inclusive theories would be difficult to reach.

While Bograd claimed that social class was a standard dimension of most domestic violence research, she argued that research into the prevalence of violence in the lives of low income women was scarce. In particular, she emphasized how low economic status intersects dynamically with race, gender, immigration status, disability and more. The high levels of violent victimization of the homeless population and the inability for women to leave potentially deadly situations both tie into the many dimensions of social class. These two examples are but a limited scope of how social class interlocks with violent victimization. When studied through the lens of intersectionality, race and gender particularly exacerbate violent situations. With the

feminization of poverty and the overrepresentation of racial and ethnic minority women in these statistics, domestic violence experiences vary intensely. Bograd stated research that indicated that "over one-third of woman-headed families lived in poverty and over half of those were Black and Hispanic" (1999, 56). She highlighted the intersectional qualities the dimensions of social class may have and challenged research to look beyond income and violence correlates and explore the various intersecting identities present.

Bograd proposed that as far as same-sex battering was concerned, there "were few or no available statistics on the intersections of homosexuality, domestic violence, race and class" (1999. 57). This statement is particularly significant to the purposes of the investigation I propose in this paper. While we have begun to explore the intersections of race, class and gender in the lives of female victims of domestic violence, we have yet to explore these intersections in the lives of LGBTQ victims of not just domestic violence but hate-motivated and sexual violence. She argued that the "invisibility of certain populations reflects more their social importance in the eyes of the dominant culture than the absence of domestic violence in their midst" (1999, 58). By relying on theories that unintentionally disregard the social contexts of many victims, we disregard the existence of their experiences. Without the appropriate theoretical understandings we cannot encourage the development of the research based statistics that fuel changes in the public sphere. She conceptualized this lack of attention to this largely under theorized and under researched area as a denial of victimization. She stated that "the intersections of race, class, sexual orientation and gender often influence whom we define as "real" or "appropriate" victims.

Utilizing her perspectives as a therapist, she delves into the "real world" consequences of intersections and domestic violence. While intersectionality may seem abstract, she stated that it has real, "life threatening consequences, as the ramifications of social location reverberate through psyche, family relations, community support and institutional response" (1999,157). The hostile social climates and contexts that surround the violence that occurs for many victims add many layers of challenges and obstacles. Not only are these individuals victimized in their homes, families and relationships but also in the outside communities. She conceptualized heterosexism, racism and classism as "microaggressions" that compound in the context of the violent experiences (1999). Additionally, she argued that victims may have internalized these ideologies and thus further hinder their help-seeking behavior (1999). Without appropriate theoretical understandings, research will continue to fall short on adequately capturing the experiences of survivors within historically oppressed communities. As a result, her direct application of intersectionality to the study of intimate partner violence has many applied research implications that shape the methodology of this paper. Her theoretical applications have demonstrated the need to pay close attention to the influences of varying social identities on how survivors experience and interpret intimate partner violence. They indicate that race, class and gender identity may have a significant impact in how survivors react and respond to violent situations. By making these propositions, Bograd urges the inclusion of these realities in social research in order to more accurately capture survivors' experiences. Bogard's contribution expands the discussion on how

help-seeking behaviors of survivors are influenced by intersecting identities and shapes important research questions.

Intersectionality and Hate-Motivated Violence

In the study reviewed above on anti-queer violence, Meyer utilized intersectionality as a theoretical foundation, to reveal how LGBTQ survivors of anti-queer violence interpreted and experienced their victimization along the lines of race, class and gender. He stated that intersectionality can facilitate our understanding of the varying ways in which the LGBTQ community can interpret and experience hate motivated violence. By denoting the ways in which institutional power structures such as race, class, gender and sexuality simultaneously structure social relations, Meyers employed intersectionality to capture these mutually reinforcing systems (2008). Inspired by the theoretical work of Patricia Hill Collins, Meyers recognized the effectiveness of viewing multiple forms of social inequality as dynamically intersected and applied it to expand our understanding of anti-queer violence.

As stated previously, Meyer adopted an intersectionality perspective to emphasize the ways in which the interlocking systems of institutionalized oppression concurrently shape social realities. He recognized these systems as interlocking power structures conceptualized by Collins as distinct but "mutually reinforcing" (Collins, 2004). However, he claimed that simply reducing them to distinct systems did not allow the researcher to "collapse each system into another" (Meyer, 2008, 269). He urged social scientists to account for the multiple forms of social inequality which occur simultaneously and shape patterns of social behavior (Meyer, 2008).

While intersectionality has been largely left out of the examination of victims experiences of hate motivated violence, Meyer cited hate crimes scholar Barbara Perry (2001) as a pioneer in the inclusion of intersectionality to the theoretical account of hate crimes. Perry challenged traditional criminological theory that stated that hate crime arose from the collective acts of those who felt powerless. She argued that this theoretical framework did not account for the fact that most of the hate crime perpetrators belonged to the most privileged social categories in society. Having understood the existence of hate crimes differently, Perry conceptualized hate crimes as a means of social control which was "rooted in institutional power structures" (Meyer, 2008, 268). She conceptualized hate crimes as a product of systems of oppression; a tool or weaponry of sorts that maintains the hegemonic power structures in place.

Meyer sought to build upon the sociological components of this criminological theory that emphasized the importance of cultural and social context while incorporating elements of Collins' intersectionality theory through empirical evidence. As with Bograd, his theoretical application of intersectionality provides empirical research implications that are essential to the research question of this paper. While his project was qualitative in nature, this paper will seek to measure the influences of race, class and gender identity on whether or not survivors sought help for their experience. Meyer demonstrates how the theoretical application of intersectionality, while seemingly abstract, can guide empirical investigations and expand our understandings of perspectives.

Standpoint Epistemology

A major component of Collins' theoretical framework is the concept of standpoint epistemology. Among others, Dorothy Smith pioneered the development of standpoint theory in the 1960's. The "notion of standpoint emphasizes that what one knows is affected by where one stands - one's subject position (Appelrouth, S, & Edles, L, 2007). Inspired by this conceptual framework, Collins expanded Smith's standpoint theory by describing standpoints as influenced by interlocking systems of oppression. Because Smith argued that varying standpoints create varying social realities, Collins was able to adapt this concept and incorporate it in intersectionality. Individuals' multiple identities, or standpoints, create these varying experiences that she argues are interlocked. Simultaneously, groups and individuals consist of several different identities that all form the nature of our patterned experiences. Exploring perspectives and experiences through a singular identity denies the existence of another.

Matrix of Domination

Tied directly into the concepts of standpoint and intersectionality, Collins conceptualizes the matrix of domination to emphasize the dynamic of interlocking identities. Through this concept, she stresses the simultaneity of race, class and gender oppression (Collins, 1990, 221). Unlike previous attempts to explore multiple forms of social inequality, Collins rejected additive approaches to the study of systems of oppression. Previously, the study of multiple identities started with one variable, and then *added* others, and then an investigation took place. It viewed each social variable (race, class and gender) as separate and distinct systems that took an additive dynamic.

Through the matrix of domination, Collins highlights the multiplicative dynamic of systems of oppression. As an alternative paradigm, this analysis did not rely on the comparison of similarities and differences between systems of oppression but rather accentuated their connections to one another. Collins assumes "that each system needs the others in order to function which creates a distinct theoretical stance that stimulates the rethinking of basic social science concepts" (Collins, 1990, 222). By approaching systems of oppression this way, Collins fosters a new way of thinking that is inclusive to varying forms of identities. Sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity among many others can be analyzed as interlocking systems. Through "economic, political and ideological domination" different groups experience various forms of interrelated oppression.

Collins added that there are multiple levels of domination. "In addition to being structured along axes such as race, gender and social class, the matrix of domination is structured on several levels" (Collins, 1990, 227). Domination is structured at the level of personal biography, the group or community level of the cultural context created by race, class and gender and the systematic level of social institutions (Collins, 1990). While individuals maintain their "individual biography", that is their own values, beliefs, goals and emotions, these are continuously shaped and influenced by the culture of our social contexts. The group provides the knowledge from which we interpret our lives and our individual behavior. Finally, both the group and the individual biography can experience domination by social institutions controlled by the dominant group. This level of oppression includes social structures such as the media, the educational and criminal justice systems, and others. These social structures introduce individuals to the

dominant form of thinking, acting and being. They pass the dominant groups culture as the normal and only acceptable form of living while simultaneously replicating it. (Collins, 1990)

Intersectional Application

The application of intersectionality is foundational to the exploration of the various social identities that shape and influence the perceptions of entire groups or individuals. In analyzing the VAVP data, it is imperative to utilize this theoretical lens to explain any variations and relationships between demographic variables and the help-seeking behavior of LGBTQ survivors of violence. The LGBTQ survivors of violence sampled in this study face intersecting oppressions that shape their standpoints, influence their group and individual behaviors, and social locations. In fact, these intersecting identities shape how they experience violence, how others treat them as survivors, how and whether escape, safety or justice can be achieved in addition to their perceptions of the existence of violence in their lives or communities. Through this conceptual lens, the data can illustrate various dimensions and dynamics of multiple identities that have rarely (if ever) been studied *within* the LGBTQ community. Unlike other theories that may have been utilized to explore intimate partner or hate motivated violence, this theoretical framework does not rely on gender as the primary system of oppression affecting victims. Current intimate partner violence theories rely heavily on gender asymmetry, heterosexual relationships, and "unintentionally forces those whose experiences differ from the mainstream to the margins" of our society (Bograd, 1999, 158). The reality that the intersections of race, class, gender identity and sexual orientation all interdependently

distinguish deserving victims from non, legitimate relationships from deviant, and the resources available to them make this theoretical approach imperative to this exploration. Through the acknowledgment of these intersecting qualities of various identities, intimate partner and hate motivated violence theories could be enhanced and more inclusive.

Chapter 2 Methodology

As mentioned previously, when attempting to collect data on the LGBTQ community, unique challenges shape the methodology and sampling designs. Given the nature of our social climate, it is difficult to access the LGBTQ community and obtain randomized large samples. In general, ideal sampling methods are ultimately unrealistic when attempting to study the LGBTQ population; "there is no sampling frame that lists gay and lesbian persons, so all samples are based on self identification of sexual orientation; this makes a random sample impossible to design" (Owen and Burke, 2004, 131). Acknowledging the historical marginalization of the LGBTQ community, the VAVP sought to maximize the number of respondents by utilizing non-random sampling methods. By doing so, the VAVP made the largest attempt at collecting this type of data in Virginia to date.

Survey Instrument

Measuring violence within and against the LGBTQ community presents a variety of challenges outlined above. First, the inaccessibility of a large portion of the community makes it difficult to precisely assess the population as a whole. Due to the nature of our social and cultural contexts, homophobia continues to marginalize the community affecting how "out" individuals can be or how open. Second, while several measuring instruments have been developed and utilized repeatedly with relative effectiveness to gauge violence against women and heterosexual domestic violence, a uniform instrument has yet to be developed to do so within the LGBTQ community. Lastly, though the development and revision of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) has lead

to more gender neutral language in intimate partner violence research, it is not without flaw. In 2008, Melanie McCarry of the University of Bristol proposed challenges to survey methodology that attempts to gauge intimate partner violence within the LGBTQ community. Although innovative research has begun to expand how social scientists measure violence within and against the LGBTQ community, she argues that a more uniform methodology would allow for comparative studies. Because much of the research on violence within and against the LGBTQ community incorporates a variety of different methodologies, it is difficult to compare and contrast findings. McCarry states that "samples in research on same sex domestic violence have often been relatively small and purposive, reflecting the experiences of white, middle class, lesbians and gay men who are between the ages of 25-35 years and who are 'out' enough to engage with venues that carry and support the surveys being done. As a consequence, rates of incidence and prevalence have varied enormously across the studies (McCarry, 2008).

