

## **ABSTRACT**

### **SAME-SEX INTIMATE PARTNER ABUSE SENSITIVITY TRAINING (SS-IPAST) FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SHELTERS: A GRANT PROPOSAL PROJECT**

**By**

**John M. Valenzuela**

**May 2010**

The purpose of this grant proposal was to develop a program, find potential funding sources and write a grant to fund a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) sensitivity training program for traditionally Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence (HIPV) shelters in the Los Angeles County. An extensive literature review was performed to identify both the differences and similarities between Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence (HIPV) and Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence (SSIPV). An additional review was conducted to identify the challenges survivors of SSIPV face when attempting to access services, including the manner in which heterosexist norms and policies can interfere with the reporting of, and response to SSIPV. The goal of this project is to raise awareness of intimate partner violence in the LGBT community, as well as demonstrate the need for a culturally sensitive and same-sex affirming response to SSIPV. The actual submission and/or funding of this grant were not a requirement for the successful completion of this project.



SAME-SEX INTIMATE PARTNER ABUSE SENSITIVITY TRAINING (SS-IPAST)  
FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SHELTERS: A GRANT PROPOSAL PROJECT

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Social Work

California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Social Work

Committee Members:

Thomas Alex Washington, Ph.D. (Chair)

Catherine Goodman, D.S.W.

Cheryl Lee, Ph.D.

College Designee:

John Oliver, Ph.D.

By John M. Valenzuela

B.A.S.W., 2009, California State University, Long Beach

May 2010

UMI Number: 1486443

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 1486443

Copyright 2010 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the immense amount of love and support I have received over the last several years from all who have shared in my academic journey. I would like to especially like to thank my mother and father, Donna Lawson and John Valenzuela, for having always had faith in my academic endeavors. Thank you to my grandmother Beverly Lawson and late grandfather, Bill Lawson; both always instilled in me the importance of education. In more recent times, my extended family, the Añorve's, have been a supportive and affirming presence in my life- thank you Raúl, Blanca, Gabriella, and Josefina Navarro. I would like to acknowledge my brother Daniel; thank you for covering for me at the restaurant and allowing me the time to stay engaged in school. Thank you to my brother Andrew and his wife Jamie. Thank you to Mark and George Colmenares and, Diana and Rosie Valenzuela. I would like to thank my close friends who have been there through the years and my advanced standing colleagues for their support during an exceptional year of achievement. I would like to thank my professors in the Department of Social Work. I would like to thank Dr. Nancy Meyer-Addams for being my mentor, professor, advisor, friend, and inspiration. I would like to thank Dr. Thomas Alex Washington for his mentorship during the thesis process. Thank you to Susan Holt with the Los Angeles Gay & Lesbian Center for her consultation. Finally, I would like to acknowledge all the survivors of Same Sex Intimate Partner Violence for having the courage to come forward and share their stories.

## CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Problem Statement .....	1
Purpose Statement .....	3
Target Population .....	4
Agency Description .....	4
Cross-Cultural and Social Work Relevance .....	5
Mental Health Relevance.....	5
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	7
Introduction .....	7
Prevalence .....	8
Battling for Women's Equality and LGBT Rights .....	9
Feminism in Action .....	10
From Out of the Closet .....	11
History of California Same-sex Intimate Partner Legislation .....	14
Criminal Justice Response to Incidents of .....	15
Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence	
Similarities and Differences between Same-Sex .....	17
and Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence	
Barriers to Reporting Same-sex Intimate Partner Violence .....	20
Feminist Theory .....	20
Myths and Stereotypes of the Gay Male and Lesbian .....	21
Female	
Attitudes toward Gays and Lesbians .....	23
Lack of Resources .....	23

CHAPTER	Page
What Domestic Violence Agencies Can do to be..... More Accepting of SSPIV	25
3. METHODOLOGY .....	27
Introduction .....	27
Target Population .....	27
Identification of a Funding Source .....	28
Selecting the Funding Source .....	29
Needs Assessment for the Grant Problem Statement.....	30
Grant Requirements .....	31
4. GRANT PROPOSAL .....	32
Introduction .....	33
Background and Population Served .....	33
Mission Statement of the L.A. Gay & Lesbian Center .....	34
Program Description .....	35
Program Objectives .....	35
Qualification of Key Leadership .....	37
Service Outline .....	39
Budget Narrative .....	40
Personnel.....	40
Non-personnel.....	41
Program Survey .....	41
5. LESSONS LEARNED .....	43
Needs Assessment .....	43
Identification of the Funding Source .....	43
Grant Writing Process .....	45
Mental Health Relevance.....	46
Social Work Implications .....	46
REFERENCES .....	49

## TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Line-Item Budget .....	48



CHAPTER 1  
INTRODUCTION  
Problem Statement

Domestic violence, also known as Intimate Partner Violence (IPV), within the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) community is a growing problem that is both underreported and devalued in contemporary American society (Hassounah & Glass, 2008). According to the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP; 2009), Los Angeles County has led the nation each year since 1998 in the number of Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence (SSIPV) cases reported. Moreover, in Los Angeles County alone, the NCAVP has recorded a 70% increase in reported incidences of SSIPV, up from 903 cases in 1998 to 1,529 reported cases in 2007.

Although scarce in number, studies conducted over the last two decades have yielded valuable data and have consistently concluded that domestic violence occurs in the LGBT community with at least the same amount of frequency and severity as in the heterosexual community (Gunther & Jennings, 1999). However, since SSIPV has not been studied and examined with the same fervor as Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence (HIPV), prevalence estimates in the LGBT community vary. Furthermore, since there is a scarcity of SSIPV data, a number of studies cited are older, but

nonetheless, suggest consistency over time. In addition, rates often vary because definitions of domestic violence vary (M. J. Brown & Groscup, 2009).

In addition to the typical barriers that face survivors of HIPV, LGBT survivors are faced with unique and additionally oppressive barriers to reporting, and surviving an abusive relationship (Hassounah & Glass, 2008). Where sexism and misogynistic social constructs kept battered women oppressed during the last century, heterosexism and homophobia have become the subversive tools used to oppress members of the LGBT community (M. J. Brown & Groscup, 2009). Stereotypes and misconceptions surrounding queer culture have helped perpetuate the fallacies of not only abhorrent behaviors such as domestic violence, but of general behaviors in same-sex relationships. This societal 'misconstruction' has affected how domestic violence between two members of the same-sex is prevented, reported, and prosecuted.

A person's sexual orientation can also drastically affect the resources and support systems available to help a survivor of SSIPV (McClennen, 2005). Typical support systems such as religious institutions, family, and friends may turn their backs on a person based on their disagreement or disregard with that person's lifestyle (McClennen & Summers, 2002). Additionally, many individuals in the LGBT community are not out as openly LGBT to their friends and families, thus alienating the survivor from potential support systems.

Intimate partner violence (IPV), exists in many forms (M. J. Brown & Groscup, 2009). The main types discussed in this thesis are: Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence (HIPV) and Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence (SSIPV). Although the gay

and lesbian community contains a variety of gender options in a relationship, this thesis will primarily focus on same-sex relationships; male to male and female to female relationships. This is not to insinuate that domestic violence does not occur in relationships in which one of the partners is bisexual, transgendered or intersex. However, this author has decided to focus on abuse within same-sex relationships. The terms relationships, couple and partnership makes no assumption of cohabitation, monogamy or permanence of the partnership.

### Purpose Statement

The goal of this project was to develop a grant proposal procuring funding for Same-sex IPV Sensitivity Training (SS-IPAST) for domestic violence shelter workers, so as to enable them to better address the needs of the LGBT community. As addressed in this thesis, IPV includes: physical abuse, mental/emotional abuse, sexual abuse, verbal abuse and or financial abuse. In an abusive relationship, any number of these forms of abuse can be present and active.

