

Queer Victims:  
Reports of Violence by LGBTQI Survivors Result in Violent Assaults by Police

by

Patrick Farr

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Social Work

Approved June 2016 by the  
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Craig Lecroy, Chair  
Cindy Sangalang  
Mary Ellen Brown

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2016

## ABSTRACT

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex (LGBTQI) people are often victimized by law enforcement and these victimizations often are related to victimizations of domestic violence and hate violence. Because reporting a victimization to the police leads to contact with police, a part of the research question involved herein looked at whether or not reporting a victimization to the police also increases the rate of police violence. Through secondary data analysis, this study investigated the correlation between reporting domestic violence and hate violence to the police, and subsequent victimizations by the police in the form of police violence. Additionally, through secondary data analysis, this study investigated whether or not this correlation is stronger with transgender women and people of color. All data analyzed in this study was collected in Tucson, Arizona through the Wingspan Anti-Violence Project (WAVP). All data was analyzed with the permission of the data owner, the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP) (see Appendix IV), and with IRB approval from the Arizona State University Office of Research Integrity and Assurance (see Appendix III). The findings demonstrated a positive correlation between the rate of LGBTQI people reporting violent crimes to the police and the rate of police violence against LGBTQI survivors of domestic violence and hate violence. The results further demonstrated the rate of police violence associated with reporting domestic violence or hate violence is greatest for transgender women and people of color.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODS.....	5
Data Source .....	5
Participants and Data Collection.....	7
Data Extraction Procedure.....	8
Research Question.....	9
Primary and Secondary Hypotheses.....	9
Operationalization of Variables .....	10
Univariate Analysis .....	12
Bivariate Analysis .....	13
RESULTS.....	14
Police Contact .....	14
Police Reports .....	15
Negative Police Contact .....	15
Primary Hypothesis .....	16
Secondary Hypothesis .....	19
DISCUSSION.....	21
CONCLUSION.....	26
REFERENCES.....	31

APPENDIX	Page
I NCAVP INCIDENT REPORT FORM.....	37
II TABLES.....	42
III ASU IRB APPROVAL.....	54
IV NATIONAL COALITION OF ANTI-VIOLENCE PROGRAMS	
DATA USE PERMISSION.....	57

## LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1: Demographic Data Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation of Total Data Set.....	43
2: Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity any contact with Police.....	44
3: Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity reported to Police.....	45
4: Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity negative contact with Police.....	46
5: Persons having Negative contact with Police after Reporting a Victimization.....	47
6: Police Abuse, Police Misconduct and Police Perpetrated Hate Violence.....	48
7: Police Violence of Total Data Set: Report of IPV/HV and No Report of IVP/HV.....	49
8: Police Violence of HV Data Set: Report of HV and No Report of HV.....	50
9: Police Violence of IPV Data Set: Report of IPV and No Report of IPV.....	51
10: Police Violence against Transgender Women Data Set: Report and No Report.....	52
11: Police Violence against People of Color Data Set: Report and No Report.....	53

## INTRODUCTION

Current laws that are meant to protect victims/survivors of hate crimes, domestic violence, sexual assault and discrimination have often not accomplished the task that the laws were meant to accomplish. Instead, these laws have inadvertently facilitated the revictimization of marginalized and oppressed peoples through institutional violence (Smith, 2007; Puar, 2007; 2013; Fagan, 1996; Smith, Richie and Sudbury, 2006; Baily, 2010; Hanssens, et al. 2014; Ahmed et al., 2015; Waters et al., 2015). The facilitation of revictimization occurs along lines of identity including gender, race, class, sexual orientation, ability, color, ethnicity and other categories as modes through which a person both self-identifies and becomes identified as possible criminals. As such, both institutional violence and discrimination enact the cultural and social formations of perpetrator and victim. The dominant critical paradigm of the anti-violence movement has embraced intersectional feminism in conjunction with a critical posture against state interventions into domestic and sexual violence (Law Enforcement Violence, n.d.; Dangerous Intersections, n.d.; Smith, Richie & Sudbury, 2006).

Women of color feminism posits that instances of institutional violence are complex systems that enforce the marginalization of the complex identities of persons (Anzaldua, 1980; Anzaldua and Moraga, 1980; Frazier, Smith and Smith, 1977; Hull, Scott and Smith, 1982; Crenshaw, 1989; 1991). This has become a theoretical tool used to disentangle the intersectionality of identity. Intersectionality is a term coined by Kimberly Crenshaw to describe “identity as woman or person of color [not] as an either/or proposition” (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1242), but instead as a both/and proposition. Thus, intersectionality is a description of identity in which a subject is not located within

a singular group identity—i.e. woman or person of color—but is instead located at the intersection of multiple identities simultaneously. Hence, the intersectional identities of LGBTQI people of color are particularly important sites of analysis for police violence, and LGBTQI people of color, as intersectionally located, are in particular danger due to the marginalization experienced through complex identities (Hanssens et al., 2014; Ahmed et al., 2014a; 2014b; 2015; Waters et al., 2015).

The term police violence is a subset of institutional violence. As a larger set of occurrences including migrant detention, imprisonment, border militarization and police violence, institutional violence includes a great many forms of abuse perpetrated at the hands of the state. *Incite! Women and Trans People of Color against Violence* outlines the notion of institutional violence as a complex, and sometimes contradictory, system of oppression that goes beyond the particular instances of institutional violence (Dangerous Intersections, n.d.). Institutional violence is the manifestation of oppression through police violence, the prison industrial complex, the military industrial complex and institutional racism (Dangerous Intersections, n.d.). As an institutional manifestation of oppression, institutional violence intersects with domestic violence/intimate partner violence, sexual assault, hate violence and discrimination to form a system of oppression that is both contained in the state, through police enforcement and repression, and extending beyond the state into interpersonal relationships, through dynamics of power and privilege (Ahmed et al., 2015; Waters et al., 2015; Venn Diagram of AVP, 2012).

Oppression occurs within both the public and the private sphere as violent acts committed against those without power. The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP) has consistently found the occurrence of institutional violence,

especially police violence, to particularly affect LGBTQI and HIV affected communities of color (Hanssens et al., 2014; Ahmed et al., 2014a; 2014b; 2015; Waters et al., 2015). LGBTQI and HIV affected communities of color are affected by institutional violence, the consequences of which are a lack of access to resources for survivors of violence.

All of this has caused what Andrea Smith (2007) warns of as a condition wherein “the State, rather than being recognized for its complicity in gender violence, became the institution promising to protect women from domestic and sexual violence by providing a provisional 'sanctuary' of sorts from the now criminally defined 'other'” (p. 49). Thus, with marginalized populations, reporting to the police can increase the chances that a survivor of a violent crime is (re)victimized at the hands of police. The violence which manifests through these exosystemic sources comes at the end of a chain of historical traumas against colonized and formerly enslaved peoples by a predominantly white male authority (Smith, 2003; 2005). This situation presents us with an irony: the police are meant to serve and protect victims of violence yet there are many instances of institutional violence as the result of reporting to police that one has been the victim of a crime (Sokolof and Dupont, 2005; Ahmed et al., 2015; Waters et al., 2015). For marginalized peoples, the intersection of domestic violence and police violence affects their choices as a survivor, including their willingness to disclose the perpetration against them and their identity as a survivor thereby resulting in a lack of access to resources.

*In Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and HIV Affected Intimate Partner Violence in 2014* (Waters et al., 2015) released by the NCAVP, Pat Farr of the Wingspan Anti-Violence Project (WAVP) found that LGBTQI and HIV+ people have a high prevalence of police abuse and misconduct. Through an analysis of data collected in



Tucson Arizona that LGBTQI and HIV+ survivors of domestic violence are especially susceptible to victimizations by police, and that this is especially the case when a survivor has reported domestic violence to the police. Pat Farr (2015) of the WAVP wrote:

“[T]he response of police to survivors reporting is consistently abusive and/or violent. Of the total 189 cases reported to the AVP, 25 cases involved police abuses including verbal abuse, slurs, and physical violence, or police misconduct including excessive force, entrapment, and unjustified arrest, 13.23% of 189. Yet, of the IPV reports made to police by survivors, 16 of these reports were met with police abuses including verbal abuse, slurs and physical violence, or police misconduct including excessive force, entrapment and unjustified arrest, 31.37% of 51. It is this continued aggression of police against LGBTQIA&HIV+ people that forms the barrier for survivors seeking and receiving justice and safety. Hence, the continued police violence against LGBTQIA&HIV+ people acts as an integral piece in the systematic exclusion of LGBTQIA&HIV+ people from economic and social justice” (pp. 81-82).

However, although the prevalence of police abuse and misconduct appears within the report, missing from this report is an analysis of data that would clarify the relationship between domestic violence and police violence. Additionally, because this report was focused on LGBTQI and HIV affected intimate partner violence, there is no data associated with police violence as it relates to hate violence. Furthermore, the NCAVP releases annual reports on intimate partner violence and hate violence, but this information has been missing from all NCAVP reports since these reports began annual publication in 1994. This lack of analysis into these corresponding modes of violence has resulted in a disparate account of police violence. In particular, the NCAVP has analyzed police violence as a particular form of victimization unrelated to domestic violence, but without a clear picture of the relationship between these forms of violence, there is a gap within the total picture of this critical relationship.

It is through this discourse that the research question that guides this thesis was developed. Although the intuition of advocates and the critical postures of theorists is substantial, there is a gap in the research literature that might confirm these intuitions. As such, guiding this thesis are the following research questions. **1) Are LGBTQI people more likely to encounter police violence in cases of domestic violence and hate crimes when there is law enforcement involvement? 2) Are transgender people and people of color more likely to become victims of police violence after law enforcement becomes involved in a domestic violence or hate violence incident?** Answering these questions may provide a greater basis for the intuitions and critical postures outlined thus far.

## METHODS

### **Data Source**

In order to answer the research questions posed above, this thesis presents an analysis of secondary data from the NCAVP. The NCAVP data set is composed of Excel files provided by local member organizations of the NCAVP who through survivor advocacy collect reports of incidents of violence. After the NCAVP receives these separate Excel files, the NCAVP then compiles these files into a single data set. The NCAVP reports rely on the independent reporting of various coalition members throughout the United States. NCAVP members are independent organizations that advocate on different system levels to end violence against LGBTQI and HIV affected communities. Through survivor level advocacy, member organizations document reports of violent incidents from LGBTQI and HIV+ people. Member organizations compile

these reports into individual level Excel files and submitted to the NCAVP for the annual reports on hate violence intimate partner violence. The NCAVP provided data in the form of an Excel file containing Tucson data collected through the WAVP as a subset of the total NCAVP data.

Through the NCAVP member organization, the WAVP, Pat Farr coordinated the collection of the data set. The WAVP collected all data in Tucson Arizona between January 1<sup>st</sup> 2014 and December 31<sup>st</sup> 2014. The WAVP then provided the data to the NCAVP for two separate NCAVP reports, “Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and HIV Affected Hate Violence in 2014” (Ahmed et al., 2015) and “Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and HIV Affected Intimate Partner Violence in 2014” (Waters et al., 2015). Thus, the secondary data analyzed for the purposes of this study is the complete WAVP 2014 data set.