Given the evident challenges, the VAVP implemented a participatory action research theory to develop a community survey that was designed and reviewed by a team of LGBTQ-identified participants. Participatory action research allows individuals from within the community to define and develop their own measures. By incorporating the experiences of members from the community, the VAVP hoped to develop an instrument that incorporated a better understanding of the issues facing the population. Inspired by Lori Girschick (2002), the VAVP cited her work utilizing participant action research on lesbian violence to validate their decision in employing this methodology.

Implementation and Measures

        The VAVP staff collaborated with a diverse range of organizations with ties to the LGBTQ community such as HIV/AIDS organizations, affirming places of worship, social justice organizations, social support groups and the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action Alliance. Bars, clubs and multiple other social venues were also targeted as locations to advertise. Through these and many other locations, the community survey was advertised as a paper or online survey, confidential, voluntary and anonymous with an incentive of winning one of five $100 gift cards.

The VAVP determined eligibility for the community survey based on the responses to the following questions:

> 1). Are you a resident of Virginia? (If you live in or attend school in Virginia, you will be considered a resident for the purposes of this study)
> 2). Do you identify yourself as having a non-heterosexual sexual orientation or gender identity or expression not traditionally associated with your birth sex (Or, do you identify somewhere along the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or Queer spectrum?)

Only those who answered "yes" to both of the questions were included in the data. In addition to measuring violence within and against the LGBTQ community, the VAVP also developed a service provider questionnaire that gathered qualitative data on the availability of services for LGBTQ survivors of violence. The data for that section will not be utilized in this research.

        The survey was divided into seven sections. Section I contained demographic information regarding sexual orientation, gender identity, assigned sex at birth, race, ethnicity, age, language spoken most often, residential status and locality, education attained, and income. Section II employed a Likert scale which asked respondents to

select whether they strongly agreed, agreed, neither agreed/disagreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with a statement about sexual violence, intimate partner violence, stalking and hate crimes within the LGBTQ community. This section measured attitudes towards these issues regarding whether or not they viewed this violence as problematic, even existent within same-sex relationships, whether intervention and prevention was a priority and more. Section III was divided into two sections measuring sexual violence. Part A asked questions regarding sexual violence that had occurred while the respondent was a child age 17 and younger while Part B asked questions regarding sexual violence that had occurred in adult life, age 18 and older. Section IV gauged responses on experiences of intimate partner violence and was also divided into two sections. Part A asked questions regarding any victimization the respondent had experienced by an intimate partner while Part B asked questions regarding whether they had ever committed violence against an intimate partner. Section V measured specific experiences of hate crime violence, harassment, and bias motivated discrimination. This section was divided into three parts. Part A asked questions regarding hate crime violence victimization. Part B asked questions regarding discrimination victimization. Lastly, Part C measured the respondents' perception of hate crime violence by employing a Likert scale ranging from very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, neutral, somewhat likely, and very likely. These questions focused on whether or not the respondent believed they would be victims within the next year or within their lifetime. Next, section VI asked questions regarding specific experiences of stalking. This section was not divided into parts. Finally, section VII asked questions regarding other people the respondent may know and their

experiences with violence. At the end of the survey, the participants were given the

option to add any comments or reflections about the information and experiences

referenced in the questionnaire. See appendix A for community survey questions.

Data Analysis

A secondary data analysis was performed on the VAVP community violence

survey and did not need to be approved by the Internal Review Board (IRB) at Virginia

Commonwealth University. The sample was first described in terms of social

demographic variables through simple frequencies of the responses to race, income and

gender identity. In the proceeding section, I have justified how I have defined race, class

and gender identity for the purposes of this analysis. Next, the sample was described in

terms of their experience with intimate partner violence and/or hate motivated violence.

The data posed a challenge in that the number of respondents who answered the question

"at any point in your life have you experienced intimate partner violence?" was different

from the number of respondents who had checked off at least one of the manifestations of

violence that they had experienced at the hands of a partner. Responses to having

experienced intimate partner violence at any point in your life and/or at least 1 of the

identified forms of violence from a partner were recoded into an "abuse" variable that

more accurately encompassed those who had experienced intimate partner violence. In

addition, some respondents who had reported not having experienced intimate partner

violence had responded to having sought help for intimate partner violence. Another

recode was used to remove those respondents who had previously answered "no" to

having experienced intimate partner violence when the reporting frequency was executed.

A recode was used for the operationalization of the help-seeking variable for intimate partner violence. In the survey, the participants were asked if they had ever sought help for violence from a partner to which the responses were a selection of informal and formal help-seeking resources. If the participants selected friends and/or family they were counted as having sought informal help resources. If the participant selected any of the other options that included agencies and professional resources, they were counted as having sought formal help.

A similar challenge arose when a frequency of the responses to "have you ever been the victim of hate crime violence or harassment based on your actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity" and "were any of these incidents reported to the police?" revealed that some respondents had answered not having experienced hate violence but said yes to reporting their hate violence experience to the police. In addition, this frequency revealed that some respondents had checked "yes-sexual orientation" but then "no" as well or "yes-gender identity" as well as "no". In the recode, if a respondent selected that they have experienced hate violence on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, reported any frequency of hate violence or if they reported a specific type of hate violence, with the exception of bullying at school, they were counted has having experienced hate violence.

Operationalization of the Independent Variables

Class

The participants' responses to income have been used to categorize them into economic classes as defined by sociologist Martin Marger (2005). Class can be

conceptualized in a variety of different ways. Class may encompass the economic and the social, which if combined, provide the definition for socioeconomic status which encompasses both the economic and social aspects of class. In an analysis of class, I have utilized Margers justification for defining class on the basis of income level. He stated that "there are three aspects to class - income and wealth, occupational prestige, and educational level" all of which he argues are "closely intertwined and together create economic commonality" or a "class" (Marger, 2005, 52-55). He then conceptualized an American class model in which he defines the underclass, working poor, working, lower-middle, upper-middle and upper-capitalist all on the basis of individual income (2005,57). Marger utilized U.S. census data to create a breakdown of individual income and categorized them by the following: Underclass (12% of the population) $0-$11,999, Working poor (13% of the population) $12,000-19,999, Working class (30% of the population) $20,000 to $39,999, Lower Middle class (30% of the population) $40,000 to $59,999, Upper middle class (14% of the population) $60,000-<$1 million, Upper-Capitalist class (1% of the population) 1 million or more. Utilizing this conceptualization of economic class, I have identified the underclass, working poor, and working classes as low economic classes for the purposes of my analysis. Due to the original entry and coding of the income variable, a total recode into the income classifications proposed by Marger is not possible. Instead, I will maintain the coding of 1-10 representing the following income break downs: 1 – no source of income, 2- $1-9,999, 3- $10,000-19,999, 4- $20,000-29,999, 5 - $30,000-39,999, 6- $40,000-49,999, 7- $50,000-59,999, 8-$60,000-79,999, 9 - $80,00-99,999 and 10 - $100,000 and up. Values 1 through 5

encompass the underclass, working poor and working classes and have been recoded into lower economic classes and values 6-10 encompass the lower-middle, upper-middle, and upper-capitalist have been coded into higher economic classes for the purpose of analysis. Both Marger and the survey question address individual and not household income.

Gender Identity

Gender identity refers to the gender or genders that an individual identifies with regardless of biological or social constructs (Blackless et.al, 2003). In the community violence survey, respondents had the opportunity to identify a physical, assigned birth sex and a gender identity. The options for assigned sex at birth were male, female and intersex while the options for gender identity were male, female, transgender, androgynous, genderqueer, transgender, female-to-male, male-to-female or other (please explain). For the purposes of this investigation, I am interested in looking at how a respondent's gender identity may influence help-seeking. Because gender identity is the gender that an individual most identifies with, it is this identification that constructs their gendered personal and social self. In an effort to more efficiently utilize the responses to gender identity, I collapsed androgynous, genderqueer, female-to-male, and male-to-female and other gender variant responses into the larger category, transgender. Transgender is an umbrella term that captures all gender identities beyond the scope of the dichotomous gender constructs of the feminine and the masculine (Blackless et. al, 2003). Unfortunately, transgender respondents could not be utilized in the proceeding analyses since the hypotheses derived from the literature suggested variations between

men and women and the small number of respondents (n=151) would not allow for an effective analysis.

Race

The respondent options for the question "what is your racial/ethnic background?" are African American (black), Caucasian (white), Latino/a, Native American/American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Caribbean and Multi/bi-racial. Due to the small number of non white respondents in the sample, responses to all non-white racial categories have been recoded into historically oppressed/marginalized racial ethnic group or people of color. The following race groups were considered historically oppressed/marginalized: African American (black), Latino/a, Native American/American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Caribbean and Multi/bi-racial. If the respondent selected any of the non-white racial categories they were recoded into the historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups category.

Creating Intersectional Variables

To ensure an intersectional analysis of the independent variables as proposed in the hypotheses in the proceeding section, "yes" responses to certain demographic questions were collapsed to create new variables that represented more intersectional qualities. A "yes" response to any of the non-white racial categories and being a man were recoded as "men of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups", a "yes" response to identifying as white and female were recoded as "white women", a "yes" response to being a male and any of the low economic class incomes were recoded as

"men of low economic classes" and a "yes" response to being a woman and any of the

low economic classes incomes were recoded as "women of low economic classes"

Statistical Analyses

After the variables were recoded and collapsed as necessary, crosstabulations of

of the independent variables were performed with having sought help for intimate partner

violence and the independent variables with having sought help for hate motivated

violence. For each crosstabulation, a Gamma value was reported that ranges from -1 to

+1. A Gamma value ranges in strength according to its proximity to -1 or +1; a value of

0 indicates no relationship present. The statistical significance was computed for each

crosstabulation Gamma value as well at the p<0.1 level. If the significance value was

less than 0.1, the relationship was reported as being statistically significant. Finally, in

order to analyze the simultaneous relationship of race, class and gender identity to help-

seeking and reporting behaviors, I conducted three logistic regression analyses.

Benefits and Limitations

Utilizing quantitative methods offers many benefits when examining the

relationship between variables. The survey design permits a quantitative analysis to

evaluate the strength and influences of different relationships between social

demographic variables, the experiences of violence and the help-seeking behaviors of

survivors. The survey allows for the quantification of victimization and offers the chance

to determine frequency by race, class and gender identity. Given the dichotomous

variable that measures help-seeking behavior in the survey, quantitative methods allow

for statistical analysis that measures predictability. In addition, the numerical data allows

for descriptive statistical analyses utilizing the social demographic variables of interest.
However, this method of analysis could leave many questions unanswered. When
attempting to quantify the human condition, the risk of losing the contextualized
occurrences and thoroughly fleshing out common themes of interpreted experiences is
inevitable. Of particular importance in the research question proposed is being able to
identify common themes in the interpretations of violence within the LGBTQ
community. A qualitative methodology could more accurately capture commonalities
and help identify reoccurring understandings within the community that could contribute
to our understanding of how survivors of violence within the LGBTQ community
experience their victimization.

Given that the investigation proposed will be dependent on a secondary data
analysis, the limitations present shape the outcomes and findings of this project. While
cost effective and ready to be examined, secondary data analysis proposes quite a few
constraints. First, performing a secondary data analysis excludes the researcher from the
development and proposition of measures. Working within the constraints of the fixed
measures implies the lack of flexibility in developing new items to be researched.
Second, the sampling design is fixed and determined by outside individuals and has
already been executed regardless of whether or not the researcher supports it. Lastly, the
instrumentation and construction of the survey has already been developed and executed
regardless of the researchers input. This affects what I am able to study by constraining
the variables to whatever has already been implemented.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses proposed in this research project are guided by review of the current literature, in particular the works of Meyer (2008) and Turrell (2008), and the theoretical framework. The guiding research question is does race, class and gender identity influence the help seeking behavior of LGBTQ survivors of intimate partner and hate-motivated violence? Based on the reviewed empirical findings, differences are likely to exist within race, class and gender identity in the perception, experience and help-seeking patterns of LGBTQ survivors of violence. Meyer (2008) and Turrell (2008) both employed concepts of intersectionality that guided the analysis of their data and illustrated how the interactions of racism, classism, sexism and homophobia shaped help-seeking behavior patterns. Given these findings, the null hypothesis will be that no relationships exist between race, class and gender identity and the help-seeking behaviors of LGBTQ survivors of violence. Based on empirical findings, the theoretical contributions and review of the literature twelve hypotheses were proposed.