Due to the current fiscal crisis in the State of California, many agencies have seen deep cuts in funding. Along with budget cuts, monies have been reallocated, rerouted and redistributed. Agencies serving specific populations have seen funding streams rerouted to serve the community at large. As stated by S. Holt (personal communication, October 6, 2009), Director of the Domestic Violence Program at the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center: “As long as SSIPV remains relatively invisible due to lack of prevention efforts and funding, this will continue to be the case . . . we desperately need

funding for prevention once again because, without prevention efforts, the intervention work that we do will always be insufficient to address and meet the need.”

### Target Population

The target population is mainstream domestic violence shelter workers in Los Angeles County. In this context, the term ‘mainstream domestic violence shelter’ refers to shelters that have traditionally served heterosexual clients. The secondary target population is members of the Los Angeles County Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community. The primary goal is to help educate and train shelter workers to better respond to cases of SSIPV. The ultimate goal is to help create a network of culturally competent shelters trained to respond to the needs survivors of SSIPV in the LBGT community.

### Agency Description

The grant writer is collaborating with the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center, located in Los Angeles, California. During the years 2000-2005, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center was able to develop the most comprehensive SSIPV program in the nation (S. Holt, personal communication, October 6, 2009). A large focus of their efforts was on prevention and education. However, in 2005, the State of California determined that funding for all prevention efforts and programs serving underserved populations could be better utilized by the mainstream shelters. As a result, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center was forced to drastically cut their broad-based prevention program. Subsequently, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center has seen an unfortunate decrease in clients seeking services. Since domestic violence funding has been rerouted to mainstream shelters,

sensitivity trainings, such as the proposed SS-IPAST program, are desperately needed. Trainings would help to ensure that all domestic violence shelters in Los Angeles County are able to accommodate the needs of the LGBT community, in a sensitive and affirming manner.

### Cross-Cultural and Social Work Relevance

According to the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), one of the main tenets of social work is social justice (NASW, 1999). Social work values require being culturally competent and empathetic when working with clients. These are but two of many reasons why addressing the issue of SSIPV is not only relevant to social work, but part of the core competencies on which the profession is based.

### Mental Health Relevance

Extensive research has been conducted on the mental health effects of HIPV. However, little research has been conducted specifically focusing on the effects of IPV in the LGBT community (Burke & Follingstad, 1999). Although research indicates that the effects are similar, there is a need to study how factors such as homophobia, HIV, hate crimes, and secrecy over being LGBT affect the mental health affects of IPV (Burke & Follingstad, 1999). Do such factors exacerbate mental health effects or add to the resiliency of a survivor to overcome the effects of abuse? These questions need to be asked, but more importantly need to be answered.

IPV can lead to adverse psychological conditions including, but not limited to, post traumatic stress disorder, depression and anxiety (Dutton, 2009). In a meta-analysis of the mental health impact of heterosexual female survivors of IPV, Golding (1999)

found that the prevalence of PTSD ranged from 31% to 84.4%, with a weighted mean prevalence estimate of 64%.

For both heterosexual men and women, physical IPV is associated with increased risk of poor health; depressive symptoms; substance use; and developing a chronic disease, chronic mental illness, and injury (Coker et al., 2002). Abuse of power and control is more strongly associated with physical abuse than with verbal abuse (Coker et al., 2002).

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a serious problem in the United States. The effects of IPV are pervasive and damaging at a variety of levels. Intimate partner violence and domestic abuse have psychological, financial, political, legal and emotional consequences that not only affect the parties involved, but American society as a whole (C. Brown, 2008). Studies report that between 2 to 4 million women are battered annually by their intimate partners and that 25-30% of all women is at risk of experiencing IPV in their lifetime (Peterman & Dixon 2003).

Whereas domestic violence encapsulated violence within an entire household, IPV refers specifically to abuse between partners and does not include, or refer to abuse of other members of the household, such as children and/or older adults (McClennen, 2005). McClennen (2005) also states that this differentiation enables better inclusion of relationships regardless of the couple's gender, marital status and age.

IPV has been legally defined as “ any assault, battery, sexual assault, sexual battery, or any criminal offense resulting in physical injury or death of one family or household member by another who is or was residing in the same dwelling” (Title XLIII, Chapter 741, Statute 741.28). According to Peterman and Dixon (2003), IPV can

manifest in a variety of different forms, including: physical abuse, emotional/verbal abuse, financial dependency, social isolation, sexual abuse, minimizing/denying, coercion/threats/intimidation, and murder.

### Prevalence

Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence (HIPV) affects approximately 1 million people in the United States every year (Wennison & Welchans, 2000). Many researchers agree that the prevalence rates of HIPV vary between 25 and 33% (Seelau et al., 2003). More recent research places the prevalence rate of Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence (SSIPV) at 47.5% for lesbians and 29.7% for gay men (M. J. Brown & Groscup, 2009). Island and Letellier (1991) estimate that out of the 9.5 million adult gay males in the United States; approximately 500,000 are victims of SSIPV each year. Later prevalence reports conducted by Gunther and Jennings (1999) indicate that rate of abuse between gay male partners is comparable to that of heterosexual partners; approximately 25% to 35%.

According to the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP), Los Angeles County has led the nation each year since 1998 in the number of SSIPV cases reported (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2009). In Los Angeles County alone, the NCAVP has recorded a 70% increase in reported incidences of SSIPV, up from 903 cases in 1998 to 1,529 reported cases in 2007.

According to the 2000 United States Census, Los Angeles County ranks number one in the amount of self-disclosed homosexual couples (M. J. Brown & Henriquez, 2008). Containing approximately 25,173 couples, Los Angeles County has more than



amount of same-sex couples than the number two county, Cook County, Illinois, home of Chicago (McClennen, 2005). These numbers, while not necessarily representative of the average same-sex couple populations in all counties, does however represent the increasing population of same-sex couples living in the United States (McClennen, 2005). When combined with the numbers recorded by the NCAVP, identified data substantiates that not only does California lead the nation with registered same-sex domestic partners (McClennen, 2005), but Los Angeles County leads the nation in reported incidents ofSSIPV (NCAVP, 2008). Therefore, not only is there an established rate of prevalence, but also an identified trend noting the projected rise in incidents reported in Los Angeles County (McClennen, 2005).

It is difficult to accurately report the total number of LGBT Americans due to several factors (M. J. Brown & Knopp, 2006). Estimates only identify those couples that are comfortable enough to be counted. Such numbers do not take into account couples or individuals who, for various reasons, are unable or unwilling to identify themselves as being in a same-sex relationship (M. J. Brown & Knopp, 2006). This lack of visibility, as well as a lack of general research, serves as a limitation in fully identifying the amount of same-sex couple living in the United States, it also makes it increasingly difficult to fully capture the prevalence ofSSIPV.

#### Battling for Women's Equality and LGBT Rights

For the last four decades women and men have strived to address the epidemic of domestic abuse (McClennen, Summer, & Dalay, 2002). Since the 1970s there have been many advances in illuminating the issue of violence against women, as well as creating

legislation to help prevent such abuse. Although the rate of progress has been slow, the overall visibility of IPV against women has increased (McClennen, Summer, & Dalay, 2002). However, recent research suggests that IPV is not just limited to women.

Although there is a severe lack of empirical data to fully evaluate the issue, studies have shown that IPV within the LGBT community is a problem of equally significant proportions (McClennen, Summer, & Dalay, 2002). As earlier stated, the current literature indicates that incidents of domestic violence within the LGBT community occur at the same prevalence rate as in the heterosexual community (C. Brown, 2008).

Similar to the initial feminist struggles of the 1960's , 70's and 80's, the ability to bring awareness to and address the subject of same-sex intimate partner violence (SSIPV) has been complicated by societal myths, gender stereotypes and oppressive attempts to deny the validity of SSIPV (C. Brown, 2008). Additionally, there are several unique complications that members of the LGBT community face in dealing with, reporting, and surviving SSIPV. Factors such as heterosexism, homophobia, gender role stereotypes, and legalized discrimination can determine the likelihood of a person seeking help, receiving help, or even acknowledging that the problem exists (C. Brown, 2008).