At the WAVP, a small team of volunteer advocates collected, entered, and coded all of the data used in this thesis under the supervision of Pat Farr. The 2014 data set submitted by the WAVP to the NCAVP includes 404 individual incident reports. In March of 2015, the WAVP submitted the 2014 data set to the NCAVP. All WAVP data was analyzed from available person-level data collected at the individual level into a Microsoft Excel file and entered by a small team of volunteers. Furthermore, the data set used for this thesis was archived in 2015 with the NCAVP for the annual NCAVP reports on hate violence and intimate partner violence (Ahmed et al., 2015; Waters et al., 2015).

Although the data set the WAVP archived with the NCAVP represented 404 incident reports, 26 of these incident reports were not for incidents of violence and thus the NCAVP used only 378 of these incidents as data for the reports. These 378 reports

included 189 incidents of self-reported intimate partner violence published in the NCAVP report on intimate partner violence (Waters et al., 2015) and 189 incidents of self-reported hate violence published in the NCAVP report on hate violence (Ahmed et al., 2015). The NCAVP provided permission to use the WAVP data and provided the author access to WAVP data in the form of the original Excel file submitted to the NCAVP in 2015 (see Appendix IV). The Arizona State University Office of Research Integrity and Assurance provided this thesis IRB approval on April 22nd, 2016 (see Appendix III).

### **Participants and Data Collection**

The WAVP collected all data in performing its normal function of survivor advocacy. The primary purpose of the WAVP is survivor advocacy, but in performing survivor advocacy, the WAVP is provided data on victimizations that contribute to knowledge production. In order to accomplish both survivor advocacy and data collection, the WAVP used two primary modes of contact with survivors. Firstly, the WAVP has a 24-hour bilingual crisis-line which survivors can call when they are in crisis. Secondly, the WAVP holds office hours to work more in depth on certain cases. In this second medium, the WAVP held open walk-in hours, Monday through Friday from 10:00 am to 5:00 pm. The reports are taken by advocates who had completed a 45-hour training/practicum with the coordinator of the WAVP. Advocates were taught in accordance with the Arizona Coalition Against Domestic Violence “Arizona Service Standards and Guidelines for Domestic Violence Program” (Arizona Service Standards 2011).

In collecting data, the WAVP implemented the “NCAVP Uniform Incident Reporting Form” that has been implemented by the majority of NCAVP member organizations for collecting data (see Appendix I). The Uniform Incident Report is a tool used to gather pertinent information that the NCAVP is interested in studying and is revised on a periodic basis. The WAVP implemented this tool for the entirety of 2014. Although the primary duty of WAVP advocates was to provide services to survivors, importantly, advocates were trained to collect data from survivors using the “NCAVP Uniform Incident Reporting Form” (see Appendix I). The extent of incident types covers domestic violence, sexual assault, hate violence, discrimination and police misconduct. Before finalization of the data, all reports were peer reviewed by WAVP staff in order to ensure completeness of reports and to correct inconsistencies in data.

#### **Data Extraction Procedure**

Data was extracted from the Microsoft Excel Person-level file submitted by the Wingspan Anti-Violence Project to the NCAVP in 2015 for “Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV affected hate violence in 2014” (Ahmed et al., 2015) and “Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV affected intimate partner violence in 2014” (Waters et al., 2015). This local level data was filtered based on various indicators including gender identity, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, known hate violence perpetrator police, police misconduct, police abuse, hate violence, intimate partner violence, and police report. This extraction developed into five data sets: 1) the total data set, 2) the police contact data set, 3) the negative police contact data set, 4) the police reporting data set, and 5) the negative police contact resulting from police reporting data set.

The 378 incident reports represent many intersections of LGBTQI and HIV+ identities. However, these identities can be broken up into broad categories of gender identity, sexual orientation and race/ethnicity. Because the data is collected as incident reports rather than as individuals, and because a minority of individuals are victimized on multiple occasions, some of the incidents may double count participants. It is unknown through the data to what extent this is the case. However, based on firsthand knowledge of the reports, double counting participants represents a minority of incidents. For a demographic analysis of the total data set, see Table 1.

### **Research Question**

The research questions guiding this paper are as follows. 1) Are LGBTQI people more likely to encounter police violence in cases of domestic violence and hate crimes when there is law enforcement involvement? 2) Are transgender people and people of color more likely to become victims of police violence after law enforcement becomes involved in a domestic violence or hate violence incident? From these two questions were developed two hypotheses. These are separately discussed below followed by the operationalization of variables, the univariate analyses and bivariate analyses of the primary and secondary hypotheses.

**Primary and Secondary Hypotheses.** According to the research questions, both a primary and a secondary hypothesis are under consideration. These hypotheses provide a basis for a univariate and a bivariate analysis of the data introduced above. The hypotheses, and the univariate and bivariate analyses are outlined below.

First, the primary hypothesis regards reporting violent crimes to police and subsequent police violence against the person who reported the crime. This hypothesis is

formulated as follows. The rate of police violence against LGBTQI people is positively correlated to the rate of LGBTQI people reporting violent crimes to police. Because the data set is largely LGBTQI people who have reported an incident of violence to the WAVP, in order to test this hypothesis, “LGBTQI people who have reported an incident of violence to the WAVP” is the independent variable. A subset of this category includes those who reported the incident to the police. Thus, “LGBTQI people who have reported an incident of violence to the police” is the dependent variable.

The secondary hypothesis regards the sexual orientations, gender identities and racial/ethnic identities of people reporting violence. This secondary hypothesis is formulated as follows. The rate of police violence against LGBTQI people is positively correlated to the gender identities and racial/ethnic identities of LGBTQI people. In order to test the secondary hypothesis, there are two sets of dependent and independent variables. In the first instance, “transgender women who have reported an incident of violence to the WAVP” is the independent variable and “transgender women who have reported an incident of violence to the police” is the dependent variable. In the second instance, “LGBTQI people of color who have reported an incident of violence to the WAVP” is the independent variable and “LGBTQI people of color who have reported an incident of violence to the police” is the dependent variable.

**Operationalization of Variables.** The categorization of negative police contact is based on three categories, one of which is a subcategory of a larger set and two of which are sets containing subcategories. The first category regards the primary perpetrator under hate violence perpetrator categories. These categories include acquaintance/friend, ex-lover/partner, landlord/tenant/neighbor, employer/co-worker, relative/family, police,

stranger, first responder and other. For the analysis of police violence, the only category that was used was “police as primary perpetrator.” The next two categories each have subcategories. The first of these is dubbed police abuse within this thesis. Police abuse has a top code of yes, no or unknown plus subcategories verbal abuse, slurs/biased language, physical violence, and sexual violence. The second of these categories is police misconduct. Police misconduct also has a top code of yes, no or unknown plus includes the subcategories excessive force, police entrapment, police raid, unjustified arrest and any other. Each of these three categories and the subsets within the three categories allow for double counting. Thus, the data provided herein does not represent individual cases but instead incidents of the various forms of bias violence, police abuse and police misconduct. For the technique of extraction implemented, see below.

First, in order to create the individual level total data set, the filter function of Excel was used to filter “Hate-Violence=0” + “Intimate-Partner-Violence=0,” and then deleting all data points resulting. The result was 378 incidents of hate violence and intimate partner violence. Beginning from the total data set, in order to create the police contact data set, the filter function of Excel was used to filter “Did-Survivor-Report-to-Police=0” + “Police-Misconduct-Top-Code=2-No+3-Unknown” + “Police-Abuse-Top-Code=2-No+3-Unknown” + “Known-Hate-Violence-Offender-Police=0,” and then deleting all data points resulting. The result was 135 incidents of police contact. Using the police contact data set, the negative police contact data set was extracted by using the filter function of Excel to filter “Police-Misconduct-Top-Code=2-No+3-Unknown” + “Police-Abuse-Top-Code=2-No+3-Unknown” + “Known-Hate-Violence-Offender-Police=0,” and then deleting all resulting data points. The result was 68 incidents of



negative police contact. Beginning again with the police contact data set, the police report data set was extracted using the filter function of Excel to filter “Did-Survivor-Report-to-Police=0,” and then deleting all resulting data points. This resulted in 100 incidents of police reports. Finally, beginning with the negative police contact data set, the negative police contact resulting from police reporting data set was extracted using the filter function of Excel to filter “Did-Survivor-Report-to-Police=0,” and then deleting all resulting data points. This resulted in 38 incidents of negative police contact resulting from police reporting.

**Univariate Analyses.** According to the procedure for data extraction described above, the univariate analysis is categorized first in terms of the overall sample (Table 1), second in terms of any police contact (Table 2), third in terms of negative police contact (Table 3), fourth in terms of police reporting (Table 4), and finally in terms of negative police contact resulting from police reporting (Table 5). Each data set was analyzed in order to develop demographic analyses focused on identity categories of gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity. This task was accomplished through the filter function on Excel in order to develop aggregate data sets of nominal data points of gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity. All aggregate data relating to gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity was entered into separate data tables for each data set. These data sets are represented as

1. Demographic Data Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation of Total Data Set (see Table 1),
2. Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity any contact with Police (see Table 2),

3. Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity reported to Police (see Table 3),
4. 4) Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity negative contact with Police (see Table 4), and
5. Persons having Negative contact with Police after Reporting a Victimization (see Table 5).

Finally, one more aggregate data table was produced using the filter function on Excel in order to account for the various types of police abuse, police misconduct and police perpetrated hate violence (see Table 6).

**Bivariate Analyses.** In order to test the first hypothesis, a bivariate analysis tests the correlation of the independent and dependent variables to incidents of police violence. This required a table to represent 1) if a police report was made and 2) if the police responded with police violence. Chi-square tests determined the p-value of the sample and thereby determine statistical significance of the findings. Initially, the data was divided between intimate partner violence and hate violence. The author of this thesis found the  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$  for both samples. The intention of running this test was to find whether there was a statistically significant difference between incidents of police violence regarding reports of intimate partner violence and hate violence. In completing this first round of tests, hate violence and intimate partner violence were tested for statistically significant differences in reporting violent crimes to police and in the result of police violence. The author found that there was no statistically significant difference between police violence resulting from reporting hate violence or intimate partner violence. Finally, the author compiled the data into a single table representing all violent

crimes, i.e. both hate violence and intimate partner violence. Again a chi-square test was run in order to determine the statistical significance of the findings. The results were similar:  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ .

In order to test the secondary hypothesis, two bivariate analyses test the correlation of the independent and dependent variables to incidents of police violence. The bivariate analysis of incidents included two tables representing 1) reports made by transgender people and 2) reports made by people of color. These additional analyses provide rates of reporting violence to the police by transgender people and by people of color as these reports correlate to police violence against transgender people and against people of color reporters. Two tables were built to represent these additional analyses. Firstly, a table was built to measure 1) if police reports were made by transgender people and 2) if the police responded with police violence against transgender people. Secondly, the author built a table to measure 1) if a person of color had made a police reports and 2) if the police responded to that report with police violence against person reporting.

## RESULTS

### **Police Contacts**

Altogether, the total for all incident reports resulting in police contact equaled 135 of the 378 total incident reports, 35.71%. Seventy of the 135 cases, 51.85%, were cases of hate violence and 65 of 130 cases, 48.15%, were cases of intimate partner violence. Of the 65 incidents of intimate partner violence that resulted in police contact, 14 of 65 cases, 21.54% were classified by the police as domestic violence and 9 of these 65 cases, 13.85% were classified as domestic violence by prosecutors. Of the 70 incidents of hate

violence, 0 were classified as a hate crime by either police or prosecutors. As a subset of the total data, these 135 incident reports were all provided by individuals who fall within the spectrum of gender and sexual minorities. For a complete demographic representation of these 135 incident reports resulting in police contact, see Table 2.