Hypotheses
1. Respondents of color[1] will be less likely than Caucasian respondents to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.
2. Respondents of color will be less likely than Caucasian respondents to have reported hate motivated violence to the police.
3. Respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than respondents of higher economic classes to have sought help because of violence from a partner.
4. Respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than respondents of higher economic classes to have reported hate motivated violence to the police.
5. Women respondents will be more likely than men to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.
6. Women respondents will be more likely than men to have ever reported hate motivated violence to the police.

---

[1] The term "respondents of color" will be used to refer to "respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups."

Intersectional Hypotheses
1. Male respondents of color will be less likely than Caucasian men to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.
2. Male respondents of color will be less likely than Caucasian men to have reported hate motivated violence to the police.
3. Within respondents of lower economic classes, men will be less likely than women to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.
4. Within respondents of lower economic classes, men will be less likely than women to have reported hate motivated violence to the police.
5. Among men, respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than respondents of high economic classes to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.
6. Among men, respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than men respondents of high economic classes to have reported hate motivated violence to the police

Responses to specific survey questions have been analyzed to test the above

hypotheses. For the independent variables of race, class and gender identity, the

following survey questions have been utilized.

1. What is your gender identity? Male   Female   Trangsender   Androgynous   Genderqueer   Transgender FTM   Transgender MTF   Other (Please Explain)
2. What is your racial/ethnic background? (Check ALL that apply) African American (black) Caucasian (white)   Latino/a   Native American/American Indian   Asian/Pacific Islander   Carribbean   Multi/bi-racial   Other
3. What is your annual income from all sources before taxes?   I have no source of income, $1 to $9,999, $10,000 to $19,999, $20,000-$29,999, $30,000-$39,999, $40,000-$49,999, $50,000-$64,999, $65,000-$79,999, $80,000-$99,999, $100,000 and beyond

The survey questions that address the dependent variable of help-seeking will be the following:

1. Have you ever sought help because of violence from a partner?
2. Were any of these incidents reported to the police? [regarding hate crime violence]

Chapter 3 Results

Social Demographic Description

The sample of respondents was descriptively analyzed on the basis of the following social demographic variables: sexual orientation, gender identity, race, and income. Because every question is optional, some questions may have more or fewer responses than the other. In general, the VAVP determined that 993 participants completed the survey in its entirety. The sample will be described utilizing the responses given to each question; counting all responses – not just those participants that responded to every question. On the basis of sexual orientation, the sample (n=993) consisted of 30.2% gay, 32..8% lesbian, 14.1% bisexual, 14.3% Queer, 2.2% Questioning, and 6.5% No label respondents; 71 respondents did not select any of the choices. On the basis of gender identity, 35.6% were male, 35.6% female, and 14.2% transgender; 64 respondents did not select any of the gender options. On the basis of race, 5.2% were African American (Black), 3.5% Latino/a, 1.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 3.9% Native American/American Indian, 0.4% Caribbean, 84.2% Caucasian (White) and 0.9% Bi/multi racial; 61 respondents did not select any of the race options . For the purposes of this analysis, respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups were collapsed into the variable "oppressed race" to control for the small number of responses to all of the non-white racial categories. When the responses were collapsed, 9.9% of the sample (n=932) fell into the category of historically oppressed/marginalized racial group while 90.1% were Caucasian/white respondents. Finally, 53.3% of the respondents fell within the economic class categories of underclass, working poor, and working class as

defined by Marger (2005, 57). For the purposes of this analysis, they have been considered lower economic classes. Sixty-three respondents did not select an income.

Within these groups, the amount of violence experienced was captured in frequency. Between Caucasian respondents and respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups, 45.1% of Caucasian and 42.9% of respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups had reported experiencing intimate partner violence. When considering hate violence, 51.7% of Caucasian respondents and 42.9% of respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups had reported experiencing hate violence on the basis of their actual or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender identity/expression. Among men and women, 38.7% of men and 49.4% of women had reported having experienced intimate partner violence. When examining the existence of hate violence among men and women, 58.3% of men and 41.3% had reported having experienced hate violence based on their actual or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender identity/expression. Lastly, between the economic classes, 44.6% of lower economic class respondents and 44.2% of higher economic class respondents had reported having experienced intimate partner violence. When examining the existence of hate violence between the economic classes, 52.2% of lower and 48.8% of higher economic class respondents had reporting having experienced hate violence on the basis of their actual or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

Table 1. Sexual Orientation Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gay	278	28.0	30.2	30.2
	Lesbian	302	30.4	32.8	62.9
	Bisexual	130	13.1	14.1	77.0
	Queer	132	13.3	14.3	91.3
	Questioning	20	2.0	2.2	93.5
	No label	60	6.0	6.5	100.0
	Total	922	92.8	100.0	

Table 2. Gender Identity Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	331	33.3	35.6	35.6
	Female	466	46.9	50.2	85.8
	Transgender	132	13.3	14.2	100.0
	Total	929	93.6	100.0	

Table 3. Race Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	African American	48	4.8	5.2	5.2
	Latino/a	33	3.3	3.5	8.7
	Asian/Pacific Islander	18	1.8	1.9	10.6
	Native American	36	3.6	3.9	14.5
	Caribbean	4	.4	.4	14.9
	Caucasian (White)	785	79.1	84.2	99.1
	Bi-Racial/Multi	8	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	932	93.9	100.0	

Table 4. Economic Class Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Lower economic classes	496	49.9	53.3	53.3
	Higher economic classes	434	43.7	46.7	100.0
	Total	930	93.7	100.0	

Table 5. Crosstabulation: Race Group and Intimate Partner Violence

			Race group		
			Caucasian	R's of Color	Total
Does R report having been in an abusive relationship or having experienced a more serious kind of partner abuse?	No	Count	431	84	515
		% within Race group	54.9%	57.1%	55.3%
	Yes	Count	354	63	417
		% within Race group	45.1%	42.9%	44.7%
Total		Count	785	147	932
		% within Race group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 6. Crosstabulation: Race Group and Hate Violence

			Race group		
			Caucasian	R's of Color	Total
Has R ever been the victim of hate crime violence or harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?	No	Count	379	84	463
		% within Race group	48.3%	57.1%	49.7%
	Yes	Count	406	63	469
		% within Race group	51.7%	42.9%	50.3%
Total		Count	785	147	932
		% within Race group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7. Crosstabulation: Economic Class and Intimate Partner Violence

			Economic class		
			Lower classes	Higher classes	Total
Does R report having been in an abusive relationship or having experienced a more serious kind of partner abuse?	No	Count	275	242	517
		% within Economic class	55.4%	55.8%	55.6%
	Yes	Count	221	192	413
		% within Economic class	44.6%	44.2%	44.4%
Total		Count	496	434	930
		% within Economic class	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 8. Crosstabulation: Economic Class and Hate Violence

			Economic class		
			Lower classes	Higher classes	Total
Has R ever been the victim of hate crime violence or harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?	No	Count	237	222	459
		% within Economic class	47.8%	51.2%	49.4%
	Yes	Count	259	212	471
		% within Economic class	52.2%	48.8%	50.6%
Total		Count	496	434	930
		% within Economic class	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 9. Crosstabulation: Gender Identity and Intimate Partner Violence

			Gender identity		
			Male	Female	Total
Does R report having been in an abusive relationship or having experienced a more serious kind of partner abuse?	No	Count	203	234	437
		% within Gender identity	61.3%	50.6%	55.1%
	Yes	Count	128	228	356
		% within Gender identity	38.7%	49.4%	44.9%
Total		Count	331	462	793
		% within Gender identity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 10. Crosstabulation: Gender Identity and Hate Violence

			Gender identity		
			Male	Female	Total
Has R ever been the victim of hate crime violence or harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?	No	Count	138	271	409
		% within Gender identity	41.7%	58.7%	51.6%
	Yes	Count	193	191	384
		% within Gender identity	58.3%	41.3%	48.4%
Total		Count	331	462	793
		% within Gender identity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Occurrence of Violence

The participants were asked the dichotomous yes or no question, "At any point in your lifetime, have you ever been in an abusive romantic/sexual relationship?" In order to ensure an accurate frequency, if the respondent selected any of the listed forms of serious[2] partner abuse experienced, they were counted as having experienced intimate partner violence. Of the 993 respondents, 45.9% had reported having experienced intimate partner violence or having experienced a more serious kind of partner abuse. Participants were asked, "Have you ever been the victim of hate crime violence or harassment based on your actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?" The response options were, "Yes – sexual orientation", "Yes-gender identity" and "No". Answers to "Yes-sexual orientation" and "Yes-gender identity" were recoded and given the values of 1 -"Yes" which signifies that they have experienced hate motivated violence; value label 0 stayed the same for a "No" response to the question. Analysis of the responses revealed that 483 values were missing. These values were recoded as "No" values. Of the 993 responses to the question, 42.8% reported having experienced hate-motivated violence.

The analysis that proceeds utilizes the segment of the sample that has experienced intimate partner (n=456) and/or hate motivated violence (n=425). The following table describes the occurrences of violence within four different social demographic variables; race, economic class, gender identity, and sexual orientation.

---

[2] Serious forms of partner abuse were: Slapped you, stabbed you, threatened to hurt you with a weapon, withheld medication from you, made you afraid of them, choked you, disclosed or threatened to disclose your HIV status, abused your children, threatened to take away your children, punched you, forced you to engage in unwanted sexual activity, did not honor your boundaries/safe word in S&M scene, harmed or threatened to harm your pets, other acts of violence/abuse

Table 11. Violence within Groups		Has R ever been the victim of hate crime violence or harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?				Does R report having been in an abusive relationship or having experienced any particular kind of partner abuse?			
		No	Yes	Total		No	Yes	Total	
		Percent	Percent	Percent	N	Percent	Percent	Percent	N
Race group	White	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%	785	42.2%	57.8%	100.0%	785
	Historically Oppressed/Marginalized Racial Group	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	147	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%	147
Economic class	Lower economic classes	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%	496	42.5%	57.5%	100.0%	496
	Higher economic classes	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%	434	42.6%	57.4%	100.0%	434
Gender identity	Male	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%	331	48.9%	51.1%	100.0%	331
	Female	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%	462	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%	462
Sexual orientation	Gay	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%	278	51.4%	48.6%	100.0%	278
	Lesbian	56.3%	43.7%	100.0%	302	37.4%	62.6%	100.0%	302
	Bisexual	57.7%	42.3%	100.0%	130	31.5%	68.5%	100.0%	130
	Queer	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%	132	43.9%	56.1%	100.0%	132
	Questioning	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	20	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	20
	No label	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	60	38.3%	61.7%	100.0%	60

Among white respondents, 51.7% reported having experienced hate violence and 57.8% reported having experienced intimate partner violence. Among respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups, 42.9% reported having experienced hate violence and 55.7% had reported experiencing intimate partner violence. Among economic classes, 52.2% of respondents of lower economic classes reported having experienced hate violence and 48.8% reported having experienced intimate partner violence. Among respondents of higher economic classes, 48.8% reported having experienced hate violence and 57.4% reported having experienced intimate partner violence. Among male respondents, 58.3% had reported having experienced hate violence and 51.1% reported having experienced intimate partner violence. Among

female respondents, 41.3% reported having experienced hate violence and 61.5% reported having experienced intimate partner violence. Lastly, among sexual orientations, 56.8% of gay, 43.7% of lesbian, 42.3% of bisexual, 58.3% of queer, 50% of questioning and 60% of no label respondents reported having experienced hate violence and 48.6% of gay, 62.6% of lesbian, 68.5% of bisexual, 56.1% of queer, 40% of questioning and 61.7% of no label respondents reported having experienced intimate partner violence.