### Feminism in Action

It has only been during the last 25 years that there has been a more unified response to helping *women* survivors of IPV. During the late 1960s and 70s, the feminist movement helped to create a system of shelters and crisis centers to assist women fleeing abusive households (Freedman, 2002). Along with an increased awareness of the prevalence of domestic violence against women, came an increased awareness of the

emotional and psychological consequences of such IPV (Freedman, 2002). In response, domestic violence shelters began to offer counseling services and case management to help develop safer ways to exit the abusive relationship and seek refuge. Via progressive policy making and pressure put on legislatures by activists and community leaders, laws began to change so as to create legal consequences for abusers (Freedman, 2002).

During the latter half of the twentieth century, the fight for women's rights appeared to explode out of nowhere; however it was a movement that had been building for a great deal of time (Freedman, 2002). Throughout history, women have struggled for independence and equality. Women have battled to be able to divorce their husbands, marry outside their race, own property, vote, hold office, and advance in the business and academic world (Ehrlich, 1980). The last century has seen a constant battle for women's rights, even when it was against the popular vote and social tide of the era (Freedman, 2002). Such a consistent battle undoubtedly proved essential for securing greater awareness and protection from domestic abuse and violence. While it did not happen over night, the years of struggle no doubt prefaced the struggles of the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and added to the momentum of change which, to this day, continues to move forward (Ehrlich, 1980).

### From Out of the Closet

Homosexuality has been a perceived sign of moral weakness and spiritual perversity for much of the last two hundred years of American society (Scasta, 1998). Homosexuality was classified as a mental disorder in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)* until 1973 (Kameny, 2009). Much like the struggle

for equal rights for women, the struggle for LGBT equality has been a battle long in the making (Bombasaro-Brady, 2009). Whereas the women's liberation movement has made great leaps in the last forty years, the time since the beginning of the LGBT movement in the early 1960s has been marked with gradual and sporadic progress.

The gay rights movement in America has been active since the founding of the Mattachine Society in 1950 (Gorton, 2009). The Mattachine Society organized some of the first protests and demonstrations combating unequal treatment of gays and lesbians. During the mid-60's, the Mattachine Society successfully stopped the New York Police Department from entrapping gay men in bars. Additionally, the Mattachine Society organized the first gay protest at the White House in 1965 (Gorton, 2009).

Arguably the most decisive point in organization and coalescence of the LGBT community occurred from June 27 to July 3, 1969. Known as the Stonewall Riots, the weeklong series of protests and demonstrations marked a dramatic shifting point in the fight for gay and lesbian rights (Gorton, 2009). The Stonewall Inn was a popular bar and dance hall in New York City during the 1960's, that had been raided several times for "indecent activities", which during the time translated into same-sex dancing and/or fraternizing. In response to the constant raids, members of the LGBT community, most noticeably transgender individuals began to protest and "riot" against the New York City Police Department.

The Stonewall Riots accomplished three main objectives. First, it served as an impetus that electrified a new generation of activists that would carry the struggle into the next century. Second, the riots at Stonewall brought a level of visibility to the LGBT

community that had not previously been established. Third, the riots initiated the development of a broad political program to help promote the rights of the LGBT community in the United States (Gorton, 2009). The riots led to the formation of the National Gay Task Force in 1973, which was the first nationally organized political action group in the United States (Kameny, 2009). Much like the women's liberation movement, the 1960s and 70's saw many firsts for the gay rights movement. The year 1974 saw the election of the first openly lesbian or gay person for public office and in 1978, openly gay candidate Harvey Milk was elected to the San Francisco County Board of Supervisors. The 1970's culminated with an LGBT equality march on Washington D.C. in which 100,000 people attended. Such a dramatic show of support would not have been possible or even conceivable a decade earlier (Gorton, 2009). While the show of support was monumental, little had been done to change discriminatory laws and practices sanctioned by local and federal government. Likewise, nothing had been initiated to bring visibility to or address the issue of intimate partner violence in the LGBT community (Kameny, 2009). Activists were occupied with creating acceptance and basic acknowledgement for same-sex couples;SSIPV was not even on the agenda (Kameny, 2009).

Any progress made by the Stonewall Riots of 1969 was quickly extinguished by the Auto Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) crisis of the 1980s and 90s. During this time the LGBT community, especially gay men, were persecuted by society as being the cause of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV). People against the "gay" way of life used the horrors of the AIDS crisis as a means of validating their fears and justifying

their claims of moral indecency (Harper & Schneider, 2003). Stereotypes of the sexually promiscuous gay man were allowed to run freely, as discrimination based on sexual preference was validated under the pretense of public health safety. However it was during this time that members of the LGBT community began to truly organize and fight for not only advances in healthcare, but for equal rights and treatment, the same rights already afforded to heterosexual members of society. Through the horrors of the AIDS crisis, arose a new sense of social; political and personal awareness and activism (Harper & Schneider 2003).

#### History of California Same-sex Intimate Partner Legislation

Until 1994 same-sex couples in California involved in incidents of IPV were not covered under the state's domestic violence laws (Younglove et al., 2002). Prior to 1994, California Penal Code, Section 273.5 (a), enacted in 1977 provided that "any person who willfully inflicts on a person of the opposite sex . . . resulting in a traumatic condition, is guilty of a felony."

It the case of *People v. Silva* (1994), California's Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal ruled that the language used in the 1977 law, which limited the reach of the law and felony level penalties to heterosexual couples was *not* in violation of the United States Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment guarantee of equal protection. The court additionally found that the omission of same-sex couples in the language of the law was not only permissible, but purposeful as well. The court further exclaimed that upholding the language of the law served an "overriding interest in preserving the institution of marriage, especially where children are involved" (Younglove et al., 2002, p.761). The

court further reasoned that “a victim of same-sex domestic violence could still file charges for assault and battery, even though the penalties were less severe than under the domestic violence statute” (Younglove et al., 2002, p.761).

In reaching their decision, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal relied in part on *People v. Cameron* (1975), which denied an equal protection challenge to the predecessor of 273.5 (273d). Section 273d used language that indicated that perpetrators of domestic violence could only be men, thus only women could be plaintiffs in domestic violence court cases. The ruling also opined that wives, due to less physical strength, were more likely to be the victims of abuse. However as a caveat, the court also acknowledged that times were changing and that women were “becoming more independent and assertive” (Younglove et al., 2002, p. 761). In response to this acknowledgment, court urged legislators to consider this reality thus leading to subsequent laws changing the language to include both men and women as potential perpetrators that could be charged. Likewise, the *Silva* court also conceded that while the language of the law was not in violation of the United States Constitution, same-sex relationships may be deserving of protections similar to those afforded by Section 273.5. Interestingly, just a few months after the *Silva* decision, the California legislature amended Section 273.5 to include same-sex couples by deleting the phrase “of the opposite sex” in determining who can be deemed a victim (Younglove et al., 2002).

#### Criminal Justice Response to Incidents of Same-sex Intimate Partner Violence

Although laws designed to extend rights and protections to survivors of SSIPV are necessary, they are useless if not properly enforced (Younglove et al., 2002). In

many situations law enforcement personnel form the frontlines in the battle against both heterosexual and same-sex IPV. Issues of cultural sensitivity and heterosexist bias can affect how first responders handle reported cases of SSIPV (Younglove et al., 2002). Additionally, as first responders and agents of the law, police officers serve as a filter through which IPV cases must pass in order to receive additional services and/or criminal justice considerations. Therefore, if there is a lack of knowledge, education, sensitivity or concern for SSIPV, the potential for a detrimental response increases (Younglove et al., 2002). Many victims fear insensitive or indifferent reactions from police officers, based on their expressed sexual orientation (Kuehnle & Sullivan, 2003).