### **Police Reports**

Of the 135 total incident reports resulting in police contact, 100 cases, 74.07%, were reported to the police by the person making the incident report. Fifty-one of these 100 incident reports, 51%, were for acts of intimate partner violence and 49 of the 100 incident reports, 49% were for acts of hate violence. Of the 51 incidents of intimate partner violence that were reported to the police, 9 of 51 cases, 17.65% were classified by the police as domestic violence and 6 of these 51 cases, 11.76% were classified as domestic violence by prosecutors. Of the 49 incidents of hate violence, 0 were classified as a hate crime by either police or prosecutors. As a subset of the total data, these 135 incident reports were all provided by individuals who fall within the spectrum of gender and sexual minorities. For a complete demographic representation of these 100 incidents resulting in police reports, see Table 3.

### **Negative Police Contact**

The analysis of negative police contact is based on the categories of police abuse, police misconduct and police perpetrated hate violence. In the case of these three categories, each incident represented in the category is double counted and does not represent a separate incident report. When allowing for double counting, of the 68 total incident reports involving negative police contacts, 30.88% (N=21) of these reports involved a police officer as the primary aggressor in an instance of hate violence, 92.65%

(N=63) of the 68 reports involved police abuse, and 73.53% (N=50) of the 68 reports involved police misconduct. Of these 68 cases, 38 cases, 55.88%, occurred subsequent to the survivor making a police reports. Of those cases that resulted in police violence, 15 of 21 cases of hate violence, 71.43%, in which a police officer was the primary aggressor was related to a police report whereas 6 of 21 cases of hate violence, 28.57%, in which a police officer was the primary aggressor was not related to a police report. 35 of 63 cases of police abuse, 55.56%, were related to a police report whereas 28 of the 63 cases, 44.44% were not related to a police report. Finally, 27 of 50 cases of police misconduct, 54%, were related to a police report whereas 23 of 50 cases of police misconduct, 46%, were not related to a police report. For a complete demographic representation of the 68 incidents resulting in negative police contact, see Table 4. For a complete demographic representation of the 38 incidents resulting in negative police contact after reporting a violent crime, see Table 5. For a complete representation of types of negative police contact, see table 6.

### **Primary Hypothesis**

The primary hypothesis states that the rate of police violence is positively correlated to the rate of reporting violent crimes to police. Using a bivariate analysis of the 38 incident reports from people who reported intimate partner violence or hate violence to the police resulting in a negative police contact and the 30 additional negative police contacts, the null hypothesis is negated and it is shown that instances of police violence positively correlated to incidents of police reports. The categories in the bivariate analysis include whether the initial victimization was reported to police by the survivor, and whether or not the incident report involved police violence.

Of the 100 police reports made after victimizations, 38 cases, 38%, resulted in negative police contact (Table 7). However, of the total 278 cases in which a victimization was not reported to the police, only 30 cases, 10.79%, resulted in police violence. Additionally, 38 of the 68 (55.88%) of the total negative police contacts occurred after the survivor had reported domestic violence or hate violence to the police (Table 7). Thus, a higher rate of negative police interactions occurred after the survivor made the initial contact with police to report. This is then separated into two data sets including both domestic violence and hate violence.

For cases of hate violence, 49 incidents, 29.93% of 189 total incidents of hate violence, were reported to the police whereas 140 incidents, 70.07% of 189 total incidents of hate violence, were not reported to the police (Table 8). Of the 49 incidents of hate violence reported to the police, 22 incidents, 44.90% of 49 reported incidents and 11.64% of 189 total incidents, resulted in negative police contact. Out of 43 negative police contacts related to incidents of hate violence, 22 incidents, 51.16%, of were reported to police before the negative police contact. Of the 140 incidents that were not reported to the police, 21 incidents, 15% of the 140 unreported incidents and 11.11% of the 189 total incidents, resulted in police violence.

For cases of domestic violence, 51 of the total 189 incidents, 26.98%, were reported to the police whereas 138 of the total 189 incidents, 73.02%, were not reported to the police (Table 9). Of the 51 incidents reported to the police, 16 incidents, 31.37% of 51 reported incidents and 8.47% of 189 total incidents, resulted in negative police contact. Out of 25 negative police contacts related to incidents of domestic violence, 16 incidents, 64%, were reported to police before the negative police contact. However, of

the 138 incidents that were not reported to the police, only 9 incidents, 6.52% of the 138 unreported incidents and 4.76% of the 189 total incidents, resulted in police violence.

For tables of the bivariate analyses of the three categorization of instances of police violence—from the total incident reports, from the intimate partner violence incident reports, and from the hate violence incident reports—see tables 7-9. Table 7 shows the rate of police violence regardless of whether the initial victimization was hate violence or domestic violence, and demonstrates a higher frequency of instances of police violence after the initial victimization is reported to the police. Table 8 represents instances of hate violence and police violence. Table 9 displays the rate of police violence when a survivor of intimate partner violence reports their victimization to the police. From these findings, it is clear that there is a higher frequency of police violence associated with hate violence, however, according to both Table 8 and Table 9, a greater proportion of police violence occurs after reporting domestic violence as opposed to hate violence.

The bivariate analysis of police violence negates the null hypothesis. According to Tables 7-9, there is a greater rate of police violence resulting from a victimization being reported to the police. Of the total 100 incidents of domestic violence and hate violence reported to the police, 38 incidents (38%) resulted in police violence (Table 9). Additionally, 38 of the 68 (55.88%) of the total negative police contacts occurred after the survivor had reported domestic violence or hate violence to the police. Thus, the rate of reports by LGBTQI people of a victimization to the police correlates to a higher rate of revictimization by police in the form of negative police contacts. Although reports of hate violence to the police result in a higher rate of negative police contact, there is a higher

proportion of reported domestic violence to police resulting in negative police contacts as compared to total negative police contacts within the category of domestic violence.

### **Secondary Hypothesis**

The secondary hypothesis states that the rate of police violence is correlated to gender identities and racial/ethnic identities. Each of these hypotheses are discussed below. The majority of reports related to negative interactions with police were transgender women and/or people of color. Of reports by cisgender white people, 13 of these 38, 34.21% resulted in negative police contact whereas 25 of the 38 reports, 65.79% were by people who are transgender and/or of color. When allowing for double counting, this included 15 of the 38 reports by transgender women, 39.47%, and 12 of 38 reports by people of color, 31.59%. This is consistent with the finding of the NCAVP in regards to police violence perpetrated against LGBTQI and HIV+ people. According to the NCAVP, people of color and transgender women are at particular risk of violence both through bias motivated assaults and through violence perpetrated by law enforcement (Ahmed et al., 2015; Waters et al., 2015).

There were a total of 93 incidents of violence against transgender women that were reported to the WAVP. For cases of negative police contact with transgender women, 26 incidents, 27.96% of 93 total incidents, were reported to the police whereas 67 incidents, 72.04% of 93 total incidents, were not reported to the police (Table 10). Of the 26 incidents of violence against transgender women reported to the police, 15 incidents, 57.69% of 26 reported incidents and 16.13% of 93 total incidents, resulted in negative police contact. Of the 67 incidents that were not reported to the police, 7 incidents, 10.45% of the 67 unreported incidents and 7.53% of the 93 total incidents,



resulted in police violence. Thus there is a higher rate of police violence associated with transgender women reporting violence to the police.

There were a total of 138 incidents of violence against people of color. For these cases of violence against people of color, 29 of the total 138 incidents, 21.01%, were reported to the police whereas 109 of the total 138 incidents, 78.99%, were not reported to the police (Table 11). Of the 29 incidents reported to the police, 12 incidents, 41.38% of 29 reported incidents and 8.70% of 138 total incidents, resulted in negative police contact. Of the 109 incidents that were not reported to the police, 12 incidents, 11.01% of the 109 unreported incidents and 8.70% of the 138 total incidents, resulted in police violence. Thus, as with cases of transgender women, the rate of violence against people of color increases with reports made to the police.

Table 5 represents the demographics of those who reported violence to the police and were subsequently victimized by police. As with all of the previous table, the following develops through an intersection of gender identity and race/ethnicity. Additionally, tables 10 and 11 illustrates through a bivariate analysis the rates of police violence increasing against transgender people and people of color after making a report to the police. As seen in the primary hypothesis, reporting a victimization to police is correlated to an increased frequency of police violence. This is more the case with transgender women and people of color than it is for white cisgender people.

The bivariate analyses of gender identity and racial/ethnic identity negate the secondary null hypothesis. Thus, the rate of police violence is positively correlated to non-normative gender identities and non-white racial/ethnic identities. Again, as with the

primary hypothesis, this is especially the case for transgender women and people of color survivors of domestic violence who have reported a victimization to police.

## DISCUSSION

The research questions that have guided this study were centered around the issue of police violence as a result of law enforcement involvement in cases of domestic violence and hate violence. According to the findings from the research questions, this study demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between law enforcement involvement in cases of domestic violence and hate violence, and police violence. As demonstrated above, there is a strong intersection between law enforcement violence and cases of domestic violence and hate violence. The hypotheses developed through these research questions are confirmed: 1) the rate of police violence against LGBTQI people is positively correlated to the rate of LGBTQI people reporting violent crimes to police, and 2) the rate of police violence LGBTQI people is positively correlated to the gender identities and racial/ethnic identities of LGBTQI people.

These results were expected based on the intuition of anti-violence activists and critical theorists that involvement of law enforcement in cases of violence often result in violence at the hands of police (Law Enforcement Violence, n.d.; Waters et al., 2015; Hannsens et al., 2014). It is perhaps the case that the presence of police at a scene increases the likelihood that the police will become violent through a misplaced exercise of power and control. Just as domestic violence is “a pattern of abusive behavior in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner” (Domestic Violence, n.d.), police enter a situation with the

intent “to gain or maintain power and control.” It is from this analogy of power and control that the concept of police violence aligns with the study of domestic violence.

Lavina Tomer and Cathy Busha explain:

“All forms of violence and oppression (sexism, racism, ableism, body image, homophobia, classism ageism...) are connected. Violence occurs when one person, one group, one country believes that she/he/it has the right to control the body, the land, the religion, the lives, the free will of another person, group, country, and so on. The abuser feels superior and entitled to her/his/its power” (Tomer & Busha, 2000, p. 1).

Nevertheless, the results highlighted in this study displays a contradiction: the police are here to serve and protect yet police violence comes as the result of reporting to police that one has been the victim of a crime. According to the results of this study regarding transgender people and/or people of color, at least one reason for the irony of police violence is found in an analysis of marginalized and oppressed identities. Women of color feminism has argued that instances of institutional violence are complex systems and reflective of the complex identities of persons (Anzaldua, 1980; Anzaldua and Moraga, 1980; Frazier, Smith and Smith, 1977; Hull, Scott and Smith, 1982). The complexity of identity represents a critique of the notion that identities are oppressed singularly and may be analyzed through concepts of sexism, racism, homophobia, classism or ableism. These concepts, however, cannot be analyzed singularly and are instead complicated subject positions involving multiple locations both inside and outside oppressed groups. Hence, a particular subject may be oppressed through multiple lines simultaneously. As such, the intersection between identity and institutional violence is a complicated system of domination and oppression that is conditioned through one’s identity (Crenshaw, 1989; 1991).