Help-seeking was defined in two different ways: formal help-seeking, which included resources such as shelters, organizations, law enforcement and professionals and informal help-seeking which included friends and family. Only those who had reported experiencing intimate partner violence or one of the listed serious forms of partner abuse were counted. Of those who had experienced intimate partner violence, 57.1% did not seek any form of help, 65.9% did not seek any formal help, and 65.5% did not turn to friends and family. Of those who had experienced hate motivated violence, 73.9% did not report the incident to the police. In the proceeding section, I analyze the independent variables influences on whether or not a respondent sought help for either form of violence. I will discuss the results by the proposed hypotheses.

Variations in Help-Seeking

Hypothesis #1: Respondents of color[3] will be less likely than Caucasian respondents to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.

In the first hypothesis, I proposed that respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups would have been less likely than those respondents who were Caucasian/White to seek help because of violence from a partner. Even after collapsing respondents who identified as African American/Black, Latino/a, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, Bi/Multi Racial and Caribbean into the respondents of color racial group, there were still relatively small numbers but within the sample, they were less likely than White respondents to have sought help. A crosstabulation of the variables illustrated a moderate relationship, with a gamma of -0.218 at significance of 0.086 indicating that it is statistically significant (p<0.1). When considering informal help seeking, the gamma statistic indicated no relationship at -0.089 with a significance of 0.485 indicating that it is not statistically significant (p<0.1).

---

[3] The term "respondents of color" will be used to refer to "respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups."

Table 12. Crosstabulation: Formal Help-Seeking for Intimate Partner Violence and Racial Groups

			Race group		
			White	R's of Color	Total
Did R seek out any of the listed formal help sources for abuse from partner?	No	Count	287	59	346
		% within Race group	64.3%	73.8%	65.8%
	Yes	Count	159	21	180
		% within Race group	35.7%	26.3%	34.2%
Total		Count	446	80	526
		% within Race group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 13. Crosstabulation: Informal Help-Seeking for Intimate Partner Violence and Racial Group

			Race group		
			White	R's of Color	Total
Did R seek out informal help from friends or family for abuse from partner?	No	Count	289	55	344
		% within Race group	64.8%	68.8%	65.4%
	Yes	Count	157	25	182
		% within Race group	35.2%	31.3%	34.6%
Total		Count	446	80	526
		% within Race group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Hypothesis #2: Respondents of color will be less likely than Caucasian respondents to have reported hate motivated violence to the police.

The second hypothesis proposed that respondents of color would be less likely to have reported hate motivated violence to the police than Caucasian/White respondents. The percentages reveal that there is not a significant relationship between the variables. In addition, the calculated gamma value of 0.091 demonstrates no relationship with a significance of 0.712 indicating no statistical significance ($p < 0.1$).

Table 14. Crosstabulation: Help-Seeking for Hate Violence and Racial Group

			Racial Group		
			White	R's of Color	Total
Were any of the incidents reported to police?	No	Count	362	27	389
		% within race group	84.4%	81.8%	84.2%
	Yes	Count	67	6	73
		% within race group	15.6%	18.2%	15.8%
Total		Count	429	33	462
		% within race group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Hypothesis #3: Respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than respondents of higher economic classes to have sought help because of violence from a partner.

The third hypothesis proposed that respondents of lower economic classes would be less likely than those of higher economic classes to have sought help because of violence from a partner. Gamma was found to have a moderate relationship at 0.288 in the hypothesized direction which illustrates a relationship between being of lower economic classes and not seeking formal help for intimate partner violence at a significance of 0.001 indicating strong statistical significance ($p<0.1$). When considering informal help-seeking, the gamma statistic indicated no relationship at -0.030 with a significance of 0.749 demonstrating no statistical significance ($p<0.1$).

Table 15. Crosstabulation: Formal Help-Seeking for IPV and Economic Class

			Economic class		
			Lower classes	Higher classes	Total
Did R seek out any of the listed formal help sources for abuse from partner?	No	Count	203	144	347
		% within Economic class	72.2%	59.0%	66.1%
	Yes	Count	78	100	178
		% within Economic class	27.8%	41.0%	33.9%
Total		Count	281	244	525
		% within Economic class	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 16. Crosstabulation: Informal Help-Seeking for IPV and Economic Class

			Economic class		
			Lower classes	Higher classes	Total
Did R seek out informal help from friends or family for abuse from partner?	No	Count	184	163	347
		% within Economic class	65.5%	66.8%	66.1%
	Yes	Count	97	81	178
		% within Economic class	34.5%	33.2%	33.9%
Total		Count	281	244	525
		% within Economic class	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Hypothesis #4: Respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than respondents of higher economic classes to have reported hate motivated violence to the police

        The fourth hypothesis proposed that respondents of lower economic classes would be less likely than those of higher economic classes to have reported hate motivated violence to the police. The percentage distribution illustrates no major relationship between the variables. Gamma was found to have a slight relationship at 0.117 in the hypothesized direction at a significance of 0.361 indicating no statistical significance $(p<0.1)$.

Table 17. Crosstabulation: Help-Seeking for Hate Violence and Economic Class

			Economic Class		
			Lower Classes	Higher Classes	Total
Were any of the incidents reported to police?	No	Count	219	173	392
		% within economic class	85.9%	82.8%	84.5%
	Yes	Count	36	36	72
		% within economic class	14.1%	17.2%	15.5%
Total		Count	255	209	464
		% within economic class	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

<u>Hypothesis #5: Women respondents will be more likely than men to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.</u>

The fifth hypothesis proposed that respondents who identified as women would be more likely than men to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner. The gamma statistic was found to illustrate a slight relationship at 0.102 in the hypothesized direction indicating that men were less likely than women to seek formal help for intimate partner violence at a significance of 0.320 indicating no statistical significance ($p<0.1$). The percentage distribution also supports the hypothesis illustrating that men were less likely to have sought help for intimate partner violence. When considering informal help-seeking, a similar relationship was found when a slight relationship at gamma 0.150 with a significance of 0.145 indicating no statistical significance ($p<0.1$). Men were slightly less likely than women to seek help from friends and family.

Table 18. Crosstabulation: Formal Help-Seeking for IPV and Gender Identity

			Gender identity		
			Male	Female	Total
Did R seek out any of the listed formal help sources for abuse from partner?	No	Count	114	177	291
		% within Gender identity	68.3%	63.7%	65.4%
	Yes	Count	53	101	154
		% within Gender identity	31.7%	36.3%	34.6%
Total		Count	167	278	445
		% within Gender identity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 19. Crosstabulation: Informal Help-Seeking for IPV and Gender Identity

			Gender identity		
			Male	Female	Total
Did R seek out informal help from friends or family for abuse from partner?	No	Count	118	178	296
		% within Gender identity	70.7%	64.0%	66.5%
	Yes	Count	49	100	149
		% within Gender identity	29.3%	36.0%	33.5%
Total		Count	167	278	445
		% within Gender identity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Hypothesis #6: Women respondents will be more likely than men respondents to have ever reported hate motivated violence to the police

The sixth hypothesis proposed that respondents who identified as women would be more likely than men to have ever reported hate motivated violence to the police. Gamma was found to have a considerable relationship at -0.199, not in the hypothesized direction illustrating that women were actually less likely to report to the police than men, at a significance of 0.219 indicating no statistical significance ($p<0.1$). In addition, through observation of the percentages, women were less likely to report hate motivated violence to the police.

Table 20. Crosstabulation: Help-Seeking for Hate Violence and Gender Identity

			Gender identity		
			Male	Female	Total
Were any of the incidents reported to police?	No	Count	156	162	318
		% within Were any of the incidents reported to police?	49.1%	50.9%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	36	25	61
		% within Were any of the incidents reported to police?	59.0%	41.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	192	187	379
		% within Were any of the incidents reported to police?	50.7%	49.3%	100.0%

Logistic Regressions

In order to analyze the simultaneous relationship of race, class and gender identity to help-seeking and reporting behaviors, I conducted three logistic regression analyses. The analyses relating these independent variables to seeking informal help and to reporting abuse did not result in any statistically significant relationships at $p < .10$, and the chi-square tests of model coefficients were not significant at this level either. Pseudo-R^2 estimates of explained variance were below one percent for each equation. However, as in the crosstabulation analysis, economic class was a significant predictor ($p = .002$) of formal help seeking behavior, controlling for gender identification and racial group. Increasing economic class from low to high approximately doubled the odds of seeking formal help for abuse (OR=1.892). This equation was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 12.638$, df=3, $p = .005$), though pseudo-estimates of explained variance were still low (e.g., Nagelkerke $R^2 = .041$).

Intersectionality and Help-Seeking

The following hypotheses propose a more intersectional influence on help-seeking.   They were tested using gamma to measure the existence of a relationship, its strength and statistical significance. A "yes" response to being non-white and male were recoded into "males of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups", a "yes" response to being both white and female were recoded into "white female", a "yes" response to being of both low economic class and female or male were recoded, accordingly, as "low economic class male" and "low economic class female".

<u>Hypothesis #7: Male respondents of color will be less likely than Caucasian men to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.</u>

The seventh hypothesis proposed that male respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups would be less likely than Caucasian men to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner. Gamma was found to have a moderate relationship at -0.281, in the hypothesized direction illustrating that men of color were less likely to seek formal help for intimate partner violence than white men, at a significance of 0.240 indicating no statistical significance ($p < 0.1$). The crosstabulation reveals the small number of men of color in comparison with white men. When considering informal help seeking, no relationship was found with the gamma statistic at 0.022 with a significance of 0.928 indicating no statistical significance ($p < 0.1$).

Table 21. Crosstabulation: Formal Help-Seeking for IPV and Men of Color with White Men

			Race and Gender		
			White Men	Men of Color	Total
Did R seek out any of the listed help sources for abuse from partner?	No	Count	259	9	268
		% within race and gender	56.7%	69.2%	57.0%
	Yes	Count	198	4	202
		% within race and gender	43.3%	30.8%	43.0%
Total		Count	457	13	470
		% within race and gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 22. Crosstabulation: Informal Help-Seeking for IPV and Men of Color with White Men

			Race of males		
			White Men	Men of Color	Total
Did R seek out informal help from friends or family for abuse from partner?	No	Count	98	16	114
		% within Race of males	70.5%	69.6%	70.4%
	Yes	Count	41	7	48
		% within Race of males	29.5%	30.4%	29.6%
Total		Count	139	23	162
		% within Race of males	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

 <u>Hypothesis #8 Male respondents of color will be less likely than Caucasian men to have reported hate motivated violence to the police.</u>

The eighth hypothesis proposed that male respondents of historically oppressed/marginalized racial groups would be less likely than Caucasian men to have reported hate motivated violence to the police. Gamma was found to have a moderate relationship at -0.236, in the hypothesized direction illustrating that men of color were less likely than white men to report hate violence to the police, at a significance of 0.404 indicating no statistical significance (p<0.1). Again, the crosstabulation reveals the small number of men of color within the sample.

Table 23. Crosstabulation: Help-Seeking for Hate Violence and Men of Color with White Men

			Race of males		
			White Men	Men of Color	Total
Were any of the incidents reported to police?	No	Count	132	20	152
		% within Race of males	80.5%	87.0%	81.3%
	Yes	Count	32	3	35
		% within Race of males	19.5%	13.0%	18.7%
Total		Count	164	23	187
		% within Race of males	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

<u>Hypothesis #9</u>: Within respondents of lower economic classes, men will be less likely than women to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.

The ninth hypothesis proposed that male respondents of lower economic classes would be less likely to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner than female respondents of lower economic classes. Gamma was found to have a moderate relationship at 0.199, in the hypothesized direction illustrating that men of lower economic classes were less likely to seek formal help for intimate partner violence than women of lower economic classes, at a significance of 0.224 indicating no statistical significance ($p<0.1$). When considering informal help-seeking, a strong relationship was found with a gamma statistic of 0.300 at a significance of 0.047 indicating statistical significance ($p<0.1$) and illustrating that men of lower economic classes were less likely than women of lower economic classes to seek informal help as well.