There is also a general consensus in the LGBT community that a general sense of heterosexism and homophobia are intrinsic in the law enforcement community and therefore mirrored in the attitudes and actions of police officers. (Younglove et al., 2002). According to Burke (1996) law enforcement officers have negative connotations of lesbians and gays who reference years of harassment, unfair treatment, bar raids, and general abuse from the criminal justice system. Furthermore, there is a historical view held by law enforcement that homosexuality is immoral and criminal and therefore “part of the societal disorder that the police officer has dedicated his or her life to eradicating” (Burke, 1994, p. 193). Therefore, as many theorists have hypothesized, due to a lack of ascribed validity to same-sex relationships, police officers respond differently to cases of SSIPV than that if HIPV (Younglove et al., 2002).

Evidence also indicates that the sex of the perpetrator and/or the sexual orientation of the couple can determine how an IPV report is handled and perceived



(Seelau & Seelau, 2005). According to Connolly et al (2000), police officers responding to domestic disturbances are less likely to arrest perpetrators that do not involve male-against-female violence. Additionally, officers are less likely to respond to incidences that involve same-sex couples, perhaps due to sexual prejudice (i.e. homophobia); (Renzetti, 1989) or as a result of gender role stereotypes that women cannot be abusers and men cannot be abused (Letellier, 1996).

### Similarities and Differences between Same-Sex and Heterosexual

#### Intimate Partner Violence

As previously stated, IPV can be manifested through a range of physical; psychological; and sexual abuses and is just as prevalent in the LGBT community as in the heterosexual community (C. Brown, 2008). Accordingly, the reactions and responses of the abused partner are also manifested in very similar ways, regardless of sexual orientation (C. Brown, 2008). As stated by Elliot (1996), members of the LGBT community experience many of the same psychological affects of abuse as do survivors in the heterosexual community. Like heterosexual survivors, LGBT survivors experience abuse in a cyclic fashion where it intensifies as time passes. Likewise, survivors of SSIPV deal with issues of power and control, social isolation, minimizing the abuse, experiencing victim blame, and thinking that they can make the abuser change (Elliot, 1996; Walsh 1996).

Just as there are many similarities between SSIPV and heterosexual cases of IPV, there are also distinct differences between the two that complicate, exacerbate, and add an additional dynamic to the abuse. Perhaps the most substantial of these differences is

the minority status of members of the LGBT community. Abused partners are not only living a life marginalized by their abusive partner, but living an existence as an oppressed minority in a hetero-centric and homophobic society (C. Brown, 2008). Weinberg (1972) created the term “homophobia” to refer to “the irrational emotional reaction of fear, disgust, anger, discomfort, and aversion to homosexuals” (p. 145). Homophobia can exist both externally, as an element of society, as well as internally, as an internalized feeling of self-loathing based on your own sexual orientation (Byrne, 1996). Regardless of the locus of origin, such condemnation adds additional levels of stress to an abuse situation (Byrne, 1996).

Heterosexist attitudes can also affect gender role socialization, which then leads to confusion on who can and cannot be a victim of IPV, thus making it more difficult to establish and identify a clear need for LGBT-specific interventions and agencies (C. Brown, 2008). Cases have been reported where police officers will respond to a domestic disturbance between a same-sex couple and immediately detain the person most resembling the traditional prototype of an abuser; the one perceived as the ‘male’ or the more ‘masculine’ of the couple. For lesbians, this might be the less effeminate partner, for men, the less masculine partner.

Survivors of IPV are often faced with social isolation as a result of being controlled and ultimately isolated by their abuser. Many times this lack of social interaction results in a lack of support and assistance, thus making the abused partner feel as though there is no escape and nobody that would be willing to help. This dynamic also exists in theSSIPV, however on a grander level (C. Brown, 2008). Approximately 26%

percent of gay and lesbian youth are forced out of their house due to their sexual orientation and 30% of homeless youth identify as members of the LGBT community (Bombasaro-Brady, 2009). These statistics indicate how “coming out” as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender can completely alienate a person from their family, even during a critical part of a person’s life, their adolescence. For this reason, many members of the LGBT community have not been able to disclose their sexual orientation to their family. For those who have been rejected due to being gay, a fundamental part of their support system has been completely obliterated.

For others, who are not out to family members, a large secret has been cultivated to protect themselves from being rejected. This secret often times gives abusers the leverage needed to scare their partners into staying in an abusive relationship (Tully, 2000). Threats of “outing” the abused partner to their family and/or reminders that the abused partner’s family has already rejected them become oppressive tools used by the abuser to manipulate their partner into staying. This, in addition to capitalizing on the abused partner’s internal homophobia, can be used to further attack a person’s self-esteem and thus further alienate the abused partner from friends, family and other supports.

Abusive partners may also attempt to limit their partner’s access to the gay community, which for many is a strong form of social support and individual pride. Perpetrators of abuse may discourage their partner from reporting abuse, stating that it would bring shame to the gay community (Balsam & Szymanski, 2005). This threat can

be additionally powerful in communities or states where contentious equal rights bills are on the ballot and up for community debate.

In instances where one of the partners is HIV positive, the partner's status can be used as another form of intimidation and control. Threats of disclosing a person's HIV positive status can be used to exert additional control of a person.

### Barriers to Reporting Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence

#### Feminist Theory

According to Ristock (2003), a barrier to providing effective services to those struggling withSSIPV is that the domestic violence movement for both heterosexual women and same-sex couples is grounded in feminist theories. Such theories often define intimate partner and domestic violence as manifestations of society's patriarchal dominance over women (Helfrich & Simpson, 2005). Gender stereotyping and the chauvinistic social construct asserting man's control over women politically, socially, sexually and physically are inherent in many feminist theories (Helfrich & Simpson, 2005).

Attached to these theories is the notion that societal acceptance of this ideal leads to the physical and sexual domination of women. Man is then seen as the oppressive force. Such ideologies have been useful in illuminating the dynamics of domestic violence in heterosexual couples and in establishing the need for female empowerment in modern society. Although bringing increased awareness to the problem and social causation of IPV, such theories do not explain violence committed by women against women. Nor do they begin to address how men can also be victims of intimate partner

violence, in same-sex and heterosexual relationships (Helfrich & Simpson, 2005). Ristock (2003) states that the contradiction between the reality that women abuse women and the theories that dictate that only men abuse women ignore SSIPV, or gay male SSIPV.

In response to the discrepancy between traditional feminist theories and current incidents of SSIPV, some theorists have revisited existing paradigms so as to better address the issue of SSIPV. According to Ristock (1991), “since lesbians are women and women lack the cultural power of men, their oppression as both women and as members of a sexual minority group may ultimately manifest itself as violence against one another.” Ristock states that theorists who attribute SSIPV to misogyny and homophobia have not been successful in influencing the theory and practice of mainstream agencies and domestic violence shelters. As a result, inconsistent and confusing theories have contributed to a lack of relevant information, understanding and intervention for women survivors of SSIPV. Such confusion and lack of concrete knowledge has added to the barriers faced by lesbian survivors of SSIPV.

#### Myths and Stereotypes of the Gay Male and Lesbian Female

Often times there are misconceptions, assumptions and stereotypes about the LGBT community. Such factors can negatively affect how a survivor of SSIPV is treated and regarded when seeking services from a traditional shelter (Helfrich & Simpson, 2005). Shelter staff workers, as well as society in general; have been shown to underestimate the ability for a woman to be violent, based on socially accepted gender role norms. Additionally, gender role stereotypes held by helping professionals of lesbian women can interfere with the validation or perception of the abuse dynamic.

Women are meant to be feminine; if they appear more masculine, they then inherit or exhibit the traits of a man. Therefore, if men are seen by most shelter workers as the abuser, the assumption is made that the more masculine partner in a lesbian relationship would be the obvious perpetrator of abuse. The same formula is also ascribed to male same-sex relationships; the more effeminate male partner is seen to assume the role of the abused, based on the feminine characteristics he is perceived to embody, thus creating a closer resemblance to a woman. Therefore, femininity is equated with the abused person and masculinity is seen as an indicator of an abuser. This belief is based on the assumption that it is always the “man” that is the abuser, or the partner that best resembles the “man” of the relationship (Ristock, 2003). As discussed earlier, this view can affect how law enforcement responds to domestic dispute calls, as well as who is identified as the perpetrator and who is received as the victim.