Two further areas of this contradiction have been analyzed by the anti-violence movement in recent years. These two areas regard the function and practice of law enforcement as it intersects with criminal justice. Firstly, regarding cases of hate violence, police violence often results from cases of self-defense against a bias motivated assault. And secondly, regarding domestic violence, police violence often results from county and state level mandatory arrest policies for incidents of domestic violence.

An especially strong component of the irony involves the criminalization of LGBTQI people for self-defense against hate motivated assaults and domestic violence (Hanssens et al., 2014; LGBTQ Allied Organizations Alarmed, 2014). There have been many prosecutions against queer people who have stood up to their attackers and fought back. Queer people of color such as Nate La Mancha (Who is Nate Mancha?, 2014), The New Jersey Four (Re-Thinking ‘The Norm,’ 2007; Black lesbian in NYC, 2015), CeCe MacDonald (Paulska, 2012) and Eisha Love (NCAVP, 2014), all stood up to violent bias motivated assaults only to be imprisoned and tried for violent crimes. This has caused deep concern within the anti-violence movement about the use of police to act on behalf of LGBTQI people. The NCAVP states:

“LGBTQ communities know that LGBTQ survivors of hate violence, particularly transgender women and LGBTQ people of color, often face biased and discriminatory treatment from law enforcement, courts, and other first responders. We are concerned that these survivors may be facing discriminatory charges based on their identities” (NCAVP, 2014).

In addition to self-defense in cases of bias motivated assaults, there have also been many LGBTQI people who have been imprisoned for violent crimes after defending themselves in cases of domestic violence and sexual assault (Hanssens et al., 2014; Law Enforcement Violence, n.d.). Although the results of this paper do not clearly define the

particular situations involved in each case, it may be assumed that at least some of these cases involved self-defense against an assault.

Similarly, and related, the revictimization of LGBTQI people through police force that is mandated under current laws regarding domestic violence (Law enforcement violence, n.d., 38). Mandatory arrest policies require law enforcement to arrest the offending party in a domestic violence case when they arrive on the scene. However, “mandatory arrest policies... have led to arbitrary arrests of survivors of domestic violence, rather than their abusers, in many cases” (Law enforcement violence, n.d., 38). Thus, similar to the arrest of queer people of color within cases of self-defense, the cases involved in mandatory arrest often misidentify the wrong person for the perpetration and revictimize survivors of violence. In Tucson Arizona, the city in which the data represented in this study was collected, the Pima County Attorney’s Office proclaims in the Pima County Domestic Violence Protocol that “A pro-arrest policy will be implemented by all departments if there is probable cause that an offense has been committed” (Domestic Violence Protocol, 2010, p. 9). Because the Domestic Violence Protocol provides officers an extraordinary amount of power to decide who within a particular situation should be arrested, this has caused many unjustified arrests of survivors of domestic violence rather than perpetrators. Although the Protocol advises that survivors of domestic violence often hit back, the ultimate decision is in the hands of often undertrained and overworked officers (Domestic Violence Protocol, 2010, pp.9-10). Again, although the results of this paper do not clearly define the particular situations involved in each case, it may be assumed that at least some of these cases involved issues of mandatory arrest policies used by the Tucson Police Department.

The three positions outlined above regarding police violence also demonstrate areas for further research. First, the issue of intersectionality and police violence against transgender people and people of color has been analyzed within this study. The results of this study demonstrated that transgender people and people of color do suffer a greater frequency of police violence. However, the results within this study come from a relatively small sample located in a particular geographic area. These results thus provide powerful evidence in efforts for local criminal justice reform, but require a larger study spanning a greater geographic area in order to validate the results around the US. This could be accomplished through a similar study implementing a secondary analysis of NCAVP data from all localities. Furthermore, although the issue of police violence against transgender people and people of color is the secondary hypothesis in this paper, to confirm the secondary hypothesis in a larger study would simultaneously confirm the results of the primary hypothesis.

Second, because the particular cases were not spelled out, the issue of self-defense and resulting police violence cannot be confirmed through the data analysis in this paper. As it is now, the issue of self-defense relies on analyses of case studies which are difficult to universalize across populations. Instead, in order to fully articulate the involvement of self-defense in these cases, a mixed methods study involving an analysis of survivor stories and quantitative data could provide a means for analyzing the frequency and rate of arrests after cases of self-defense. In such a case that a mixed methods study was feasible, it would also be beneficial to have testimony of police specific to each case. Although this testimony of police would be biased and untrustworthy as evidence against the incident as police violence, this information could also provide a researcher

information regarding the incident that would provide a more well-rounded understanding of negative police interactions.

Finally, again because the particular cases were not clear enough to analyze the involvement of mandatory arrest policies, a mixed methods approach might be implemented in order to confirm the involvement of mandatory arrests in cases of police violence. This could be accomplished through a public records search involving cases of domestic violence and resulting arrests. Although the numbers in a single geographic area such as Tucson may be large, the result could offer insight into the realities of police violence against domestic violence survivors resulting from mandatory arrest policies.

## CONCLUSION

During the initial data analysis, the expected outcome regarding police reporting was that LGBTQI people would have low levels of reporting to police. But instead, it was found that 26.46% of LGBTQI survivors of violence, 100 out of 378, had reported the crime to police. It was this high level of reporting and the associated astonishment that drove the data analysis to look at what had occurred, as discussed by Crenshaw, after the crash. Kimberley Crenshaw points to a central difficulty while describing intersectionality and discrimination. Crenshaw writes:

“Discrimination, like traffic through an intersection, may flow in one direction, and it may flow in another. If an accident happens in an intersection, it can be caused by cars traveling from any number of directions and, sometimes, from all of them... But it is not always easy to reconstruct an accident: Sometimes the skid marks and the injuries simply indicate that they occurred simultaneously,

frustrating efforts to determine which driver caused the harm. In these cases, the tendency seems to be that no driver is held responsible, no treatment is administered, and the involved parties simply get back in their cars and zoom away (Crenshaw 1989, p. 149).

This quotation captures the after-the-accident feel of the data that this study was built off of. Although, unfortunately, it was not possible through the data to gather information regarding why the report was made, it was possible to see what had happened after the report was made. By analyzing these 100 reports to police, the author began to look at how each of these cases panned out after the report was made to police. It was only after-the-accident that this data became a clearer representation of not only domestic violence and hate violence, but also police violence. However, because this information was not purposefully gathered but instead was stumbled upon during data analysis, there are many places in which the study could have been improved.

These sites for improvement include the implementation of mixed methods data analysis, and clearer categories of police violence. As acknowledged above, the data is very rough and lack the depth that a mixed methods study might provide through an analysis of qualitative data surrounding the incidents discussed in the quantitative data. This qualitative data might offer insight into the events that occurred before the crash and provide a more in depth understanding of the incidents. Additionally, also acknowledged above, the incidents reported in this study were all self-reported by victims of police violence. It is thus likely that the police involved would argue against the accuracy of these reports. This deficiency is built into the methodology and ethicality of privileging the positions of survivors of violence over other testimonies. However, it is important to



note that this is a deficiency that could be overcome through a more open mixed methods analysis involving data from police officers regarding the incidents described in the data.

Even with these weaknesses of the study in one's purview, the findings of this study provide support for the intuition of anti-violence activists regarding police violence. According to the available data for this study, LGBTQI victims of violence who report the violent victimization to police are more likely to be victims of police violence than are LGBTQI people who do not report their victimization. Additionally, rates are greater for transgender women and LGBTQI people of color.

From this data it is important to outline some of the ramifications of these findings for policy. In terms of policy recommendation, four primary points have been made by the NCAVP which should be echoed here. These four recommendations regard 1) education of police officers in order to bring them to a higher standard of cultural competence with LGBTQI people, 2) eliminating police profiling of LGBTQI people and transgender people, 3) review outcomes and revise mandatory arrest policies in order to ensure that police officers are not committing acts of violence against survivors of domestic abuse, and 4) holding police officers accountable for acts of police violence including all of the various forms of violence discussed in this study. Each of these four areas of policy recommendation are discussed below.

The first of these policy recommendations regards the issue of a police force that is untrained to interact with LGBTQI people. The NCAVP explains that when police officers lack knowledge regarding LGBTQI people, this "can result in officers using inappropriate and disrespectful language, conveying hostile attitudes, and committing violence against [LGBTQI] people" (Ahmed et al., 2015, 62). In order to overcome this

lack of knowledge, it is imperative that law enforcement is required to complete cultural competency training on LGBTQI issues and communities. By doing so, law enforcement will be provided with the skills necessary to interact with LGBTQI people and to increase the rate of positive police interactions within the LGBTQI community. Education also has the effect of lower rates of police profiling by bring officers to a higher level of cultural competence.

The second policy recommendation regards police profiling. Following the Black Lives Matter movement against police violence, the profiling of people of color is a centrally important manifestation of police violence which is currently under review in police practices. The profiling of LGBTQI people of color and transgender women creates a situation for survivors of violence in which either a person is more likely to be victimized by police or a person does not report a violent crime for fear of police violence. In order to overcome this problem, the NCAVP recommends that “federal, state, and local governments should enact polices that prohibit police profiling such as the federal End Racial Profiling Act that includes provisions on sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, immigration status, housing status, and race” (Ahmed et al., 2015, p. 14).

The third policy recommendation regards issues surrounded mandatory arrest policies. Mandatory arrest policies are implemented across the US including Tucson so that victims of domestic violence are safer and domestic violence is less lethal. For law enforcement, this has been difficult to apply to domestic violence in LGBTQI relationships. The Pima County Attorney states that “All domestic violence incidents involving same sex relationships shall be handled according to this law enforcement

[mandatory arrest] protocol... [in order] to ensure that officers treat same-sex relationships with the same dignity and respect heterosexual relationships receive” (Domestic Violence Protocol 2010, p. 22). However, the findings of this study suggest that mandatory arrest policies are likely one of the causes of high arrest rates of survivors who have reported domestic violence to the police. In order to alter the situation facing survivors of domestic violence and to lower the rates of police violence, the NCAVP recommends that “policy makers should revise ‘mandatory arrest’ programs to assess the efficacy of these programs and their unintended consequences on the arrest of LGBTQ survivors” (Waters et al., 2015, p. 44).

The fourth policy recommendation regards holding police officers accountable who have committed acts of police violence. Even after requiring cultural competence training, prohibiting police profiling, and revising mandatory arrest policies, there will likely be officers who do misuse their power. In such cases there should be provisions for holding police officers accountable for their actions. The NCAVP recommends that “policymakers should ensure that police officers are investigated and held accountable for homophobic, biphobic, and transphobic harassment and violence” (Ahmed et al., 2015, p. 15). In Tucson, there is an Independent Police Auditor which is a first step toward accountability. However, there is not a provision that ensures advocates can help citizens make complaints with the Independent Police Auditor, and this lack causes many complainants to forgo the complaint due to the difficulty and opacity of the complaint process. As such, there should additionally be advocates that can help citizens make complaints in order to ensure that complaints are made correctly and investigated in a timely manner.