Table 24. Crosstabulation: Formal Help-Seeking for IPV and Lower Economic Class with Gender Identity

			Lower economic class by gender		
			Lower class males	Lower class females	Total
Did R seek out any of the listed formal help sources for abuse from partner?	No	Count	54	101	155
		% within Lower by gender	78.3%	70.6%	73.1%
	Yes	Count	15	42	57
		% within Lower by gender	21.7%	29.4%	26.9%
Total		Count	69	143	212
		% within Lower by gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 25. Crosstabulation: Informal Help-Seeking for IPV and Lower Economic Class with Gender Identity

			Lower economic class by gender		
			Lower class males	Lower class females	Total
Did R seek out informal help from friends or family for abuse from partner?	No	Count	52	89	141
		% within Lower by gender	75.4%	62.2%	66.5%
	Yes	Count	17	54	71
		% within Lower by gender	24.6%	37.8%	33.5%
Total		Count	69	143	212
		% within Lower by gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Hypothesis #10: Within respondents of lower economic classes, men will be less likely than women to have reported hate motivated violence to the police.

The tenth and final hypothesis proposed that male respondents of lower economic classes would be less likely to have reported hate motivated violence to the police than female respondents of lower economic classes. Gamma was found to have a strong relationship at -0.374, not in the hypothesized direction illustrating that women of lower

economic classes were less likely to report hate violence to the police than men of lower economic classes, at a significance of 0.068 indicating statistical significance (p<0.1).

Table 26. Crosstabulation: Help-Seeking for Hate Violence and Lower Economic Classes with Gender Identity

			Lower economic class by gender		
			Lower class males	Lower class females	Total
Were any of the incidents reported to police?	No	Count	65	98	163
		% within Lower by gender	80.2%	89.9%	85.8%
	Yes	Count	16	11	27
		% within Lower by gender	19.8%	10.1%	14.2%
Total		Count	81	109	190
		% within Lower by gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Hypothesis #11: Among men, respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than respondents of high economic classes to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner.

The eleventh hypothesis proposed that male respondents of lower economic classes would be less likely to have ever sought help because of violence from a partner than male respondents of higher economic classes. Gamma was found to have a strong relationship at 0.370, in the hypothesized direction indicating that men of lower economic classes were less likely to seek formal help for intimate partner violence than men of higher economic classes, at a significance of 0.025 indicating a statistical significance (p<0.1). When considering informal help-seeking, a weaker relationship was found with a gamma statistic of 0.137 with a significance of 0.437 indicating no statistical significance (p<0.1).

Table 27. Crosstabulation: Formal Help-Seeking for IPV and Men of Higher and Lower Economic Classes

			Economic class of males		
			Lower class males	Higher class males	Total
Did R seek out any of the listed formal help sources for abuse from partner?	No	Count	41	33	74
		% within class and males	73.2%	49.3%	60.2%
	Yes	Count	15	34	49
		% within class and males	26.8%	50.7%	39.8%
Total		Count	56	67	123
		% within class and males	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 28. Crosstabulation: Informal Help-Seeking for IPV and Men of Higher and Lower Economic Classes

			Economic class of males		
			Lower class males	Higher class males	Total
Did R seek out informal help from friends or family for abuse from partner?	No	Count	39	39	78
		% within class and males	69.6%	58.2%	63.4%
	Yes	Count	17	28	45
		% within class and males	30.4%	41.8%	36.6%
Total		Count	56	67	123
		% within class and males	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

<u>Hypothesis #12: Among men, respondents of lower economic classes will be less likely than men respondents of high economic classes to have reported hate motivated violence to the police</u>

The twelfth and final hypothesis proposed that male respondents of lower economic classes would be less likely to have reported hate motivated violence to the police than male respondents of higher economic classes. Gamma was found to have a slight relationship at 0.169, not in the hypothesized direction illustrating that men of higher classes were less likely to report hate violence to the police than lower class males at a significance of 0.307 indicating no statistical significance ($p < 0.1$).

Table 29. Crosstabulation: Help-Seeking for Hate Violence and Men of Higher and Lower Economic Classes

			Economic class and Gender		
			Higher Class Males	Lower Class Males	Total
Were any of the incidents reported to police?	No	Count	211	75	286
		% within class and gender	85.4%	80.6%	84.1%
	Yes	Count	36	18	54
		% within class and gender	14.6%	19.4%	15.9%
Total		Count	247	93	340
		% within class and gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Summary of the Findings

Out of the twelve proposed hypotheses ten were either slightly or moderately supported by the gamma measure, three of which were not in the hypothesized direction and four were statistically significant at p<0.1. The lack of statistical significance can be attributed to the small number of responses to many of the minority group variables. When attempting to examine relationships between variables, it is imperative to obtain a large enough probability based sample to ensure significant and relevant findings. In the following section I will discuss the findings, the limitations the data proposed and it's implications on future research opportunities.

Chapter 4 Discussion

First, it is essential to discuss the limitations that the data set posed in the analysis of these relationships. Because target sampling method was utilized to collect the data, there is less of an emphasis on the importance of statistical significance. The low number of statistically significant findings can be attributed to the limitations the sample proposed in terms of numbers; minority populations were very small and did not lend relevant findings. There were ten relationships that demonstrated some support for the influences of race and gender identity on whether or not survivors had sought help.

In hypothesis one, a moderate relationship was found in the overall sample between race and help-seeking for intimate partner violence. This provides some support for the findings in the literature review that indicated a difference in the perception and experiences of violence across race and whether or not help was sought. In hypotheses three and four a moderate and slight relationship was found in the overall sample between economic class and help-seeking for both intimate partner and hate motivated violence that also demonstrated high statistical significance. Both Meyer and Turrell's (2008) findings provided support for the influence of economic class on violent experiences and help-seeking. In hypothesis five, a slight relationship was found in the sample between gender identity and help-seeking for intimate partner violence. These findings demonstrated that men were less likely than women to seek help for intimate partner violence. These findings also support Meyer and Turrell's (2008) gender variances in help-seeking and is theoretically grounded in that it shows support for how rigid constructions of masculinity may act as a barrier to seeking help. In hypothesis six, a

considerable relationship was found in the overall sample between gender identity and help-seeking for hate motivated violence but not in the hypothesized direction. Instead, the crosstabulation revealed that women were less likely to report hate violence to the police than men. While this finding was not supported by the literature, in an application of the theoretical framework, it would challenge us to look at how women perceive the criminal justice system and its accessibility. In hypothesis nine a weak relationship was found within the lower economic classes group on the basis of gender identity with men being less likely to seek help. In hypothesis seven and eight, men of color and white men were compared in their help-seeking for intimate partner and hate motivated violence. This hypothesis, grounded in the findings of Meyer and Turrell (2008), proposed that a race difference within men would exist. Meyer found race based variations in how violence was experienced as well as Turrell who focused on help-seeking that indicated that men of color would be less likely to seek help and/or report. However, a moderate relationship was found when looking at help-seeking for violence from a partner in the hypothesized direction but also a moderate relationship existed that was not in the hypothesized direction when looking at police reporting for hate violence. While white men were more likely to seek help than men of color for intimate partner violence, they were found to be less likely to report hate violence to the police. When examining the crosstabulation however, it is essential to note the very small numbers for men of color that render this statistic less relevant. It is still likely that the findings in the literature review would be reflected through a project like this but it would require a much more diverse sample. In hypothesis eleven, a weak relationship was found within the lower

economic classes group on the basis of gender identity for help-seeking for intimate partner violence with men being less likely to seek help.

In help-seeking for intimate partner violence, a significant difference existed within the sample between the number of white men who sought help and men of color who sought help. The difference within the group of men indicates support for race based influences on help-seeking for intimate partner violence. In the analysis that looked at police reporting for hate motivated violence, again the relationship existed as the crosstabulation demonstrated the difference in the number of white men who reported versus men of color. In hypothesis ten, gender identity was analyzed within the lower economic classes group. Once again, this hypothesis was grounded in the findings of Meyer and Turrell that illustrated differences on the basis of gender in experiences and help seeking. Turrell's (2008) findings supported a strong indication that women were far more likely to seek help then men. The crosstabulation revealed a difference among men and women with a strong relationship but not in the hypothesized direction. In this sample, it resulted that women were less likely to report hate motivated violence to the police than men. While this was not supported by the literature, in an application of intersectionality, one could argue that this existed within the group as a result of sexism, patriarchal social structures and gender inequality embedded within our social and cultural contexts. Being of lower economic classes, sexism may perhaps be intensified within the group resulting in women being less likely to seek help, in particular from the police. In hypothesis eleven, a strong relationship was found showing that male respondents of lower economic classes were less likely to seek help because of violence

from a partner than male respondents of higher economic classes. Again, this is supported by the literature, demonstrating a stark difference in help seeking with the group of men on the basis of economic class. In hypothesis twelve, a slight relationship was found within men on the basis of economic class in help-seeking for hate motivated violence with men of lower economic classes being less likely to report. Again, these gender identity influences are evidenced in Turrell's findings that indicated that men were least likely to seek help for violent experiences. Finally, hypothesis two was the only one found to not have any relationship at all. This compared police reporting for hate violence on the basis of race and resulted in no relationship between the variables. The absence of a relationship can be attributed to the low number of people of color in the sample.

The logistic regression that was performed measured the simultaneous relationship of race, class and gender identity to help-seeking and reporting behaviors. This demonstrated that economic class was a significant predictor (p=.002) of formal help seeking behavior, controlling for gender identification and racial group. When increasing the economic class from low to high, the odds that help was sought doubled. This is strongly supported by the literature as it illustrates how economic barriers are a significant obstacle in accessing resources.

Overall, the findings of this analysis demonstrated moderate and slight support for the influences of race, class and gender identity on whether or not LGBTQ survivors of violence seek help. The logistic regression illustrated the significant influence of economic class on the help-seeking behavior of the respondents. Statistical significance

testing was used for heuristic purposes, since the study was exploratory and the sampling was nonprobability in design. The theoretical propositions of intersectionality that emphasize differences within groups and the influences of varying social localities on lived experiences, opportunities and structures were moderately supported through this research. The findings demonstrate support for the importance of looking at how various oppressed identities and differences in social localities within groups may have an impact on whether or not LGBTQ survivors of violence seek help.

Future Implications and Conclusion

The findings of this project have demonstrated support for previous studies that have looked at how race, class and gender identity may affect the experiences and help-seeking of LGBTQ survivors of violence. The availability of knowledge about violence and resources for violent experiences may be shaped and influenced by varying social localities. Historically oppressed and marginalized racial communities, lower economic classes and restrictive gender constructs all have been demonstrated to influence violent experiences and help-seeking. The barriers to resources can be theoretically rooted in the hostility of our social and cultural contexts that make it more difficult for communities of color and lower economic statuses. While intersectionality does not seek to identify who has it worse, it does influence us to look at the differences within groups and may provide insight into tailoring outreach for the LGBTQ community that is indicative of the diversity within the group.

Formal help-seeking resources are evidently not perceived as viable options for many in the LGBTQ community for experiences with intimate partner violence. Across

race group, economic groups and men and women, it was more common to not seek formal help resources. While differences existed across groups and within groups, with men, lower economic classes, and LGBTQ of color being less likely than women, higher economic classes and white LGBTQ to seek formal help, a general lack of formal help-seeking was evidenced throughout the sample. This carries various implications for domestic violence agencies and state laws. For domestic violence agencies, this and other findings should raise awareness around the disparity in outreach and services to the LGBTQ community. As mentioned in the methodology chapter, it was evident that some respondents in the survey were not identifying serious forms of relationship abuse as intimate partner violence. When directly asked if they had experienced intimate partner violence, there were respondents who selected "no" who later selected serious forms of experienced serious partner abuse. For anti-violence projects and domestic violence agencies, there should be a concern in challenging the heterosexist construct of intimate partner violence. Within same-sex relationship abuse, the heterosexist notions and assumptions surrounding the abuser and the person being abused that are evident across state laws, agency practices and outreach as well as law enforcement responses does not exist. In addition to challenging these assumptions, marketed services should strive to be more inclusive to the LGBTQ community by addressing the existence of intimate partner violence and how regardless of gender, domestic violence is a reality for which they have resources and inclusive staff.