Myths and heterosexual assumptions ascribed to HIPV are also applied to SSIPV (Irwin, 2008). Socialization and victim blaming form the basis for many myths about why IPV occurs and why subsequent stereotypes have become so deeply embedded in American society. It is important to acknowledge the numerous myths that abound, so as to be able to anticipate their presence and offer grounded rebuttals to refute their legitimacy. More importantly, it is necessary to understand society’s misconceptions, so as to develop ways to inform the public on the reality of same-sex relationships and SSIPV.

Common myths surrounding IPV include: the victim was asking for the abuse; since the abuse was not physical then it isn’t that bad; all abuse is a result of drinking or

drinking or drugs; abuse is a working class issue; if the abuse were that bad, then the victim could just leave; and finally, that all abuse is perpetrated by males against females (Walsh, 1996).

### Attitudes toward Gays and Lesbians

In the last twenty years the LGBT community has made progress in the fight for equality and acceptance. However, negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians are still prevalent in society (Brewer, 2003). While Americans are becoming more supportive of civil rights for the LGBT community, individual attitudes toward gays and lesbians still reflect a moral and fundamental disapproval (Sherril & Yang, 2000). A recent Gallop Poll (2006) suggests that negative attitudes toward lesbians and gays continue to be prevalent. Of those surveyed, 43% said the homosexuality should not be considered an acceptable alternative lifestyle. Studies have shown direct correlations between negative attitudes of minority groups and incidents of discrimination and hate crimes (M. J. Brown & Henriquez, 2008). According to a national survey conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation (2001) 34% of respondents reported being turned away from renting or buying a home due to their sexual orientation, or know of someone who has. In the workplace, studies have shown that between 25% and 66% of gay and lesbian employees have reported experiencing discrimination or harassment based on their sexual orientation (Croteau, 2006).

### Lack of Resources

There is a profound lack of resources for survivors of SSIPV in the United States (Helfrich & Simpson, 2005). Existing shelters are almost always limited to women.

According to Freiss (2000), of the approximately 1,500 battered women's shelters in the United States, none are devoted to lesbians and few have caseworkers that focus on lesbian clients. Within the United States fewer than 30 agencies exclusively address the issue of IPV within the LGBT community. Of these 30, five are located in the state of California (L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center, 2001). Although there have been improvements in the last several years since these studies were conducted, current research has yet to identify a substantial increase in services offered, however the incidents of SSIPV have increased (McClennen, Summer, & Vaughan, 2002).

Studies have shown that the services offered by 'mainstream' domestic violence shelters are often heterosexist in design and generally unwelcoming to members of the LGBT community (Helfrich & Simpson, 2006). Intervention language, literature and shelter staff attitudes often reflect a lack of sensitivity and understanding for the unique issues that SSIPV survivors face (Renzetti, 1996). Lesbian women seeking services at traditional domestic violence shelters face a variety of institutional and personal barriers such as heterosexism, discrimination, verbal abuse, physical abuse, and hostility (Eliason, 1996). Homosexual women also run an additional risk of coming face to face with their abuser inside the shelter. Since many shelters do not have policies and procedures in place to effectively screen survivors and identify batterers, perpetrators of SSIPV have an easier time infiltrating the shelter to confront their abused partner (Helfrich & Simpson, 2005). In many cases discrimination against gays and lesbians is not only permissible, but completely legal (M. J. Brown & Henriquez, 2008). Such condoned discrimination also makes it difficult for agencies to operate services specifically aimed at addressing



the needs of the SSIPV survivor community. It also leaves members of the LGBT community wary of reporting abuse; for fear that officers will treat them with indifference or insensitivity (Kuehnle & Sullivan, 2003).

#### What Domestic Violence Agencies Can Do to be More Accepting of SSIPV

Renzetti (1996) states that in order for helping professionals to better respond to the needs of survivors of SSIPV, agencies should have in place explicit policies for addressing homophobia in staff, volunteers, heterosexual clients; written and spoken language that is not heterosexist; materials that are gender neutral and LGBT inclusive.

Helfrich and Simpson (2005) conducted an in-depth qualitative study of six domestic violence shelter workers, detailing their experiences and knowledge of SSIPV. Of the six staff members, two work in shelters that have exposure to SSIPV. Results indicated that a lack of knowledge, training and cultural awareness added to the agency's inability to successfully and competently address the issue of SSIPV. In an earlier study, Simpson (2004) found that barriers to service for lesbian survivors of SSIPV occurred on three main levels: systemic, institutional and individual. At the systemic level, Simpson (2004) found that service delivery was affected by the assumptions and values of heterosexist society and that those assumptions are transmitted to and absorbed by agencies and their staffs. Institutionally, agencies lack policies that mandate continuous staff training, nondiscriminatory screening, and consistent internal practice evaluations (Simpson, 2004). Finally, Simpson claims that biases at an individual level affect how staff and domestic violence shelter workers personally interact with LGBT clients seeking services.

Helfrich and Simpson's (2005) qualitative research yielded four areas of change that mainstream domestic violence shelters should take in order to offer more sensitive and inclusive services to members of the LGBT community. The four areas as outlined by Helfrich and Simpson (2005) are: Policies regarding institutional inclusion; policies regarding assessment of language and literature; policies regarding training and supervision; and policies regarding institutional evaluation and quality assurance.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The key to any grant proposal is locating a source of funding. In many ways the grant proposal must be written in part, to satisfy the requirements and of the funder. Many elements must be considered when searching for an appropriate funding source, including funding cycles, availability of funds, and alignment of grant purpose and funding scope. In order to increase the likelihood of receiving a monetary award, the purpose of the grant and mission of the funding agency must be in agreement. To locate an appropriate match, an investigative search must be performed. The following chapter will outline the methods used to locate funding sources, identify the selection process, and ultimately describe the methodology used to procure a funding source for the Same-Sex IPV Sensitivity Training (SS-IPAST) for Domestic Violence Shelters.

#### Target Population

The target population is staff members working in traditional; mainstream domestic violence shelters in Los Angeles County, California. For the purposes of clarification, ‘mainstream’ refers to shelters that specifically serve and/or have traditionally accommodated primarily heterosexual survivors of domestic violence. The sensitivity training provided is appropriate for all levels of shelter staff, including those

who do not come directly into contact with clients. Part of the focus of the proposed sensitivity training is to help change the culture of traditional shelters. This means targeting not only professional staff members, but paraprofessionals as well. It is pertinent that LGBT clients seeking services be treated with sensitivity and competence from the moment they call the agency to the time they leave the agency.

#### Identification of a Funding Source

In order to locate an appropriate funding source, this author specifically sought to identify funding organizations concerned with the prevention of violence, and support of issues within the Gay and Lesbian Community. Initially, a general search of relevant funding sources was performed using standard search engines such as, [bing.com](http://bing.com), [google.com](http://google.com), and [yahoo.com](http://yahoo.com). Keywords such as 'domestic violence,' 'SSIPV,' 'intimate partner violence,' 'gay,' and 'lesbian' were used to help identify and narrow search results. To offer a comprehensive perspective various online reference sources available through the California State University, Long Beach Foundation Library and Office of Research were utilized.

After an exhaustive search, [www.LGBTfunders.com](http://www.LGBTfunders.com), a website specifically tailored to LGBT grant funders was located. [LGBTfunders.com](http://LGBTfunders.com) provides a comprehensive database of organizations charged with addressing social, medical, legal, legislative, and political issues in the LGBT community. Funders range from philanthropic organizations to corporations. Monetary awards vary from a few thousand dollars to amounts in excess of \$100,000.

Utilizing the resources available on LGBTfunders.com, three potential funding sources were located. Each source specifically concentrated on funding programs that promote acceptance and/or combat hate crimes and violence in the LGBT community. These three organizations appeared to best represent the scope of the project. Additionally, criteria used for the initial decision process was based on the available funding cycles, overall award amounts, agency qualifications, and goodness of fit for the organizations and grant needs. The three organizations selected for the first round of consideration were: the Ford Foundation, David Bohnett Foundation, and Liberty Hill. Each of the three organizations has a rich history of being committed to advancement social justice and preservation of equality in all communities.