## REFERENCES

- Arizona Revised Statute 13-1406. Sexual assault; classification; increased punishment. Retrieved from: <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars/13/01406.htm>
- Arizona Revised Statute 13-3601. Domestic violence; definition; classification; sentencing option; arrest and procedure for violation; weapon seizure. Retrieved from: <http://azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/ars/13/03601.htm&Title=13&DocType=ARS>
- Amnesty International, Stonewalled: Police Abuse and Misconduct Against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People in the U.S. 13, AMR 51/122/2005 (2005).
- Ahmed, O., Jindasurat, C., Ayala, J., Argyros, C., Campos, U., Eckhardt, A., Farr, P., Gilmore, L., Knox, L., Kopp-Richardson, S., Lee, A., Marrero-Cruz, S.I., MacDade, L., Merrill, J., Moore, L., Musquiz, R., Pitmon, B., Presley-Kimball, C., Rucker, D., dos Santos, C.S., Siferd, Y., Sprague, L., Tobin, H.J., Umezu, N., Walker, T. & Waggoner, R. (2014a). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV affected hate violence in 2013. National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, Inc. Retrieved from: [http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/2013\\_ncavp\\_hvreport\\_final.pdf](http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/2013_ncavp_hvreport_final.pdf)
- Ahmed, O., Jindasurat, C., Ayala, J., Argyros, C., Campos, U., Eckhardt, A., Farr, P., Gilmore, L., Knox, L., Kopp-Richardson, S., Lee, A., Marrero-Cruz, S.I., MacDade, L., Merrill, J., Moore, L., Musquiz, R., Pitmon, B., Presley-Kimball, C., Rucker, D., dos Santos, C.S., Siferd, Y., Sprague, L., Tobin, H.J., Umezu, N., Walker, T. & Waggoner, R. (2014b). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV affected intimate partner violence in 2013. National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, Inc. Retrieved from: [http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/ncavp2013ipvreport\\_webfinal.pdf](http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/ncavp2013ipvreport_webfinal.pdf)
- Ahmed, O., Jindasurat, C., Ayala, J., Argyros, C., Campos, U., Eckhardt, A., Farr, P., Gilmore, L., Knox, L., Kopp-Richardson, S., Lee, A., Marrero-Cruz, S.I., MacDade, L., Merrill, J., Moore, L., Musquiz, R., Pitmon, B., Presley-Kimball, C., Rucker, D., dos Santos, C.S., Siferd, Y., Sprague, L., Tobin, H.J., Umezu, N., Walker, T. & Waggoner, R. (2015). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV affected hate violence in 2014. National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, Inc. [http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/Reports/2014\\_HV\\_Report-Final.pdf](http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/Reports/2014_HV_Report-Final.pdf)
- Anzaldúa, G. (1980). *Borderland: la frontera*. Aunt Lute Books. San Francisco, CA.
- Anzaldúa, G. & Moraga, C. (Eds.) (1981), *This bridge called my back* (pp. 210-218). Watertown, Massachusetts: Persephone Press.

- Ashford, J. B. & Leroy, C. W. (2013). *Human Behavior in the Social Environment: A Multidimensional Perspective*, 5th Edition. Brooks/Cole: Cengage Learning.
- Bailey, K.D. (2010) Lost in Translation: Domestic Violence, the Personal is Political, and the Criminal Justice System, *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 100(4). 1255-1300
- Basile KC, Smith SG, Breiding MJ, Black MC, Mahendra RR. Sexual Violence Surveillance: Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, Version 2.0. Atlanta (GA): National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2014. Retrieved from: [http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sv\\_surveillance\\_definitions1-2009-a.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sv_surveillance_definitions1-2009-a.pdf)
- Breiding MJ, Basile KC, Smith SG, Black MC, Mahendra RR. Intimate Partner Violence Surveillance: Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, Version 2.0. Atlanta (GA): National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2015 Retrieved from: <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/intimatepartnerviolence.pdf>
- Carson, E.A. (2014). Prisoners in 2013. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved on 3-4-2015 <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p13.pdf>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 139, pp. 139–67.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color, *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6)., pp. 1241–1299.
- Domestic violence protocol (2010). Pima County Domestic Violence Task Force. Barbara LaWall Pima County Attorney. Tucson AZ. Retrieved from: [http://www.pcao.pima.gov/documents/pcao\\_dv\\_protocol.pdf](http://www.pcao.pima.gov/documents/pcao_dv_protocol.pdf)
- Durso, L.E., & Gates, G.J. (2012). *Serving our youth: findings from a national survey of service providers working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless*. Los Angeles: The Williams Institute with True Colors Fund and The Palette Fund. <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Durso-Gates-LGBT-Homeless-Youth-Survey-July-2012.pdf>
- Workers World [Editorial] (2007). Black lesbian in NYC get 11 years for self-defense. *Colorlines*. Reprinted from Workers World Accessed on 4-12-2015: [http://colorlines.com/archives/2007/06/black\\_lesbians\\_in\\_nyc\\_get\\_11\\_y\\_1.html](http://colorlines.com/archives/2007/06/black_lesbians_in_nyc_get_11_y_1.html)

- Federal Bureau of Investigation [Editorial] (no date). Federal Civil Rights Statutes. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Accessed on 4-13-2015: <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/civilrights/federal-statutes>
- Incite! Women of Color against Violence [Editorial] (n.d.). Dangerous Intersections. Incite! Women of Color against Violence. Retrieved from: <http://www.incite-national.org/page/dangerous-intersections>
- Office of Violence against Women [Editorial] (n.d.). Sexual assault. Office of Violence Against Women. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov/ovw/sexual-assault>
- Office of Violence against Women [Editorial] (n.d.). Domestic violence. Office of Violence Against Women. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov/ovw/domestic-violence>
- Human Rights Campaign [Editorial] (n.d.). Hate Crimes Law. Human Rights Campaign. Retrieved from: <http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/hate-crimes-law>
- Incite! Women of Color against Violence [Editorial] (2008) Re-Thinking ‘The Norm’ In Police/Prison Violence & Gender Violence: Critical Lessons From the New Jersey 7. *Left Turn Magazine*. Reprinted in *Law enforcement violence against women of color and trans people of color: a critical intersection of gender violence and state violence: an organizer’s resource and tool kit from Incite! Women of Color against Violence*. Incite! Women of Color against Violence, Redmond, WA
- U.S. Department of Justice [Editorial](n.d.). The Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2009. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/crm/matthewshepard.php>
- U.S. Department of Justice [Editorial](n.d.). The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) 2013 Reauthorization. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov/tribal/violence-against-women-act-vawa-reauthorization-2013-0>
- Justice 4 Nate [Editorial] (2014). Who is Nate Mancha? Justice4Nate. Accessed on 4-12-2015: <http://www.justice4nate.com/>
- Fagan, J. (1996). The criminalization of domestic violence: promises and limits. National Institute of Justice Research Report. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/crimdom.pdf>
- Farr, P. (2015). Wingspan Anti-Violence Project Local Report. In Waters, E., Jindasurat, C., C., Eugene, B., Presley, C., Santos, C., Santos, D., Lordes, E., Wood, E., Gargurevich-Gorman, E., Less, J., Punzo, J., Shaw, J., Morris, K., MacDade, L., Taraskiewics, L., Sprague, L., Failey, M., Farr, P., Musquiz, R., Holt, S., Siferd,

- Y., (2015). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV affected intimate partner violence in 2014. National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, Inc. Retrieved from: [http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/2014\\_IPV\\_Report\\_Final\\_w-Bookmarks\\_10\\_28.pdf](http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/2014_IPV_Report_Final_w-Bookmarks_10_28.pdf)
- Frazier, D., Smith, B. & Smith, B. (1977). The Combahee River Collective statement. In Gloria
- Gates, G.J. (2011). How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender? The Williams Institute. The UCLA School of Law. Retrieved from: <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-How-Many-People-LGBT-Apr-2011.pdf>
- Gates, G. & Newport, F. (2012). LGBT Percentage Highest in D.C., Lowest in North Dakota. Gallup State of the States Series. Retrieved from: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/160517/lgbt-percentage-highest-lowest-north-dakota.aspx>
- Glaze, L.E. & Kaeble, D. (2014). Correctional populations in the United States, 2013. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Gottschalk, M. (2006). The prison and the gallows: the politics of mass incarceration in America. Cambridge University Press
- Hanssens, C., Moodie-Mills, A. C., Ritchie, A. J., Spade, D. & Vaid, U. (2014). A Roadmap for Change: Federal Policy Recommendations for Addressing the Criminalization of LGBT People and People Living with HIV. New York: Center for Gender & Sexuality Law at Columbia Law School. <http://law.columbia.edu/roadmap-for-change>
- Hull, G.T., Scott, P.B. & Smith, B. (1982). All the women are white, all the blacks are men but some of us are brave: Black women's studies. New York, New York: Feminist Press.
- Law enforcement violence against women of color and trans people of color: a critical intersection of gender violence and state violence: an organizer's resource and tool kit from Incite! Women of Color against Violence. Incite! Women of Color against Violence, Redmond, WA
- Lehrner, A. & Allen, N.E. (2009). Still a movement after all these years? Current tensions in the domestic violence movement. Violence Against Women Volume 15 Number 6. 656-677
- Neal, J. W. & Neal, Z. P. (2013). Nested or Networked? Future Directions for Ecological Systems Theory. Social Development Vol 22 No. 4 722-737

- New York City Anti-Violence Project [Online Image] (2012). Venn diagram of AVP programs and services. New York, New York: New York City Anti-Violence Project. Retrieved from: <http://www.avp.org/about-avp/faqs>
- Pasulka, N. (2012). The Case of CeCe McDonald: Murder—or Self-Defense Against a Hate Crime? Mother Jones. Accessed on 4-12-2015: <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/05/cece-mcdonald-transgender-hate-crime-murder>
- National Coalition of Anti-Violence Projects [Press Release] (2014). LGBTQ Allied Organizations Alarmed by Trend of Prosecution of Survivors for Self-Defense; Call for National Advocacy and Charges to be Dropped Against LGBTQ Survivors for Defending Themselves. The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. New York City Anti-Violence Project.
- Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham and London: Duke University Press
- Puar, J. (2013). Homonationalism as assemblage: Viral travels, affective sexualities. *Jindal Global Law Review* 4(2), pp. 23-43.
- Schechter, S. (1982). *Women and male violence: The visions and struggles of the battered women's movement*. South End Press
- Smith, A. (2005). *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*.
- Smith, A. (2003). Not an Indian Tradition: The Sexual Colonization of Native Peoples. *Hypatia*. vol. 18, no. 2.
- Smith, A. (2007). Unmasking the state: Racial/gender terror and hate crimes. *Australian Feminist Law Journal* 26(1), pp. 47-57.
- Smith, A.L., Richie, B.E., Sudbury, J. & White, J. (2006). *The color of violence: the Incite! anthology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: South End Press.
- Sokoloff, N.J. & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence: Examining the intersections of race, class, and gender—an introduction. In N. Sokoloff & C. Pratt (Eds.) (2008) *Domestic Violence at the Margins Fourth Edition*. New Brunswick, New Jersey and London: Rutgers University Press.
- Tomer, L. & Busha, C. (2000). Introduction. *Domestic Violence in The Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Community: A Resource 2000*. Tucson, Arizona: Wingspan Domestic Violence Project