The results of the project illustrated a tremendous distrust in the criminal justice system across race, class and gender identity. Of those respondents who had experienced

hate motivated violence, only 26.1% sought help from the police. When examining differences across race, class and gender identity, the percentage distributions illustrated that regardless of social demography, the police were not a viable option for many. However, when examining respondents of lower economic classes, a strong relationship was found between gender and not reporting to the police. Of those lower economic class women, almost 90% did not report hate motivated violence to the police compared to 80.2% of lower economic class men. The magnitude of that disparity in help-seeking, not just among lower economic class women, but as evidenced throughout the sample, should have serious implications for law enforcement in Virginia. These results bring into question the commonwealths' laws on hate violence directed towards sexual orientation and gender identity, homophobia among police officers and institutionalized homophobia within the criminal justice system. First, it should be noted that sexual orientation is not an acknowledged protected category under state law in Virginia. When survivors of hate motivated violence know or assume that their experiences are not validated as a hate crime by the states laws, it discourages police reporting and replicates a cycle of silence. Second, while this project did not focus on the perceptions of law enforcement within the community, it should be noted that homophobia within the criminal justice system and among police officers may be playing a part in the lack of trust within the LGBTQ community. Conscious efforts in training of law enforcement to raise awareness around issues of homophobia and heterosexism and how to address not only hate violence on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity but also in cases of same sex intimate partner violence.

In assessing intersectionality quantitatively, the data set posed several limitations that have implications on future research. When examining within group differences and how intersectional qualities of social life shape and influence varying realities, it is first imperative to obtain a diverse sample. Intersectionality emphasizes the need to look at various identities encompasses by individuals and without a diverse sample, analysis is limited when minority category intersect with other minority categories. For example, in this project, it was not possible to look at the three social variables intersecting at once and their influences on the dependent variable because this process created variables with very few to zero respondents – eg., transgender respondents of color who were survivors of intimate partner violence. As a result, a detailed intersectional analysis of the data was not possible. These limitations posed by the data set did not allow for more complex multivariate analyses to be performed due to sample sizes. In the future, it would be beneficial to ensure that a large diverse sample was obtained in order to more accurately study the influences of intersecting identities.   The survey instrument itself posed its own setbacks as it featured questions that were phrased in double negatives such as "I have never sought help for violence from an intimate partner – Yes or No". In the future, it would be beneficial for community agencies to partner with researchers in academic institutions in order to achieve more relevant findings. Through these collaborations, community agencies can maximize their efforts by constructing survey instruments that more adequately measure the phenomenon of interest and ensure diversity, better sampling methods, efficient data entry and variable coding.

Future research should continue to assess the impacts of varying localities on the experiences of violence and whether or not LGBTQ survivors seek help. Future endeavors should take into account the need to represent the diversity within the LGBTQ community and the specific needs that groups within the community may be experiencing. Through targeting LGBTQ members of color, of various economic classes, gender identities, ages, geographic localities and more, more diverse samples could be obtained to ensure adequate representation of intersectional groups.

References

Allard, S. A. 1991. Rethinking battered women's syndrome: A Black feminist perspective. *UCLA W omen's Law Journal*, *1*, 191-207

Andermahr, S., T. Lovel and C. Wolkowitz (1997): *A Concise Glossary of Feminist Theory* (London and New York: Arnold)

Andermahr, S., T. Lovel and C. Wolkowitz (1997): *A Concise Glossary of Feminist Theory* (London and New York: Arnold)

Appelrouth, S, & Edles, L (2007). Sociological Theory in the Contemporary Era: Text and Readings.Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press

Arriaga,W. B., & Capezza, N. M. (2005). Targets of partner violence. The importance of understanding coping trajectories. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20, 89–99.

Blackless, M. et. Al (2003). "Atypical Gender Development – A Review". International Journal of Transgenderism 9: 29–44

Bograd, M. 1999. Strengthening domestic violence theories: Intersections of race, class, sexual orientation, and gender. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *25*, 275 -289.

Briere, J., & Jordan, C. E. (2004). Violence against women. Outcome complexity and implications for assessment and treatment. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19, 1252–1276.

Butler, L. (1999). African American lesbian women experiencing partner abuse. In J.McClennan & J. Gunther (Eds.), *A professional guide to understanding gay and lesbian domestic violence* (pp. 181-205). Pittsburgh, PA: Edwin Mellen.

Burke, L.,&Follingstad, D. (1999). Violence in lesbian and gay relationships: Theory, prevalence, and correlational factors. *Clinical Psychology Review, 19*, 487-312.

Clough, P. T. (1994): *Feminist Thought* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers New York: Routledge.

Coleman, V. (1990). Violence in lesbian couples: A between group comparison. Abstract from: Silver Platter File: Psych Lit: Dissertation Abstracts Item: 9109022.

Collins, P. H. 2000. "Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of Empowerment" (2nd ed.). NY: Routledge.

Collins, P.H (2005). "Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender and the New Racism" Routledge

Collins, P.H. 2006. "From Black Power to Hip Hop: Racism, Nationalism, and Feminism". Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press

Courvant, D., & Cook-Daniels, L. (2000-2001). Trans and intersex survivors of domestic violence: Defining terms, barriers and responsibilities. Retrieved May 16, 2009, from the Survivor Project Web site: www.survivorproject.org/defbarresp.html

Crenshaw,K. (1994). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. InM. A. Fineman& R. Mykitiuk (Eds.), *The public nature of private violence: The discovery of domestic abuse* (pp. 93-118).

Cruz, J. M. (2003). Why doesn't he just leave? Gay male domestic violence and the reasons victims stay. *Journal of Men's Studies, 11*(3) 309-319.

Cruz, J. M., & Firestone, J. M. (1998). Exploring violence in gay male relationships. *Violence and Victims, 13*, 159-173.

Dasgupta, S. D. (1998).Women's realities: Defining violence against women by immigration, race and class. In R. K. Bergen (Ed.). *Issues in intimate violence* (pp. 209-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

De Vidas, Michael (1999). "Childhood Sexual Abuse and Domestic Violence: A Support Group for Latino Gay Men and Lesbians." *Journal of Gay Lesbian Social Services* 10(2):51.

Eastburn, J., & Sigrist, S. (1988). Lesbian battering: An exploratory study. Unpublished thesis, CA State University, Sacramento.

Girshick, L. (2002). *Woman to woman sexual violence: Does she call it rape?* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Greene, B. (1994). Lesbian women of color. In Comas-Diaz, L & Greene, B.(Eds.). *Women of color* (pp. 389-427). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Hamberger, L. K. (1996). Intervention in gay male intimate violence requires coordinated efforts on multiple levels. *Journal of Gay&Lesbian Social Services, 4*, 83-91.

Hammond, N. (1988). Lesbian victims of relationship violence. *Women and Therapy, 8,* 89-105.

Hart, B. J. (1986). Lesbian battering: An examination. In K. Lobel (Ed.) *Naming the violence.* Seattle, WA: Seal Press.

Island, D., & Letellier, P. (1991). *Men who beat the men who love them: Battered gay men and domestic violence.* New York: Haworth Press.

Jacobs, R., Rasmussen, L., & Hohman, M. (1999). The social support needs of older lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *Journal of Gay&Lesbian Social Services, 9*(1), 1-30.

Jenkins, Morris. 2009. "The Attitudes of Black and White College Students Toward Gays and Lesbians." *Journal of Black Studies* 39(4).

Josephson, J. (2002). The intersectionality of domestic violence and welfare in the lives of poor women. *Journal of Poverty*, *6*, 1-20.

Kanuha, V. (1990). Compounding the triple jeopardy: Battering in lesbian of color relationships. *Women and Therapy, 9,* 169-184.

Kaufman Kantor, G., Jasinski, J., & Aldarondo, E. (1994). Socio-cultural status and incidence of marital violence in Hispanic families. *Violence and Victims*, 9

Kelly, E., & Warshafsky, L. (1987). *Partner abuse in gay male and lesbian couples.* Paper presented at the Third National Conference of Family Violence Researchers, Durham, NH.

Koss, M.,Goodman, L., Browne, A., Fitzgerald, L., Keita, G., & Russo, N. (1994). *No safe haven: Male violence against women at home, at work, and in the community.* Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Kanuha, V. (1996). Domestic violence, racism and the battered women's movement in the United States. In J. L. Edelson&Z. C. Eisikovits (Eds.), *Future interventions with battered women and their families* (pp. 34-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuehnle K, Sullivan A (2003). Gay and lesbian victimization: Reporting factors in domestic violence and bias incidents Criminal Justice and Behavior. 30(1):85-96

Leventhal, B., & Lundy, S. (Eds.). (1999). *Same-sex domestic violence: Strategies for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Letellier, P. (1994). Gay and bisexual male domestic violence victimization:Challenges to feminist theory and responses to violence. *Violence and Victims, 9,* 95-106.

Lie, G-Y., & Gentlewarrior, S. (1991). Intimate violence in lesbian relationships: Discussion of survey findings and practical implications. *Journal of Social Service Research,15,* 41-59.

Lie, G-Y., Schilit, R., Bush, J., Montagne, M., & Reyes, L. (1991). Lesbians in currently aggressive relationships: How frequently do they report aggressive past relationships? *Violence and Victims, 6,* 121-135.

Lockhart, L., White, B., Causby, V., & Isaac, A. (1994). Letting out the secret: Violence in lesbian relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9,* 469-492. *Susan C. Turell and La Vonne Cornell-Swanson 87*

Loulan, J. (1987). *Lesbian passion: Loving ourselves and each other*. San Francisco: Spinsters Books.

Maier, Shana. 2008. "Rape Victim Advocates' Perception of the Influence of Race and Ethnicity on Victims' Responses to Rape." *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 6(4):303

Mann, S. A.,&Grimes, M. (2001).Common and contested ground: Marxism and race, gender and class analysis. *Race, Gender & Class*, 8-32. *Domestic Violence at the Margins*

McCarry, M. (2008). *Comparing Domestic Abuse in Same Sex and Heterosexual Relationships*, Violence Against Women Research Group/University of Bristol

McClennen, J., Summers, A., & Vaughan. C. (2002). Gay men's domestic violence: Dynamics, help seeking behaviors, and correlates. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 14*(1), 23-49.

McClennen, J. C. (1999). Prevailing theories regarding same-gender partner abuse: Proposing the feminist social-psychological model. In J. C. McClennen & J. Gunther (Eds.), A professional's guide to understanding gay and lesbian domestic violence: Understanding practiceinterventions (pp. 3-12). Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

McClennen, J. C., Summers, B.,&Daley, J. G. (2002). Lesbian partner abuse scale. Research on Social Work Practice, 12(2), 277-292.

McClennen, J. C., Summers, B., & Vaughan, C. (2002). Gay men's domestic violence: Dynamics, help-seeking behaviors, and correlates. Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services,14(1), 23-49.

Mendez, J. M. (1996). Serving gays and lesbians of color who are survivors of domestic violence. In C. Renzetti & C. Miley (Eds). *Violence in gay and lesbian domestic partnerships*. New York: Haworth Press.

Merrill, G.,&Wolfe, V. (2000). Battered gay men: An exploration of abuse, help seeking, and why they stay. *Journal of Homosexuality, 39*(2), 1-30.

Meyer, Doug (2008). Interpreting and Experiencing Anti-Queer Violence: Race, Class, and Gender Differences Among LGBT Hate Crime Victims. Race, Gender & Class: Volume 15, Number 3-4, 2008 (262-282)

Narayan, U. (1989): "The Project of Feminist Epistemology" in S. Bordo and A. Jaggar eds., *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing* (Rutgers: Rutgers University Press) pp.256-272

Owen, S. S., & Burke, T. W. (2004). An exploration of prevalence of domestic violence in same-sex relationships. *Psychological Reports, 95*(1), 129-132.