#### Selecting the Funding Source

In order to select the most appropriate funding sources, three distinct criteria were employed: ability to meet funder-designated grant requirements, past history of donations/funding decisions, and overall ‘goodness of fit’ between the funding source and the recipient of the funds, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center. This criterion was also loosely used in the initial selection process, however more comprehensively applied in the final decision. After careful consideration, the David Bohnett Foundation was deemed the best choice for funding the Same-Sex IPV Sensitivity Training (SS-IPAST) for Domestic Violence Shelters grant. The David Bohnett Foundation met the three criteria best.

Many funders have a limit on the monetary size of the agency being funded. The LA Gay and Lesbian Center, while in desperate need of domestic violence funding, is a

large multimillion dollar non-profit organization. Many funding sources had monetary caps and maximum budget requirements that automatically disqualified the LA Gay and Lesbian Center from competing in the process and qualifying for funds. However, the David Bohnett Foundation did not have such a cap.

Secondly, the David Bohnett Foundation has a rich history of funding not only social justice projects, but specifically social justice projects within the LGBT community. The David Bohnett Foundation funds non-profit organizations that promote equality and positive media portrayals of the LGBT community. As part of this focus, funds are specifically available for anti-violence funding. Although the other organizations also have rich histories of donating to the LGBT community, the focus and scope of David Bohnett Foundation's funding was viewed to be the best match for the requirements of the grant request.

Lastly, taking into consideration all the different elements of the organizations, the David Bohnett Foundation had the best 'goodness of fit' with the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center, and shared the purpose and principles of the grant.

#### Needs Assessment for the Grant Problem Statement

In order to gauge the areas most in need of additional funding, this author executed two specific tasks: performed a comprehensive literature review, and initiated a collaborative relationship with an appropriate agency well versed in LGBT issues. The agency selected was the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center.

Through a careful examination of existing research and literature on the topic ofSSIPV, it became increasingly apparent that there were many gaps in literature. Upon

further inspection, these gaps were discovered to not only be represented in literature and research, but representative of a general lack of services in the community as well. In order to better bridge the gap in literature and address the absence of available services, this researcher decided to establish a relationship with one of the few agencies in the community that was addressing the need for LGBT domestic violence services; the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center, and specifically, Susan Holt, Director of the Domestic Violence Program. Holt offered this author a wealth of community-based information and resources and was accessible for consultation on a regular basis.

### Grant Requirements

As mentioned above, one measure used to select the David Bohnett Foundation was the lack of stringent grant requirements set forth by the organization. With several funding cycles, no monetary cap on non-profit revenue, and an open application process, the requirements designated by the foundation were a good match for the grant in question.

Specifically, requirements for submitting a grant request include: current Internal Revenue Service (IRS) 501 (c)(3) designation; the agency must fit into one of the planned giving areas, of which the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center fits into the 'LGBT Community' giving area; a letter of inquiry must be submitted; once the letter of inquiry is accepted, a three-part grant application must be completed. In addition to the multi-stage process for application submission, all applicants must meet the following basic eligibility requirements: must be an organization with a non-profit status; the applicant and activities must be within the United States of America; the area of focus must correspond

correspond with a pre-designated area of funding; the project/grant cannot solely be a production project (i.e. film, documentary, video, etc.); and the proposal must have a national; Southern California, or CyberCenter focus.



## CHAPTER 4

### GRANT PROPOSAL

#### Introduction

The purpose of this grant proposal is to fund the Same-Sex Intimate Partner Abuse Sensitivity Training (SS-IPAST) for domestic violence shelters in Los Angeles County. The SS-IPAST program will help ensure that survivors of Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence (SSIPV) receive culturally sensitive treatment from domestic violence shelters traditionally utilized by heterosexual female survivors. Monies procured will be used to fund the SS-IPAST program, which will educate staff workers on the unique issues, challenges, and barriers that LGBT clients face when attempting to access domestic violence services. As the recipient of the grant funding, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center will be responsible for developing, housing, staffing, maintaining and delivering SS-IPAST training services to domestic violence shelters in Los Angeles County vicinity.

#### Background and Population Served

The 2000 United States Census ranked Los Angeles County number one in the number of self-disclosed homosexual couples (M. J. Brown & Henriquez, 2008). Census figures list the number of same-sex couples at approximately 25,173 couples. When combined with the numbers recorded by National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs

(NCAVP). Data substantiates that California leads the nation with registered same-sex domestic partners (McClennen, 2005), and Los Angeles County leads the nation in reported incidents ofSSIPV (NCAVP, 2008). Therefore not only is there an established rate of prevalence, but also an identified trend noting the projected rise in incidents reported in Los Angeles County (McClennen, 2005).

#### Mission Statement of the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center

The L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center provides an estimated quarter-million client visits each year for a population of clients as diverse as the surrounding Los Angeles area (L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center, 2010). The L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center provides a broad array of services for the lesbian, gay, bisexual; and transgender community. As stated on the official organization website, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center's purpose and mission is to:

Empower people to lead full and rewarding lives without limits based on sexual orientation and gender identity, by providing the highest quality educational, cultural, and wellness programs to residents of Los Angeles County; Heal the damage caused by discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, by providing the highest quality health and social services to residents of Los Angeles County in need; Advocate full access and equality for all people regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, by promoting our communities' needs at local; state, and national levels; and Lead through example, by living our values, sharing our expertise, and celebrating the full diversity of our lives, families, and communities (page 2).

In addition to offering legal; social; cultural and educational services through its two main locations, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center also operates the Jeffrey Goodman Special Care Clinic and on-site pharmacy. Through this clinic, the Center offers free and low-cost health, mental health, HIV/AIDS medical care and HIV/STD testing and prevention (L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center, 2010).

low-cost health, mental health, HIV/AIDS medical care and HIV/STD testing and prevention (L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center, 2010).

### Program Description

The Same-Sex Intimate Partner Abuse Sensitivity Training (SS-IPAST) program will create a heightened awareness of the challenges, barriers and obstacles faced by same-sex survivors of intimate partner violence. Conducted within traditional heterosexual-centered domestic violence shelters, trainings will offer culturally sensitive interventions and LGBT appropriate alternatives to existing hetero-normative policies and procedures in place. Utilizing the theories developed by Helfich and Simpson (2005), sensitivity training will attempt to address the three levels of prejudicial barriers commonly found among domestic violence shelter workers: systemic prejudice, institutional prejudice, and individual prejudice.

The SS-IPAST program will be permanently housed within, and operated by the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center. Specific monies procured by this grant will be utilized by the Center and specifically allocated to the SS-IPAST program.

### Program Objectives

In order to best accommodate the needs of domestic violence shelters in the Los Angeles area, SS-IPAST sessions will be conducted onsite at the actual agencies. This offers trainings to be administered to all agency staff. To best change the culture of the agency to be more inclusive of LGBT clients, all levels of staff and paraprofessionals will attend the training. A 2005 research study conducted by Helfrich and Simpson identified four areas of shelter protocol that should be evaluated when attempting to create an

agency culture of LGBT inclusiveness: policies regarding institutional inclusion; policies regarding assessment of language and literature; policies regarding training and supervision; and policies regarding institutional evaluation and quality assurance (Helfrich & Simpson, 2005). In addition to the four areas of policy evaluation, the SS-IPAST program will specifically focus on addressing and meeting three main objective areas: Evaluation, Training, and Implementation.

Objective 1: To evaluate current LGBT policies and procedures in place at the domestic violence shelter/agency. An initial visit to the domestic violence shelter/agency will be conducted to assess current policies and procedures in place that either help or hinder services offered to same-sex clients. All aspects of the agency will be evaluated to assess the overall culture and climate of the shelter. Agency literature, signage, forms, paperwork, rules, regulations and policies will be reviewed to identify hetero-centric and potentially insensitive language and/or classifications. The overall purpose of this trip is to identify areas where additional sensitivity and LGBT inclusiveness is needed as well as to help customize the subsequent training to the unique and individual needs of the shelter and its clients.