- Walters, M.L., Chen J., & Breiding, M.J. (2013). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Findings on Victimization by Sexual Orientation. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Walton, L. (2014). Courts roundup: Man sentenced in road rage; arrest made in sex assault. The Gazette: Colorado Springs News, Sports and Business. Accessed on 4-12-2015: <http://gazette.com/courts-roundup-man-sentenced-in-road-rage-arrest-made-in-sex-assault/article/1543010>
- Waters, E., Jindasurat, C., C., Eugene, B., Presley, C., Santos, C., Santos, D., Lordes, E., Wood, E., Gargurevich-Gorman, E., Less, J., Punzo, J., Shaw, J., Morris, K., MacDade, L., Taraskiewics, L., Sprague, L., Failey, M., Farr, P., Musquiz, R., Holt, S., Siferd, Y., (2015). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV affected intimate partner violence in 2014. National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project, Inc. Retrieved from: [http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/2014\\_IPV\\_Report\\_Final\\_w-Bookmarks\\_10\\_28.pdf](http://www.avp.org/storage/documents/2014_IPV_Report_Final_w-Bookmarks_10_28.pdf)

APPENDIX I

NCAVP INCIDENT REPORT FORM

<b>National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs</b> Case Intake/ Incident Reporting Form	Your Name: _____	<b>1</b>
	Date: ____/____/____ Time of Intake: ____ AM/PM <input type="checkbox"/> Staff <input type="checkbox"/> Volunteer <input type="checkbox"/> Intern    Location of Intake _____	

<b>CALLER INFORMATION</b>  Case Number: _____	Intake Type: <input type="checkbox"/> Hotline/Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Email <input type="checkbox"/> Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Ofc/Walk-in <input type="checkbox"/> Media <input type="checkbox"/> Website	Entered Into Database ____/____/____ Call Back Needed <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Primary Language _____
-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Case Type(s)</b> <i>(select all that apply)</i>	<b>B:</b> Hate Violence <b>I:</b> Intimate Partner Violence <b>H:</b> HIV-related <b>NA:</b> Hotline <b>P:</b> Police Violence <b>S:</b> Sexual Violence <b>Z:</b> Pick-up violence
-------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Caller's Name: _____ Caller's Address: _____  Phone: (____) _____ Ok to call? <input type="checkbox"/> Alt Phone: (____) _____ Ok to call? <input type="checkbox"/> Caller's E-mail: _____ Ok to email? <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Caller presents as (check one):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Family <input type="checkbox"/> Friend <input type="checkbox"/> Lover/Partner <input type="checkbox"/> Offender <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational Survivor/Victim <input type="checkbox"/> Service provider <input type="checkbox"/> Survivor/Victim <input type="checkbox"/> Witness <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____
	<b>Caller assessed as (For IPV cases, complete after using IPV Assessment Form):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Family <input type="checkbox"/> Friend <input type="checkbox"/> Lover/Partner <input type="checkbox"/> Offender <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational Survivor/Victim <input type="checkbox"/> Service provider <input type="checkbox"/> Survivor/Victim <input type="checkbox"/> Witness <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____

<b>Caller Was Referred By (Check one)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> AVP Publicity <input type="checkbox"/> Court <input type="checkbox"/> Family <input type="checkbox"/> Friend <input type="checkbox"/> Hospital _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Internet <input type="checkbox"/> LGBTQ Org _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Media <input type="checkbox"/> Non-LGBTQ org <input type="checkbox"/> Phone Book <input type="checkbox"/> Police <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**NOTE**  
 The information below is being collected for research purposes, and will not be used to screen survivors. All of the questions below are optional, and survivors do not have to disclose any information if they choose not to.

<b>SURVIVOR/VICTIM #1</b>	<b>SURVIVOR/VICTIM INFORMATION</b>
---------------------------	------------------------------------

Number of Survivors/Victims: _____ <i>(Attach Additional Survivor/Victims Form to document other survivor/victims)</i> Survivor/Victim is: <input type="checkbox"/> Person <input type="checkbox"/> Organization  Name: _____ Address: _____  Phone: _____ Email: _____  Prefers contact via: <input type="checkbox"/> Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Email OK to say 'AVP'? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk. OK to leave message? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk. OK to email 'AVP'? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk. OK to receive mail? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk.	<b>AGE:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> < 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 40-49 <input type="checkbox"/> 15-18 <input type="checkbox"/> 50-59 <input type="checkbox"/> 19-24 <input type="checkbox"/> 60-69 <input type="checkbox"/> 25-29 <input type="checkbox"/> 70-79 <input type="checkbox"/> 30-39 <input type="checkbox"/> > 80  <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed  Age (if known): _____ D.O.B: ____/____/____	<b>GENDER ID (check all that apply):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Man <input type="checkbox"/> Woman <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Transgender <input type="checkbox"/> Transgender <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Identified/Other (specify): _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed  <b>INTERSEX:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>RACE/ETHNICITY (check all that apply):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Arab/Middle Eastern <input type="checkbox"/> Asian/Pacific Islander <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American/ African Descent <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous/First People/ Native American/ American Indian <input type="checkbox"/> Latina/o <input type="checkbox"/> White <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Identified/Other (specify): _____  <input type="checkbox"/> South Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed	<b>SEXUAL ORIENTATION:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual <input type="checkbox"/> Gay <input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual <input type="checkbox"/> Lesbian <input type="checkbox"/> Queer <input type="checkbox"/> Questioning/ Unsure <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Identified/ Other (specify): _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed	<b>IMMIGRATION STATUS:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. citizen <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent resident <input type="checkbox"/> Undocumented <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed  <b>INCOME:</b> Yearly _____ Monthly _____ Do you receive any form of government assistance? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>HIV STATUS:</b> Survivor/victim is HIV+? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed  <b>DISABILITY:</b> Survivor/victim has a disability? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed  If yes, check all that apply and specify: <input type="checkbox"/> Blind/Visually impaired: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Deaf/Hard of hearing: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Learning disability: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Physical: _____
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SURVIVOR/VICTIM USE OF ALCOHOL/DRUGS	
Alcohol involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed	Drugs involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed
If yes, describe: _____	

CASE/INCIDENT INFORMATION	2
---------------------------	---

Date of Incident: ___/___/___ Time of Incident: ___:___am/pm	Location/ Address of Incident: _____
Precinct where incident occurred: _____	ZIP: _____
Is this a Serial Incident? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk.	Previous police report filed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk.
If Yes: Number of Previous Incidents <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2-5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11+ <input type="checkbox"/> Unk. Ongoing since: ___/___/___	

TYPE(S) OF VIOLENCE (check all that apply):	SITE TYPE (check one):
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>VIOLENCE AGAINST PERSON</b> (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Physical violence against person</b> (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Forced use of alcohol/drugs <input type="checkbox"/> Murder <input type="checkbox"/> Attempted murder <input type="checkbox"/> Physical violence <input type="checkbox"/> Attempted physical violence <input type="checkbox"/> Robbery <input type="checkbox"/> Attempted robbery <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual violence <input type="checkbox"/> Attempted sexual violence <input type="checkbox"/> Self-injury <input type="checkbox"/> Suicide <input type="checkbox"/> Attempted suicide <input type="checkbox"/> Other self-harming behavior (cutting, etc.)  Was a weapon involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown List weapon: _____  Did the person die? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown Was the person injured? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown If yes, severity of injury: <input type="checkbox"/> No injuries requiring medical attention <input type="checkbox"/> Injuries requiring medical attention (specify): <input type="checkbox"/> Needed but not received <input type="checkbox"/> Outpatient (Clinic/MD/ER) <input type="checkbox"/> Hospitalization/Inpatient <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed Type of injury (specify): _____ _____ <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other violence against person</b> (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Blackmail <input type="checkbox"/> Bullying <input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination <input type="checkbox"/> Eviction <input type="checkbox"/> False police reporting <input type="checkbox"/> Financial <input type="checkbox"/> Harassment (not in person: mail, email, tel. etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Isolation <input type="checkbox"/> Limiting/restricting bathroom access <input type="checkbox"/> Medical <input type="checkbox"/> Psychological/Emotional abuse <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual harassment <input type="checkbox"/> Stalking <input type="checkbox"/> Threats/Intimidation <input type="checkbox"/> Use of children (threats, outing, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Use of immigration status <input type="checkbox"/> Verbal harassment in person <input type="checkbox"/> Violence against pet <input type="checkbox"/> Pet injured <input type="checkbox"/> Pet killed <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Police violence/misconduct</b> (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Excessive force <input type="checkbox"/> Police entrapment <input type="checkbox"/> Police harassment <input type="checkbox"/> Police raid <input type="checkbox"/> Unjustified arrest <input type="checkbox"/> Use of condoms as evidence  Reported to internal/external police monitor? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Will Report <input type="checkbox"/> Attempted, complaint not taken <input type="checkbox"/> Not available <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> (specify): _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cruising area <input type="checkbox"/> In or near LGBTQ-identified venue <input type="checkbox"/> Media <input type="checkbox"/> Non-LGBTQ-identified venue (bar, restaurant, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Online/Internet <input type="checkbox"/> Police precinct/ jail/ vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Public Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Private residence <input type="checkbox"/> School/college/university <input type="checkbox"/> Shelter <input type="checkbox"/> DV/IPV <input type="checkbox"/> Non-DV/IPV <input type="checkbox"/> Street/public area <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Workplace (place where survivor or abusive partner is employed) <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed  Was this incident related to pick-up violence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown  If yes, did survivor/victim & offender meet through cruising website or phone app? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown  If yes, specify website/app: <input type="checkbox"/> Adam4adam <input type="checkbox"/> Craigslist <input type="checkbox"/> Eros <input type="checkbox"/> Grindr <input type="checkbox"/> Manhunt <input type="checkbox"/> Rentboy <input type="checkbox"/> Other website/app (specify): _____  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>MOTIVE</b> (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Intimate partner violence <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Pick-up violence <input type="checkbox"/> Police violence <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual violence <input type="checkbox"/> Bias violence <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Homelessness/Classism <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Immigrant <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-LGBQ/Homophobia/Biphobia <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Sex worker <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Transgender/Transphobia <input type="checkbox"/> Disability <input type="checkbox"/> HIV/AIDS-related <input type="checkbox"/> Racist/Anti-ethnic <input type="checkbox"/> Religious (specify perceived religion): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Sexist <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>VIOLENCE AGAINST PROPERTY</b> (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Arson <input type="checkbox"/> Theft <input type="checkbox"/> Vandalism <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ *Est. stolen/damaged property value: \$ _____	

Unknown

**OFFENDER INFORMATION** **3**

**Total Number of Offenders:** \_\_\_\_\_ Is offender a member of identifiable **hate group**?  Yes  No  Unk. Hate group's name(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Vehicle used in case/incident?  Yes  No If yes, describe vehicle: \_\_\_\_\_ License #: \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: If there is more than one offender, CREATE A DESIGNATION FOR EACH OFFENDER for use in the blank following each demographic category below (A, B, C, etc.)**  
 Offender A Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Offender B Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Offender C Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**OFFENDER(S) KNOWN TO SURVIVOR?**  Yes  No **If YES, fill out 1), below. If NO, fill out 2).**