Rennison, C., & Planty, M. (2003). Non-lethal intimate partner violence: Examining race, gender and income patterns. *Violence and Victims, 18*(4), 433-443.

Renzetti, C. M. (1998).Violence and abuse in lesbian relationships: Theoretical and empirical issues. In R. K. Bergen (Ed.), *Issues in intimate violence* (pp. 117-127). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Renzetti, C. (1992). *Violent betrayal: Partner abuse in lesbian relationships*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Renzetti, C. (1996). The poverty of services for battered lesbians. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 4,* 61-68.

Renzetti, C. (1997). Violence and abuse among same-sex couples. In A. P.Cardarelli(Ed), *Violence between intimate partners: Patterns, causes and effects* (pp. 70-89). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Renzetti, C., & Miley, C. (Eds.) (1996). *Violence in gay and lesbian domestic partnerships.* New York: Haworth Press.

Richie, B. (1996). *Compelled to crime: The gender entrapment of battered Black women*.NewYork: Routledge.

Richie, B. (2000).ABlack feminist reflection on the antiviolence movement. *Signs*, *25*, 1133 -1137.

Ristock, J. (2002). *No more secrets: Violence in lesbian relationships*. New York: Routledge.

Rivera, J. (1997). Domestic violence against Latinas by Latino males: An analysis of race, national origin, and gender differentials. In A. K. Wing (Ed.), *Critical race feminism: A reader* (pp. 259-266). New York: New York University Pres

Scherzer, T. (1998). Domestic violence in lesbian relationships: Findings of the lesbian relationships research project. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 2*(1), 29-47.

Sokoloff, N. J. (with C. Pratt; Eds.). (2005). *Domestic violence at the margins: Readings in race ,class, gender, and culture*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Volpp, L. (2005). Feminism versus multiculturalism. In N. J. Sokoloff (with C. Pratt; Eds.), *Domestic violence at the margins: Readings in race, class, gender, and culture*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Turell, S. C. (2000). A descriptive analysis of same-sex relationship violence in an ethnically diverse sample. *Journal of Family Violence, 15,* 281-293.

Vatnar, S, & Bjørkly, S. (2009). Interactional aspects of intimate partner violence result in different help-seeking behaviors in a representative sample of women. *Journal of Family Violence, 24:231–241*

Waldner-Haugrud, L., Gratch, L., & Magruder, B. (1997). Victimization and perpetration rates of violence in gay and lesbian relationships: Gender issues explored. *Violence and Victims, 12,* 173-184.

Waldron, C. (1996). Lesbians of color and the domestic violence movement. In C. Renzetti, & C. Miley (Eds.). *Violence in gay and lesbian domestic partnerships.* New York: Haworth Press.

Waterman, C., Dawson, L., & Bologna, M. (1989). Sexual coercion in gay male and lesbian relationships: Predictors and implications for support services. *Journal of Sex Research, 26,* 118-124.

Zinn, M. B. and B. Thornton Dill (1996): "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism", *Feminist Studies* 22(2) pp.321-331

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Anti-Violence Project Community Survey
Equality Virginia Education Fund

The purpose of this study is to learn about the experiences and needs of members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) communities across the Commonwealth related to issues of violence.

The Anti-Violence Project will use the results of this survey to provide recommendations to service providers and legislators on issues pertaining to violence. This information will also be used to guide the programmatic work of the Anti-Violence Project in the future.

This survey is completely anonymous and confidential.

It should take between 15-30 minutes to complete the survey. Your participation is completely voluntary. You can skip questions you do not want to answer and can stop at any time.

The survey will cover sexual violence, intimate partner violence, hate crimes, stalking, and bias based discrimination. For some people, answering questions about personal experiences can be very upsetting. If you become upset during this survey, please remember that you can stop at any time.

Here are some hotline numbers you can call for support:

Triangle Foundation (Michigan)
877.787.4264   24hr hotline

New York City Anti-Violence Project
212.714.1141   24hr bilingual hotline

Gay and Lesbian National Hotline
(serves bisexual and transgender people)
Monday-Friday 4pm-12am EST, Saturday 12pm-5pm EST
888.843.4564

Buckeye Region Anti-Violence Program (Ohio)
866.86.BRAVO (866.862.7286) 24hr hotline

> Once you have completed your survey, please return to:
> Anti-Violence Project
> c/o Equality Virginia Education Fund
> 403 N. Robinson St.
> Richmond, VA 23220

Eligibility Requirements

If you answer no to either question, please do not complete this survey.
Thank you for your interest, but you are not eligible to participate.

1. Are you a resident of Virginia?
(If you live in or attend school in Virginia, you will be considered a resident for the purposes of this study.)

☐ Yes   ☐ No

2. Do you identify yourself as having a non-heterosexual sexual orientation **OR** a gender identity or expression not traditionally associated with your birth sex?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

How did you find out about this survey?

[   ]

Section I
Please answer these questions as honestly as possible.
Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1.   What is your sexual orientation? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Gay   ☐ Lesbian   ☐ Bisexual
☐ Queer   ☐ Questioning   ☐ No label
☐ Heterosexual   [   ]
☐ Other (please explain):

2.   What is your gender identity? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Male   ☐ Female   ☐ Transgender
☐ Androgynous   ☐ Genderqueer   ☐ Transgender
☐ FTM Transgender MTF   [   ]
☐ Other (please explain):

3.   What was your physical, assigned sex at birth?
☐ Male   ☐ Female   ☐ Intersex

4.   What is your racial/ethnic background? (check ALL that apply)

- [ ] African American (black)
- [ ] Latino/a
- [ ] Asian/Pacific Islander
- [ ] Multi/bi-racial
- [ ] Other (please explain):
- [ ] Caucasian (white)
- [ ] Native American/American Indian
- [ ] Caribbean

5.   What is the language you speak most often? (check ONE only)

- [ ] English
- [ ] An Asian language
- [ ] American Sign Language
- [ ] Other (please explain):
- [ ] Spanish
- [ ] An African language
- [ ] Multilingual

6.   What is your age? [ ]

7.   If you are a college student, which college/university/community college do you attend?

8.   Describe the area in which you live:
- [ ] Rural
- [ ] Urban
- [ ] Suburban

9.   What city or county, *in Virginia*, do you primarily live in?

10.   Is that:
- [ ] City
- [ ] County

11.   What is your current living situation? (check ONE only)
- [ ] Own/ co-own
- [ ] Rent/ share
- [ ] Transitional/halfway house
- [ ] Assisted housing through religious group/government agency/private agency
- [ ] Hospice
- [ ] Homeless and in shelter
- [ ] Homeless and on streets
- [ ] Assisted living facility/retirement community
- [ ] Domestic violence shelter
- [ ] Other: (please explain)

13.   Who else shares your living space? (check ALL that apply)

- [ ] Live alone
- [ ] Live with LGBTQ roommate(s)
- [ ] Live with straight roommate(s)
- [ ] Live with significant other
- [ ] Live with spouse
- [ ] Live with immediate birth family
- [ ] Live with other birth family members
- [ ] Live with strangers
- [ ] Live with your or your significant other's children
- [ ] Other: (please explain)

14. How many adults (18 and older) live with you? [ ]

15. How many children (17 and younger) live with you? [ ]

16. What is your highest level of education?
- [ ] 8th grade or less
- [ ] Some high school
- [ ] High school graduate/GED
- [ ] Some college
- [ ] College graduate
- [ ] Nursing degree
- [ ] Technical certificate/associate's degree
- [ ] Graduate or professional degree

17. What is your current employment status?
- [ ] Full time (35 hrs or more per week)
- [ ] Part time (less than 35 hours/week)
- [ ] Student (full time, not working)
- [ ] Retired
- [ ] Student (full time, working)
- [ ] Student (part time)
- [ ] Disability (out of work)
- [ ] Unemployed
- [ ] Unpaid full time caregiver (of child or adult)
- [ ] Sex work or drug trade
- [ ] Other: (please explain)

18. What is your annual income from all sources before taxes?
- [ ] I have no source of income
- [ ] $40,000 to $49,999
- [ ] $1 to $9,999
- [ ] $50,000 to $64,999
- [ ] $10,000 to $19,999
- [ ] $65,000 to $79,999
- [ ] $20,000 to $29,999
- [ ] $80,000 to $99,999
- [ ] $30,000 to $39,999
- [ ] $100,000 and beyond

Section II

Now you will be asked whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree/disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree based on your thoughts about sexual violence, intimate partner violence (domestic violence), stalking, and hate crimes within the LGBTQ community. Please mark your answers as honestly as possible. N/A could also mean "I don't know."
Remember, you can skip statements or stop at any time.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1. Intimate partner (abuse/violence) is a problem in LGBTQ communities.	[ ] 1	[ ] 2	[ ] 3	[ ] 4	[ ] 5	[ ] N/A

2. Sexual violence is a problem in LGBTQ communities. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

3. Domestic violence agencies primarily serve straight women. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

4. Virginia law enforcement is sensitive to LGBTQ partner abuse. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

5. Gay men are less likely than lesbians to reach out for help. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

6. I know my legal rights around same-gender partner abuse or abuse in a relationship where one or more partners are transgender. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

7. I know my legal rights around sexual violence/assault. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

8. Some people in abusive same-gender relationships do not report abuse because they do not want to disclose their sexual orientation to the police or others. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

9. Some transgender people in abusive relationships do not report abuse because they do not want to disclose their transgender status to the police or others. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

10. Addressing LGBTQ intimate partner violence should be a priority for the LGBTQ community. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

11. Virginia law regarding domestic violence applies to LGBTQ relationships as well as straight relationships ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

12. Women cannot sexually assault or rape other women. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

13. Members of the transgender community face a high risk of hate crimes. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

14. Protective orders are always available to LGBTQ persons experiencing violence in Virginia. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

15. I would feel comfortable reporting intimate partner violence to the police. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

16. I would feel comfortable reporting Intimate partner violence to the police if an LGBTQ liaison unit would respond. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

17. I would feel comfortable calling an LGBTQ-specific hotline for services relating to sexual violence and intimate partner violence. ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
18. I would reach out to friends, family, or a therapist before calling a domestic violence program or sexual assault crisis center.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ N/A
19. There is enough information on LGBTQ sexual and/or intimate partner violence readily available in my area.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ N/A
20. Lesbians don't batter because they're women and women are not batterers.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ N/A
21. Stalking is a punishable offense in Virginia.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ N/A
22. Hate crimes are no longer an issue for the LGBTQ community.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ N/A
23. Women cannot sexually assault or rape men.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ N/A

Section III Part A

You will now be asked questions about your specific experiences with sexual violence.
Please be as honest as possible with your answers.
Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1. When you were a child, age 17 and younger, did anyone coerce/force you to engage in any unwanted sexual activity?
☐ Yes   ☐ No *(skip to Section III Part B)*

2. As a child, age 17 and younger, at what ages did this unwanted sexual activity take place?

3. What happened to you during this (these) experience(s)? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Forced/coerced oral sex   ☐ Forced/coerced you to touch someone's genitals
☐ Forced/coerced anal sex   ☐ Unwanted sexual contact through your clothes
☐ Forced/coerced vaginal sex   ☐ Forced/coerced to have unprotected sex
☐ Forced/coerced you to watch sexual activity or pornography
☐ Other: (please explain)

4. Who forced you to engage in unwanted sexual activity? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Father   ☐ Stepfather
☐ Mother   ☐ Stepmother
☐ Brother/Sister   ☐ Stepbrother/stepsister
☐ Member of extended family   ☐ Friend of family
☐ Dating partner   ☐ Member of clergy
☐ Care provider (teacher, babysitter, etc.)