Objective 2: To conduct a comprehensive onsite Same-Sex Intimate Partner Abuse Sensitivity Training (SS-IPAST) session specifically directed to the needs of the host agency. SS-IPAST sessions will be performed onsite at the agency/shelter so as to enlighten participants to the presence, severity, frequency and risk factors relevant SSIPV. Attendees will be trained on how to identify domestic violence between members of the same-sex, as well as the similarities and differences between

heterosexual and same-sex intimate partner violence. Training participants will also be educated on the myths, stereotypes and misconceptions of not only SSIPV, but of the LGBT community in general. Simpson (2004) found that service delivery was affected by assumptions and values of heterosexual society, and that those assumptions are transmitted and absorbed by agencies and their staffs. To rectify this effect, staff members will be instructed on how to work directly with LGBT clients in an inclusive and accepting manner, from the first encounter to the final meeting.

Objective 3: To assist in the development and implementation of LGBT response/intervention plans. The third objective of the SS-IPAST program is to help develop a response/intervention treatment plan that is culturally sensitive to the needs of survivors of SSIPV and inclusive of the LGBT community. This objective has two main components: a) develop an in-house treatment plan for clients who are able to be housed in the shelter and, b) develop a crisis management/referral program for those clients who are unable to be accommodated and/or housed. This component is particularly important for addressing the needs of male survivors of SSIPV. Understanding that it is logistically difficult for some shelters to house men, a responsible alternative must be in place to help men who come to the shelter for help. Whether in the form of a referral to another shelter or immediate crisis intervention to help stabilize the client, a plan will be developed to address the needs of male clients.

#### Qualification of Key Leadership

The SS-PAST program has been designed to be implemented under the existing S.T.O.P. Domestic Violence Program at the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center. Currently the

L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center contains its own internal program aimed at addressing the psychological; preventative, educational and legal needs of both victims and perpetrators of SSIPV. The SS-PAST program is meant to augment the existing S.T.O.P. Domestic Violence Program. Funding procured by this grant proposal will specifically be used for the SS-PAST program and will not be utilized for general S.T.O.P. Domestic Violence Program funding.

Under the leadership of Domestic Violence Program Director Susan Holt, the SS-IPAST program itself will be staffed by two full-time employees and one part-time employee. Interns will also be utilized in an auxiliary role.

Program Manager. The Program Manager will be utilized to oversee the development and implementation of the SS-IPAST program. The position of Program Manager will be staffed with a master's level social worker (MSW). In addition to overseeing the running of the program, the Program Manager will also help in agency/shelter assessments, evaluations, and onsite trainings. The Program Manager will also be responsible for maintaining the grant specific requirements of the program

Program Facilitator. A full-time Program Facilitator will be employed primarily to perform agency/shelter assessments, evaluations and trainings. This position has been designed for a beginning level MSW or someone with a Bachelor's of Arts in Social Work (BASW) and extensive work experience. Interns from accredited MSW programs will also be utilized to assist the Program Facilitator with their duties.

Case Manager/Clerk. A part-time employee with a BASW will be utilized to collect community resources and referrals to be used as case management tools for

agencies/shelters that have received training. This person will also help coordinate the paperwork and clerical needs of the program. Interns from accredited BASW programs will be utilized to assist the Case Manager/Clerk in their duties.

### Service Outline

By community referral or self-referral; domestic violence shelters/agencies will contact the SS-IPAST program at the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center. The shelter/agency will then conference with the Program Director regarding the services offered by the program. Once an agreement has been made, and appropriate paperwork has been completed, either the Program Director or the Program Facilitator will visit the agency to perform a preliminary assessment of the agency/shelter (as described in Objective 2 of the 'Objectives' section). Once an assessment has been performed, the visiting staff member will coordinate with shelter/agency staff to schedule a training day. During the time between the initial visit and the training session, a training plan will be developed to address the needs and build on the strengths of the agency. This plan will be worked on by all members of the SS-IPAST program, including interns. The Case Manager/Clerk will make copies of the training, conduct research, gather appropriate community referrals and references, and assemble training materials for the session. Interns will assist in this process as well.

Once all materials are in place, the Program Director, Program Facilitator, and/or interns will visit the agency and conduct the actual training (Objective 2). Subsequent to the training, the Program Facilitator and/or intern will sit down with a designated person

at the agency/shelter to draft a specific intervention/treatment plan to address the immediate needs of LGBT clients (Objective 3).

Upon completion of the training, the SS-IPAST team will continue to assist the agency/shelter with future consulting and/or retraining.

### Budget Narrative

#### Personnel

Program Director: This is a full-time position to be held by a master's degree level of social worker (MSW). The position will be funded by this grant. The hourly rate for the program director will be \$25.00 per hour at 40 hours per week, equaling to \$4,000 per month. Benefits for this position were calculated at 25% for a total amount of \$1,000 per month. Total monthly salary for this position will be \$5,000 per month. The program director will receive a 5% cost of living raise for the 2nd year of the program, for a total amount of \$5,200 per month.

Program Facilitator: This is a full-time position to be held by a master's degree level of social worker (MSW) or bachelor's degree level social worker with extensive experience in the field. The position will be funded by this grant. The hourly rate for the program director will be \$20.00 per hour at 40 hours per week, equaling to \$3,200 per month. Benefits for this position were calculated at 25% for a total amount of \$800 per month. Total monthly salary for this position will be \$4,000 per month. The program director will receive a 5% cost of living raise for the 2nd year of the program, for a total amount of \$4,200 per month.



Case Manager/Clerk: This is a part-time position to be held by a bachelor's degree level social worker (BSW). The position will be funded by this grant. The hourly rate for the case manager/clerk will be \$18.00 per hour at 20 hours per week, equaling to \$1,440 per month. Benefits for this position were calculated at 25% for a total amount of \$360 per month. Total monthly salary for this position will be \$1,800 per month. The case manager will receive a 5% cost of living raise for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the program, for a total amount of \$1,890 per month.

#### Non-Personnel

Direct/Indirect Program Costs. Operation costs for this program will be funded for by this grant. Direct/Indirect program costs include: stationary, paper, office supplies, transportation costs, copying costs, office equipment, telephone, internet service, and outreach activities. Although housed within the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center, the SS-IPAST program will pay their portion of utilities and facilities use. The total approximated monthly expense for all direct program costs is \$2,200.

The total program costs will be \$12,960 per month for the 1<sup>st</sup> year and \$13,840 per month for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the program.

#### Program Summary

The Same-Sex Intimate Partner Abuse Sensitivity Training (SS-IPAST) program will use grant money to create a training/consulting program to augment the existing S.T.O.P. Domestic Violence Program at the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center. The program will operate under the administration of Susan Holt, the Director of the S.T.O.P. Domestic Violence Program; however it will be solely funded by this grant. The SS-

SPAST program will train Los Angeles County domestic violence shelter workers to ensure that services being offered are sensitive to the needs of same-sex clients and inclusive of the LGBT community. The program will function with three key objectives: evaluate existing policies of and procedures in shelters to assess how well they meet the needs of same-SS-IPV; conduct a sensitivity training for all shelter staff, specifically tailored to the agency and based on needs identified at the initial evaluation; and assist in implementing LGBT sensitive treatment plans and interventions so as to integrate components of the training into written agency policy and practice. After these objectives have been successfully met, the SS-IPAST team will work with the agency in the future in a consulting role to offer additional support and training.

## CHAPTER 5

### LESSONS LEARNED

#### Needs Assessment

The grant writer recognizes that there is a need for domestic violence agencies to be more sensitive when working with clients that identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual; or Transgender (LGBT). The grant writer consulted with the Director of the S.T.O.P. Domestic Violence Program at the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center to gather information on Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence (SSIPV). Conversations with the Director also enabled the grant writer to understand what services are available, and more importantly, what services are lacking in the community. The grant writer also spoke to LGBT survivors of intimate partner violence as well as a domestic violence shelter worker.