**1) KNOWN OFFENDER(S): RELATIONSHIP TO SURVIVOR/VICTIM:**

Acquaintance/Friend  Employer/Co-Worker  Ex-Lover/Partner ( Live-in  Non Live-In)  Landlord  
 Lover/Partner ( Live-in  Non Live-In)  Pick-Up  Police  Other law enforcement (FBI, ICE, etc.)  
 Other first responder (EMT, Court personnel, etc.)  Relative/Family  Roommate  Service provider  
 Tenant/Neighbor  Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  Unknown

**2) UNKNOWN OFFENDER: RELATIONSHIP TO SURVIVOR/VICTIM:**

Police  Other law enforcement (FBI, ICE, etc.)  Other first responder (EMT, Court personnel, etc.)  
 Pick-Up  Stranger  Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  Unknown

<p><b>AGE:</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> 14 or under _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 15-18 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 19-24 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 25-29 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 30-39 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 40-49 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 50-59 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 60-69 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 70-79 _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 80 or over _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed _____ Age (if known) _____ D.O.B: _____/_____/_____	<p><b>GENDER ID</b> (check all that apply):</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Man _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Woman _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Transgender _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Transgender _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Identified /Other _____ (specify): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not Disclosed _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown _____	<p><b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b> (check all that apply):</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Arab/Middle Eastern _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Asian/Pacific Islander _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American/ African Descent _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous/First People/ Native American/ American Indian _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Latina/o _____ <input type="checkbox"/> White _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Identified /Other _____ (specify): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> South Asian _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown _____	<p><b>SEXUAL ORIENTATION:</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Gay _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Lesbian _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Queer _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Questioning/Unsure _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Identified/Other _____ (specify): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown _____
			<p><b>OFFENDER USE OF ALCOHOL/DRUGS</b></p> Alcohol involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed <input type="checkbox"/> Unk. Drugs involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not disclosed <input type="checkbox"/> Unk. If yes, describe: _____ _____

**POLICE/COURT RESPONSE**

**Did survivor/victim interact with police in any way?**  Yes  No  Unknown

<p><b>POLICE RESPONSE</b></p> <p>What was police attitude toward survivor/victim?  <input type="checkbox"/> Courteous <input type="checkbox"/> Indifferent <input type="checkbox"/> Hostile <input type="checkbox"/> Unk.</p> <p>Did police do any of following to survivor/victim?          (check all that apply):  <input type="checkbox"/> Arrest survivor/victim  <input type="checkbox"/> Verbal abuse  <input type="checkbox"/> Use slurs or bias language  <input type="checkbox"/> Physical violence  <input type="checkbox"/> Police refused to take complaint  <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual violence  <input type="checkbox"/> Other negative behaviors (specify): _____</p> <p>If police violence/misconduct, reported to internal/external police monitor?</p>	<p><b>POLICE REPORTING</b></p> <p>Did survivor/victim report incident to police?  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Will report</p> <p>Did the police take a complaint? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Complaint # _____</p> <p>Did the police arrest the offender(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown</p> <p>Police involved (check all that apply):  <input type="checkbox"/> City/Muni. <input type="checkbox"/> County <input type="checkbox"/> State <input type="checkbox"/> Federal (specify): _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____ Police Badge # _____</p> <p><b>PROTECTIVE ORDERS</b></p> <p>Was a protective order sought by survivor/victim?  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown</p> <p>Was the protective order granted?  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Will Report <input type="checkbox"/> Attempted, complaint not taken <input type="checkbox"/> Not available <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	Protective order obtained (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> By survivor/victim <input type="checkbox"/> By offender <input type="checkbox"/> Both survivor/victim & offender <input type="checkbox"/> Civil <input type="checkbox"/> Criminal <input type="checkbox"/> DV <input type="checkbox"/> Non-DV <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**POLICE/COURT RESPONSE** *(continued)* **4**

<b>DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CLASSIFICATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Did the survivor/victim identify the case/incident as domestic violence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown Did the police classify the case/incident as domestic violence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown If criminal case, was the case/incident classified as domestic violence by prosecutors? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In process <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<b>BIAS INCIDENT CLASSIFICATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Did the survivor/victim describe the incident as hate-motivated? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown Did the police classify the incident as hate-motivated? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown Was the incident classified as a hate crime by prosecutors? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In process <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**SERVICES PROVIDED**

GENERAL SERVICES	ADVOCACY <i>(check all types that apply):</i>	REFERRALS <i>(check all that apply):</i>	FOLLOW-UP NEEDED?
<input type="checkbox"/> Counseling <input type="checkbox"/> Safety planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Legal <input type="checkbox"/> Medical <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Police <input type="checkbox"/> Public benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Disability/SSD <input type="checkbox"/> Medicaid/Medicare <input type="checkbox"/> Public Assistance/Food Stamps <input type="checkbox"/> Shelter/Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployment <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Legal <input type="checkbox"/> Shelter <input type="checkbox"/> DV <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless <input type="checkbox"/> Medical <input type="checkbox"/> Police <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Agency follow-up <input type="checkbox"/> Caller follow-up

**CASE STATUS & MANAGEMENT (Staff Only)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Case Opened <b>Assigned to:</b> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Case Reassignment <b>Re-assigned to:</b> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Opened Closed Case <b>Assigned to:</b> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Case Conference Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Case Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Case Data Update <input type="checkbox"/> Quality Status Review
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**NARRATIVE**

In your description of the case/incident, please make sure that you give the scenario of the violence, including the use of weapons, the specific anti-LGBTQ words used (if any), and extent of injuries.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX II  
TABLES

Table 1

*Demographic Data Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation of Total Data Set*

	N	%	N=378
<b>Gender Identity</b>			
Transgender Men	12	3.17	
Transgender Women	93	24.6	
Cisgender Men	132	34.92	
Cisgender Women	132	34.92	
Intersex	5*	1.32	
Self-Defined Other	8*	2.12	
Unknown	3	0.79	
Total	385*	101.85	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			
Lesbian	60	15.87	
Gay	102	26.98	
Bisexual	88	23.28	
Queer	41	10.85	
Questioning	9	2.38	
Heterosexual	18	4.76	
Self-Defined Other	10	2.65	
Unknown	50	13.23	
Total	378	100.00	
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
White	190	50.26	
Black	8	2.12	
Arab/Mid. East.	4	1.06	
Asian/Pac. Isl.	2	0.53	
Nat. Amer./Amer. Indian/Indigenous	19	5.03	
Latinx	54	14.29	
Mixed Race/Ethnicity	21	5.55	
White plus other	1	0.26	
Black Plus Indigenous	2	0.53	
Black Plus Indigenous plus Latinx	2	0.53	
Indigenous plus Latinx	10	2.65	
Indigenous plus White plus Other	1	0.26	
Latinx plus Other	1	0.26	
White plus Latinx	2	0.53	
Other	2	0.53	
Unknown	76	20.11	
Total	378	100.00	

*\*Self-Defined Gender Identity and intersex identified people are double counted with transgender women. Totals are thus 7 more than total incident reports under gender identity. Actual totals equal 378.*



Table 2

*Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity any contact with Police*

	N	%	N=135
<b>Gender Identity</b>			
Transgender Men	0	0.00	
Transgender Women	33	24.44	
Cisgender Men	52	38.52	
Cisgender Women	48	35.56	
Intersex	2*	1.48	
Self-Defined Other	1*	0.74	
Unknown	2	1.48	
Total	138*	102.22	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			
Lesbian	23	17.04	
Gay	40	29.63	
Bisexual	39	28.89	
Queer	12	8.89	
Questioning	1	0.74	
Heterosexual	7	5.19	
Self-Defined Other	4	2.65	
Unknown	9	2.96	
Total	135	100.00	
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
White	73	54.07	
Black	2	1.48	
Arab/Mid. East.	0	0.00	
Asian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00	
Indigenous	12	8.88	
Latinx	18	13.33	
Mixed Race/Ethnicity	11	8.15	
White plus other	1	0.74	
Black Plus Indigenous	0	0.00	
Black Plus Indigenous plus Latinx	1	0.74	
Indigenous plus Latinx	6	4.44	
Indigenous plus White plus Other	1	0.74	
Latinx plus Other	1	0.74	
White plus Latinx	1	0.74	
Other	1	0.74	
Unknown	21	15.56	
Total	135	100.00	

*\*Self-Defined Gender Identity included 1 person who was double counted under transgender woman. All intersex identified people are double counted with transgender women. Totals are thus 3 more than total incident reports.*

Table 3

*Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity reported to Police*

	N	%	N=100
<b>Gender Identity</b>			
Transgender Men	0	0.00	
Transgender Women	26	26.00	
Cisgender Men	37	37.00	
Cisgender Women	35	35.00	
Intersex	2*	2.00	
Self-Defined Other	1*	1.00	
Unknown	2	2.00	
Total	103*	103.00	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			
Lesbian	17	17.00	
Gay	32	32.00	
Bisexual	26	26.00	
Queer	6	6.00	
Questioning	0	0.00	
Heterosexual	6	6.00	
Self-Defined Other	4	4.00	
Unknown	9	9.00	
Total	100	100.00	
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
White	53	53.00	
Black	1	1.00	
Arab/Mid. East.	0	0.00	
Asian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00	
Indigenous	10	10.00	
Latinx	13	13.00	
Mixed Race/Ethnicity	5	5.00	
White plus other	0	0.00	
Black Plus Indigenous	0	0.00	
Black Plus Indigenous plus Latinx	0	0.00	
Indigenous plus Latinx	2	2.00	
Indigenous plus White plus Other	1	1.00	
Latinx plus Other	1	1.00	
White plus Latinx	1	1.00	
Other	0	0.00	
Unknown	18	18.00	
Total	100	100.00	

*\*Self-Defined Gender Identity included 1 person who was double counted under transgender woman. All intersex identified people are double counted with transgender women. Totals are thus 3 more than total incident reports*

Table 4

*Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity negative contact with Police*

	N	%	N=68
<b>Gender Identity</b>			
Transgender Men	0	0.00	
Transgender Women	22	32.35	
Cisgender Men	30	44.12	
Cisgender Women	16	23.53	
Intersex	2*	2.94	
Self-Defined Other	1*	1.47	
Unknown	0	0.00	
Total	71*	104.41	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			
Lesbian	11	16.68	
Gay	20	29.41	
Bisexual	24	35.29	
Queer	9	13.24	
Questioning	1	0.74	
Heterosexual	1	0.74	
Self-Defined Other	0	0.00	
Unknown	2	2.94	
Total	68	100.00	
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
White	39	57.35	
Black	1	1.47	
Arab/Mid. East.	0	0.00	
Asian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00	
Indigenous	5	7.35	
Latinx	10	14.70	
Mixed Race/Ethnicity	10	14.70	
White plus other	1	1.47	
Black Plus Indigenous	0	0.00	
Black Plus Indigenous plus Latinx	1	1.47	
Indigenous plus Latinx	6	8.82	
Indigenous plus White plus Other	0	0.00	
Latinx plus Other	1	1.47	
White plus Latinx	1	1.47	
Other	1	1.47	
Unknown	5	7.35	
Total	68	100.00	

*\*Self-Defined Gender Identity included 1 person who was double counted under transgender woman. All intersex identified people are double counted with transgender women. Totals are thus 3 more than total incident reports.*