☐ Stranger   ☐ Prison guard or staff member
☐ Law enforcement officer   ☐ Health care provider
☐ Sex work client
☐ Other: (please explain)

5. What was the gender of the person who assaulted you?
☐ Unknown   ☐ Male
☐ Female   ☐ Transgender
☐ Other: (please explain)

6. What was the sexual orientation of the person who assaulted you?
☐ Unknown   ☐ Heterosexual   ☐ Lesbian
☐ Gay   ☐ Bisexual   ☐ Queer
☐ Other: (please explain)

7. Was this assault in the context of an intimate dating relationship?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

8. Did you seek services/support as a result of this violence?
☐ Yes   ☐ No *(skip to Section III Part B)*

9. If yes, who did you reach out to?(check ALL that apply)
☐ Law enforcement officer   │ │ Family member   │ Friend
☐ Therapist   Teacher   Hotline
☐ Hospital/doctor
☐ Other: (please explain)

10. Please, describe briefly what happened after you reported the abuse.

Section III Part B
Please answer as honestly as possible.
Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1. Since the time you were 18 years old, have you ever been coerced/forced to engage in any unwanted sexual activity?
☐ Yes   ☐ No *(skip to Section IV Part A)*

2. What has happened to you? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Forced/coerced oral sex   ☐ Forced/coerced you to touch someone's genitals
☐ Forced/coerced anal sex   ☐ Unwanted sexual contact through your clothes
☐ Forced/coerced vaginal sex   ☐ Forced/coerced to have unprotected sex
☐ Forced/coerced you to watch sexual activity or pornography
☐ Someone violated your S&M boundaries/safe word

☐ Other: (please explain)

3.　　　Who forced you to engage in unwanted sexual activity? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Primary partner　　　　Ex-partner　　　　Father
☐ Stepfather　　　　　　　Mother　　　　　　Stepmother
☐ Brother and/or sister　　Stepbrother/sister　Roommate
☐ Friend　　　　　　　　　Sex work client　　Acquaintance
☐ Health care provider　　☐ Date　　　　　　☐ Member of your extended
family
☐ Law enforcement officer　☐ Adult care provider　☐ Stranger
☐ Prison guard or staff member　　　　　　　☐ Member of partner's family
☐ Other: (please explain)

4.　　　What was the gender of the person(s) who assaulted you? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Unknown　　　　　　　☐ Male
☐ Female　　　　　　　　☐ Transgender
☐ Other: (please explain)

5.　　　What was the sexual orientation of the person(s) who assaulted you? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Unknown　　　　　　☐ Heterosexual　　　☐ Lesbian
☐ Gay　　　　　　　　　Bisexual　　　　　　Queer
☐ Other: (please explain)

6. Was this assault in the context of an intimate relationship (i.e. was this your partner, ex-partner, boy/girlfriend, ex-boy/girlfriend etc)?
☐ Yes　　　　　☐ No

7. Did you seek any services/support as a result of this (these) experience(s)?
☐ Yes　　　　　☐ No *(skip to Section IV Part A)*

8. Who did you reach out to? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Hotline　　　　　　Police　　　　　　　　Hospital/doctor
☐ Therapist　　　　　Friend　　　　　　　　Family member
☐ Other: (please explain)

9. Please, describe briefly what happened after you reported the abuse?

Section IV Part A
You will now be asked about specific experiences of intimate partner violence (domestic violence). Please be as honest as possible with your answers.

Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1. At any point in your lifetime have you ever been in an abusive romantic/sexual relationship?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

2.   During any relationship in your lifetime has your partner ever: (check ALL that apply)
☐ Slapped you   ☐ Yelled at you
☐ Stabbed you   ☐ Threatened to hurt you with a weapon
☐ Withheld medication from you   ☐ Made you afraid of them
☐ Choked you   ☐ Disclosed or threatened to disclose your HIV status

☐ Abused your children   ☐ Threatened to take away your children
☐ Punched you   ☐ Kept you from seeing your friends
☐ Threatened to have you deported
☐ Forced you to engage in unwanted sexual activity
☐ Did not honor your boundaries/safe word in S&M scene
☐ Told you that you weren't a "real lesbian" or a "real gay man"
☐ Told you that you weren't a "real man" or a "real woman"
☐ Disclosed or threatened to disclose your sexual orientation
☐ Disclosed or threatened to disclose your transgender status
☐ Made you financially responsible for the household
☐ Made you financially dependent on them
☐ Harmed or threatened to harm your pets
☐ Other acts of violence/abuse
☐ None of the above (*skip to Section IV Part B)*

3. For those checked in #2, was the offending partner ever the same gender as you?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

4.   For those checked in #2, was the offending partner ever a transgender individual?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

5.   Have you ever needed medical attention as a result of violence from a partner?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

6.   Have you ever been left homeless as a result of violence from a partner?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

7.   Have you ever lost custody of your children as a result of violence from a partner?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

8.   Have you ever sought help because of violence from a partner? (check ALL that apply)
☐ I have never sought help because of violence from a partner *(skip to #10)*
☐ Domestic violence shelter   Law enforcement   Hotline
☐ Criminal Justice System   Therapist   Friend

www.manaraa.com

☐ Family member   ❙ LGBTQ advocacy group   ☐ Doctor/ER
☐ Clergy/Minister   Support group
☐ Other: (please explain)

9. Of those you sought help from, how helpful were they?

	Least Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Neutral	More Helpful	Most Helpful	
Domestic violence shelter	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Law enforcement	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Hotline	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Therapist	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Friend	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Family member	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Criminal Justice System	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Clergy/Minister	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
LGBTQ advocacy group	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Doctor/ER	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Support group	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A
Other (from above)	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	N/A

10. If you did not seek help, could you explain what kept you from seeking help? (check ALL that apply)
☐ Fear of hostile reactions
☐ Fear that shelter wouldn't accept you
☐ Fear of Homophobia in criminal justice system
☐ Fear of having to disclose your sexual orientation or gender identity
☐ There were no resources in your area
☐ Fear no one would believe you
☐ Afraid of your partner's reaction
☐ Other: (please explain)

Section IV Part B
1.   Have you ever, in your intimate relationships, … (check ALL that apply)
☐ Slapped your partner
☐ Disclosed or threatened to disclose your partner's sexual orientation
☐ Disclosed or threatened to disclose your partner's transgender status
☐ Yelled at your partner
☐ Withheld medication from your partner
☐ Made your partner afraid of you
☐ Threatened your partner with a weapon
☐ Punched your partner
☐ Kept them from seeing their friends
☐ Threatened to have your partner deported

المنارة للاستشارات

- ☐ Threatened to take away your or your partner's children
- ☐ Hurt your and/or your partner's children
- ☐ Forced your partner to engage in unwanted sexual activity
- ☐ Made your partner financially dependent on you
- ☐ Stabbed your partner
- ☐ Choked your partner
- ☐ Told your partner they weren't a "real lesbian" or a "real gay man"
- ☐ Told your partner that they weren't a "real man" or a "real woman"
- ☐ Made your partner financially dependent on you

2.   Now, think of all the times someone has hurt (physically or emotionally) you when you were in a close relationship. Who hurt you?: (check ALL that apply)

- ☐ Primary partner
- ☐ Stepfather
- ☐ Brother and/or sister
- ☐ Member of partner's family
- ☐ Dating partner
- ☐ Other: (please explain)

- ☐ Ex-partner
- ☐ Mother
- ☐ Stepbrother/sister
- ☐ Extended family member
- ☐ Roommate/ex-roommate

- Father
- Stepmother
- Adult child
- Close friend

Section V Part A
You will now be asked questions about specific experiences of hate crime violence, harassment, and bias motivated discrimination. Please answer as honestly as possible. Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1.   Have you ever been the victim of hate crime violence or harassment based on your actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?

☐ Yes- sexual orientation   ☐ Yes- gender identity   ☐ No *(skip to Section V Part B)*

2.   How many times have you experienced hate crime violence/harassment?

☐ 1-4   ☐ 5-9   ☐ 10-15   ☐ 16 or more

3. What has happened to you? (choose ALL that apply)
- ☐ Physically assaulted ☐ Verbally assaulted
- ☐ Sexually assaulted   ☐ Spit at/on
- ☐ Object thrown at you ☐ Threatened to hurt you
- ☐ Vandalized your property ☐ Destroyed your property
- ☐ Chased/followed you ☐ Bullied at school

4. Were weapons used in any of those incidents?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

5.   If yes, what kind(s) of weapon(s) was(were) used? Please describe:

6. Were any of the incidents reported to police?
☐ Yes   ☐ No *(skip to #8)*

7. If reported, were any of these incidents investigated as a hate crime?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

8. Were any of these incidents in the context of an intimate partner relationship?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

Section V Part B
Please answer as honestly as possible.
Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1. Have you experienced discrimination based on your actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression? (choose ALL that apply:)
☐ Yes- sexual orientation   ☐ Yes- gender identity/expression
☐ No *(skip to Section V Part C)*

2. Of the discrimination you experienced, which of the following happened to you? (choose ALL that apply)
☐ Fired from job   ☐ Denied a promotion Discrimination
☐ in school   ☐ Other discrimination in workplace
☐ Housing discrimination ☐ Discrimination from care providers
☐ Other: (please explain)

Section V Part C

	Very Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely
1. How likely is it that you will experience ☐ 5 hate crime or bias related violence/discrimination in the next year based on your actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	
2. How likely is it that you will experience ☐ 5 hate crime or bias related violence/discrimination in your lifetime based on your actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	

Section VI
Now you will be asked questions about specific experiences of stalking. Please answer as honestly as possible.

Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1. Not counting bill collectors, telephone/door-to-door solicitors, or other salespeople, has anyone ever: (check ALL that apply)

☐ Followed or spied on you
☐ Made unwanted phone calls to you
☐ Stood outside your home, school, or workplace
☐ Left unwanted items for you to find
☐ Sent you unwanted letters, email, text messages, or other mail
☐ Hacked into your email accounts
☐ Vandalized your property
☐ Tried to communicate with you against your will
☐ None of the above *(skip to Section VII)*

2. If you checked one or more items in #1, were any of these things done on more than one occasion?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

3. Did you feel frightened or fear bodily harm as a result of these behaviors?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

4. For all incidents checked above, who was the person exhibiting stalking behavior? (check ALL that apply)

☐ Primary partner   ☐ Ex-partner   ☐ Date   ☐ Friend/acquaintance
☐ Relative   ☐ Stranger   ☐ Co-worker
☐ Other: (please explain)

5. Did you report these incidents to police?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

6. Have you ever sought help because of these experiences? (check ALL that apply)

☐ I did not seek help *(skip to Section VII)*
☐ Domestic violence shelter   │ Law enforcement
☐ Hotline   │ Therapist   │ Friend
☐ Family member   │ Criminal Justice System │ Clergy/Minister
☐ LGBTQ advocacy group   │ Doctor/ER   │ Support group
☐ Other: (please explain)

7. Of those you sought help from, who was most helpful?

Least Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Neutral	More Helpful	Most Helpful

Domestic violence shelter	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Law enforcement	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Hotline	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Therapist	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Friend	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Family member	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Criminal Justice System	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Clergy/Minister	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
LGBTQ advocacy group	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Doctor/ER	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Support group	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Other (from above)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Section VII

Now you will be asked about other people you have known and their experiences with violence. Please answer as honestly as possible. Remember, you can skip questions or stop at any time.

1. Has any LGBTQ person you've known personally experienced sexual violence? (By this we mean, been forced to engage in *any* unwanted sexual activity)

☐   Yes ☐   No

2. Has any LGBTQ person you've known personally experienced intimate partner violence? (By this we mean experienced physical, sexual, or emotional violence in the context of an intimate relationship)

☐   Yes ☐   No

3. Has any LGBTQ person you've known personally experienced hate crime violence based on their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?

☐   Yes- sexual orientation   ☐   Yes- gender identity/expression   ☐   No

4. Has any LGBTQ person you've known personally been murdered as a result of hate crime violence based on their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?

☐   Yes- sexual orientation   ☐   Yes- gender identity/expression   ☐   No

5. Has any LGBTQ person you've known personally experienced discrimination or harassment based on their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity/expression?

☐   Yes- sexual orientation   ☐   Yes- gender identity/expression   ☐   No

6. Has any LGBTQ person you've known personally experienced stalking behavior?

☐   Yes ☐   No

7. Please use this space to add any comments or reflections about the information and experiences referenced in this survey.

Thank you for participating.