Table 5

*Persons having Negative contact with Police after Reporting a Victimization*

	N	%	N=38
<b>Gender Identity</b>			
Transgender Men	0	0.00	
Transgender Women	15	39.47	
Cisgender Men	16	42.11	
Cisgender Women	7	18.42	
Intersex	2*	5.26	
Self-Defined Other	1*	2.63	
Unknown	0	0.00	
Total	41*	107.89	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			
Lesbian	7	18.42	
Gay	12	31.58	
Bisexual	13	34.21	
Queer	3	7.89	
Questioning	0	0.00	
Heterosexual	1	2.63	
Self-Defined Other	0	0.00	
Unknown	2	5.26	
Total	100	100.00	
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
White	26	68.42	
Black	0	0.00	
Arab/Mid. East.	0	0.00	
Asian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00	
Indigenous	4	10.53	
Latinx	4	10.53	
Mixed Race/Ethnicity	5	13.16	
White plus other	1	2.63	
Black Plus Indigenous	0	0.00	
Indigenous plus Latinx	0	0.00	
Indigenous plus Latinx	2	5.26	
Indigenous plus White plus Other	0	0.00	
Latinx plus Other	1	2.63	
White plus Latinx	1	2.63	
Other	0	0.53	
Unknown	2	5.26	
Total	38	100.00	

*\*Self-Defined Gender Identity included 1 person who was double counted under transgender woman. All intersex identified people are double counted with transgender women. Totals are thus 3 more than total incident reports.*

Table 6

*Police Abuse, Police Misconduct and Police Perpetrated Hate Violence\**

	N	%	N=68
Police Abuse	63	92.65	
Verbal Abuse	33	48.53	
Slurs/Biased Language	16	23.53	
Physical Violence	23	33.83	
Sexual Violence	5	7.35	
Police Misconduct	50	73.53	
Excessive Force	22	32.35	
Police Entrapment	7	10.29	
Unjustified Arrest	32	47.06	
Other Police Misconduct	19	27.94	
Police Perpetrated Hate Violence	21	30.88	
Anti-LGBQ Bias	15	22.06	
Anti-Sex Worker Bias	7	10.29	
Anti-Transgender Bias	10	14.71	
Other Bias	13	19.12	

\*Double counting is allowed in all categories.

Table 7

*Police Violence of Total Data Set: Report of IPV/HV and No Report of IPV/HV*

Total N=378

P<0.00001

Chi Square= 36.9045

	Police Violence	No Police Violence	Total
Report of IPV/HV to Police	38	62	100
No Report of IPV/HV to Police	30	248	278
Total	68	310	378

	N	% Column	% Row	% Total
Report of IPV/HV to Police				N=100
Police Violence	38	55.88	38.00	10.05
No Police Violence	62	20.00	62.00	16.40
No Report of IPV/HV to Police				N=278
Police Violence	30	44.12	10.79	7.94
No Police Violence	248	80.00	89.20	65.61

Table 8

*Police Violence of HV Data Set: Report of HV and No Report of HV*

Total N=189  
P<0.01 P= .000017  
Chi Square= 18.4607

	Police Violence	No Police Violence	Total
Report of HV to Police	22	27	49
No Report of HV to Police	21	119	140
Total	43	146	189

	N	% Column	% Row	% Total
Report of HV to Police				N=49
Police Violence	22	51.16	44.90	11.64
No Police Violence	27	18.49	55.10	14.29
No Report of HV to Police				N=140
Police Violence	21	48.84	15.00	11.11
No Police Violence	119	81.51	85.00	62.96

Table 9

*Police Violence of IPV Data Set: Report of IPV and No Report of IPV*

Total N=189  
P<0.01 P= .000008  
Chi Square= 20.0359

	Police Violence	No Police Violence	Total
Report of IPV to Police	16	35	51
No Report of IPV to Police	9	129	138
Total	25	164	189

	N	% Column	% Row	% Total
Report of IPV to Police				N=51
Police Violence	16	64.00	31.37	8.47
No Police Violence	35	21.34	68.63	18.52
No Report of IPV to Police				N=138
Police Violence	9	36.00	6.52	4.76
No Police Violence	129	78.66	93.48	68.25



Table 10

*Police Violence against Transgender Women Data Set: Report and No Report*

Total N=93  
P<0.01 P= .000001  
Chi Square= 23.1501

	Police Violence	No Police Violence	Total
Report by Transgender Woman to Police	15	11	26
No Report by Transgender Woman to Police	7	60	67
Total	22	71	93

	N	% Column	% Row	% Total
Report of Violence to Police				N=26
Police Violence	15	68.18	57.69	16.13
No Police Violence	11	15.49	42.31	18.52
No Report of Violence to Police				N=67
Police Violence	7	31.82	10.45	7.53
No Police Violence	60	84.51	89.55	64.52

Table 11

*Police Violence against People of Color Data Set: Report and No Report*

Total N=138  
P<0.01 P= .000126  
Chi Square= 14.7055

	Police Violence	No Police Violence	Total
Report by Person of Color to Police	12	17	29
No Report by Person of Color to Police	12	97	109
Total	24	114	138

	N	% Column	% Row	% Total
Report of Violence to Police				N=29
Police Violence	12	50.00	41.38	8.70
No Police Violence	17	14.91	58.62	12.32
No Report of Violence to Police				N=109
Police Violence	12	50.00	11.01	8.70
No Police Violence	97	85.09	88.99	70.29

APPENDIX III  
ASU IRB APPROVAL



APPROVAL: EXPEDITED REVIEW

Craig Lecroy  
Social Work, School of  
520/884-5507  
Craig.Lecroy@asu.edu

Dear Craig Lecroy:

On 4/22/2016 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Police Violence against Victims Reporting Abuse and Hate Crimes
Investigator:	Craig Lecroy
IRB ID:	STUDY00004179
Category of review:	(7)(b) Social science methods, (7)(a) Behavioral research
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• data release agreement, Category: Other (to reflect anything not captured above);</li><li>• irb police violence 4 14, Category: IRB Protocol;</li><li>• irb certification, Category: Other (to reflect anything not captured above);</li><li>• irb certification, Category: Other (to reflect anything not captured above);</li></ul>

The IRB approved the protocol from 4/22/2016 to 4/21/2017 inclusive. Three weeks before 4/21/2017 you are to submit a completed Continuing Review application and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 4/21/2017 approval of this protocol expires on that date. When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the "Documents" tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc:

Patrick Farr

APPENDIX IV  
NATIONAL COALITION OF ANTI-VIOLENCE PROGRAMS  
DATA USE PERMISSION



NCAVP Data Release Agreement Form

Date of Request: <u>2-29-2016</u>		Name of Requestor: <u>Pat Farr</u> Job Title: <u>Student</u>	
Name of Organization/Institution: <u>Arizona State University</u>		Address: <u>282 S Highland Ave</u> <u>Tucson AZ</u> <u>85719</u>	
NCAVP Member Organization: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
Telephone numbers: <u>541-359-8738</u>		Email Address: <u>pnfarr@email.arizona.edu</u>	
Purpose of Request (Include any expected final products, presentations, or publications): <u>The data will be used in a Social Work thesis to research police violence against LGBTQIA&amp;HIV+ people when they have reported IPV or HV. The purpose of this research &amp; the expected outcome is a Master's Thesis that satisfies the requirements for an MSW at ASU. The thesis will be published without copyright and held at the ASU library.</u>			
Complete list of people having access to the data:			
Name		Position/Affiliation	Location
<u>Pat Farr</u>		<u>Student</u>	<u>Tucson AZ</u>
<i>(Attach additional sheets, if necessary.)</i>			
If applicable, IRB number and affiliated institution: <u>Arizona State University</u>			
As a condition of receiving data, I/we agree that:			
1. I/We shall use the data solely for the purpose of the approved research study or activity stated above.			
2. I/We guarantee that the anonymity of the information provided by the data will be maintained, and that no information provided in the data will be used for the purpose of contact with the survivors or anyone associated with the survivors, including NCAVP Member Programs.			
3. I/We shall provide NCAVP staff by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with			

proof of delivery with a written plan of action for the dissemination of the approved final products, presentations, or publications prior to any of the above products being released.

4. I/We shall credit NCAVP in any final products. The language used to credit NCAVP will be sent to NCAVP staff for approval prior to any public release of the products.
5. I/We shall provide NCAVP staff with written notification by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with proof of delivery once the approved activity or study has been completed. Upon completion of the approved project or research study, I/we shall destroy the data and information derived from its contents, including all copies, modified data, or hybrid or merged databases containing the data, with the exception of the above approved products, publications, and presentations. I/we shall provide NCAVP staff with written confirmation by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with proof of delivery of the destruction of the data and information derived from its contents.
6. I/We may retain the data specified in this agreement until 12-1-16, hereinafter referred to as the retention date. Upon the retention date, I/we shall destroy the data and information derived from its contents, including all copies, modified data, or hybrid or merged databases containing the data, with the exception of the above approved products, publications, and presentations. I/we shall provide NCAVP staff with written confirmation by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with proof of delivery of the destruction of the data and information derived from its contents.
7. I/We will notify NCAVP staff in writing by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with proof of delivery of any requested changes to the expected termination date, changes in study protocol, any changes to persons with access to the requested data, and final disposition of the data.
8. I/We have attached a list of all persons who will have access to the data. The persons on this list are aware of the conditions of this Agreement. NCAVP staff will be notified of any changes to the list of approved people in writing by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with proof of delivery of any changes to the list. I/we affirm that no portion of the data covered by this Agreement will be released or disclosed to any other individual or entity for any purpose.
9. This agreement is effective starting the date that the agreement is approved by the Co-Director of Community Organization and Public Advocacy at the New York City Anti-Violence Project and the Executive Director of the New York City Anti-Violence Project. (See Below)
10. NCAVP may cancel this Agreement if the above research study or project, as it currently is written or any changes thereafter, are not in the best interests of NCAVP. NCAVP staff will provide written notification of the cancellation of the agreement and state the reasons for doing so. Upon receipt of this notice, I/we shall cease using the data and destroy the data and information derived from its contents, including all copies, modified data, or hybrid or merged databases containing the data, with the exception of the above approved products, publications, and presentations. I/we shall provide NCAVP staff with written confirmation by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with proof of delivery of the destruction of the data and information derived from its contents within seventy two hours of written



notification of cancellation of agreement.

11. I/we may cancel this agreement without cause no less than twenty four hours written notice to NCAVP staff. Upon cancelation of this agreement, I/we shall destroy the data and information derived from its contents, including all copies, modified data, or hybrid or merged databases containing the data, with the exception of the above approved products, publications, and presentations. I/we shall provide NCAVP staff with written confirmation by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with proof of delivery of the destruction of the data and information derived from its contents within seventy two hours of written notification of cancellation of agreement.

The terms of this agreement may not be waived, altered, modified, or amended except by written agreement of both parties.

This agreement supersedes any and all agreements between the parties with respect to the use of the data specified in this agreement.

Signature of Requestor: <u>  <i>PK</i>  </u>	Date (month, day, year): <u>  2-29-16  </u>
-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

NCAVP STAFF USE	
Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	Name of Authorizing NCAVP Staff: <u>  <i>Chris J. Indasunt</i>  </u> Signature of Authorizing NCAVP Staff: <u>  <i>[Signature]</i>  </u> Date (month, day, year): <u>  3/11/16  </u>
Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	Name of NYC AVP Executive Director: <u>  <i>Bonny Tilley</i>  </u> Signature of NYC AVP Executive Director: <u>  <i>[Signature]</i>  </u> Date (month, day, year): <u>  3/14/16  </u>