Through an extensive review of literature, the grant writer was able to gather sufficient information to put the issue of SSIPV into a socio-political context. Through analyzing the history of the gay rights movement, as well as the feminist and women's liberation movement, the grant writer was able to identify similarities and differences between the creation and implementation of rights protecting women, and later those that began to protect members of the LGBT community.

The grant writer found ample sources detailing the history of the gay rights movement; however challenges were encountered in finding information onSSIPV. As the grant writer began to review literature, it became evident that there is a lack of empirical research on intimate partner violence in the LGBT community. Even less information was found on how homophobic attitudes can affect the accessibility and quality of services offered toSSIPV survivors.

#### Identification of Funding Source

Utilizing the internet to locate potential funding sources proved to be an efficient and productive tactic. The grant writer was able to find a variety of websites and search engines detailing grant opportunities and charitable foundations. After an initial search, it became evident that certain organizations offered funds for particular areas of research, such as healthcare. Other organizations had several different areas in which they offered funding opportunities.

To gain a better understanding of the grant process, the grant writer consulted with other grant writers and non-profit organizations. Various internet and research library references were also used to help empower the grant writer with more information. It was identified that each funding source operated cycles. Cycles begin with an open enrollment time, where organizations are able to submit a grant application. Cycles typically end a few months later. Some organizations have multiple cycles in a year; others only open their organization to grant requests once or perhaps twice annually.

In order to tighten the focus of the search, the grant writer used search engines specifically tailored to domestic violence prevention and/or LGBT issues. After evaluating several organizations, the grant write decided on the David Bohnett Foundation, due to its focus on both anti-violence initiatives as well as the positive promotion of the LGBT community.

### Grant Writing Process

Each funding source has a different application process. The David Bohnett Foundation requires that applicants register with the organization via the internet. Applicants must also submit their federal tax identification number. Furthermore, applicants must answer a series of online questions in order to determine eligibility. Once cleared to apply, all organizations seeking funding must submit a written proposal; outlining the program which needs funding. The grant writer found that the application process for the David Bohnett Foundation was less intensive than other funding sources. The proposal had less stringent guidelines; it resembled more of an open-letter, free-writing format.

When writing the letter, the grant writer found that it was critical to have a comprehensive understanding of the topic of same-sex intimate partner violence (SSIPV). Not only was it necessary to be well versed in the prevalence and statistical aspect of SSIPV, but also the emotional; psychological; social; economic, judicial; and legislative issues surrounding the need for cultural sensitive services for the LGBT community. It became obvious to the grant writer that the grant proposal had to substantiate the need for sensitivity training sessions by illuminating the issue of SSIPV.

### Mental Health Implications

In addition to the socio-economic ramifications thatSSIPV can have, the grant writer discovered the emotional and psychological effects ofSSIPV. The grant writer was able to understand that many survivors ofSSIPV find themselves re-victimized by external factors separate from the actual abuse and/or abusive household. First responders and social services dedicated to help the victim can actually be detrimental to the stability of the client. Heterosexist and homophobic practices and protocols can further alienate, harm and harass victims ofSSIPV. Additionally, the myths, stereotypes and misconceptions developed by heterosexual society can prevent a person from reporting abuse, or dissuade a victim from reaching out for services. Mental health issues can arise from an abusive situation. Depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, and anxiety are common derivatives of domestic violence. Research also states that these psychological effects can be exacerbated by insensitivity toward past or current abuse and trauma. Creating culturally sensitive and LGBT affirming responses toSSIPV can help prevent, mitigate or reduce the risk of long-term psychological effects on an IPV survivor.

### Social Work Implications

It is imperative that social workers perform their job in a culturally competent and client-affirming manner. An ever-changing social environment means that social workers must work to adjust with the world around them. Additionally, social workers are expected to serve as advocates, agents of change, and examples of how to help clients in a socially sensitive manner. The grant writer wanted to ensure that funding could be

procured to help train shelter workers on how to respond to incidents of SSIPV and how to treat survivors of SSIPV in a sensitive, affirming and inclusive manner.

TABLE 1. Line-Item Budget

Program Budget	Year 1	Year 2
Expenses		
Salaries and Benefits		
Personnel		
Program Director: \$25 per hr X 40 hrs per week X 4 weeks Benefits@25%	\$4000/month \$1000/month	\$4200/month \$1050/month
Program Facilitator: \$ 20 per hr X 40 hrs per week X 4 weeks Benefits@25%	\$3200/month \$ 800/month	\$3360/month \$ 840/month
Case Manager/Clerk: \$ 18 per hr X 20 hrs per week X 4 weeks Benefits@25%	\$1400/month \$ 360/month	\$1470month \$ 720/month
<i>TOTAL SALARIES WITH BENEFITS</i>	<i>\$10,760/month</i>	<i>\$11,640/month</i>
Direct / Indirect Program Costs		
Computers/Printer/Fax Machine	\$ 125	\$ 125
Telephone/Internet (Subsidized by the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center)	\$ 150	\$ 150
Office/Work Supplies/Copying Fees	\$ 350	\$ 350
Transportation (Mileage Reimbursement) @ .11/mile	\$ 250	\$ 250
Electricity (Subsidized by the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center)	\$ 75	\$ 75
Emergency Fund	\$ 250	\$ 250
Fundraising Events	\$ 500	\$ 500
Community Outreach	\$ 500	\$ 500
<i>TOTAL DIRECT / INDIRECT PROGRAM COSTS</i>	<i>\$2,200</i>	<i>\$2,200</i>
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS / MONTHLY	\$12,960	\$13,840
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS/ ANNUALLY	\$155,520	\$166,080



## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Balsam, K. F., & Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Relationship quality and domestic violence in women's same-sex relationships: The role of minority stress. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 258-269.
- Bombasaro-Brady, J. (2009). Honoring Jane Addams a WILPF commitment to gay rights. *Peace and Freedom*, 69(1), 20-21.
- Brown, C. (2008). Gender-role implications on same-sex IPV. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23(6), 457-462.
- Brown, M. J., & Groscup, J., (2009). Perceptions ofSSIPV among crisis center staff. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24, 87-93.
- Brown, M. J., & Knopp, L. (2006). Places or Polygons? Governmentality, scale, and the census in the gay and lesbian atlas. *Population, Space and Place*, 12, 223-242.
- Brown, M. J., & Henriquez, E. (2008). Socio-demographic predictors of attitudes towards gays & lesbians. *Individual Differences Research*, 6(3), 193-202.
- Burke, L. K., & Follingstad, D. R., (1999) Violence in lesbian and gay relationships: Theory, prevalence, and correlational factors. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19, (5), 86-88.
- Burke, M. (1994). Homosexuality as deviance. A case of a gay officer. *British Journal of Criminology*, 34(2), 192-203
- Burke, R.A. (1996). *A matter of justice: Lesbians and gay men in law enforcement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- California Penal Code 273.5 (Deering 2001)
- Carlson, B. E., McNutt, L. A., Choi, D. Y., & Rose, I. M. (2002). IPV and mental health: The role of social support and other protective factors. *Violence Against Women*, 8(6), 720-745

- Coker, A., Davis, K., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H., & Smith, P. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 56-62.
- Connolly, C., Huzurbazar, S., and Routh-McGee, T. (2000). Multiple parties in domestic violence situations and arrest. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 181-188.
- Dutton, M. A. (2009). Pathways linking intimate partner violence and posttraumatic disorder. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 10(3), 211-224.
- Ehrlich, C. (1980, February). The women's liberation movement in the 1970's. *Off Our Backs*, 10(2), 24. Retrieved from GenderWatch (GW) (Document ID: 659249911).
- Freiss, S. (2000). Domestic violence is a serious problem for gays. In T. L. Roleff (Ed.), *Domestic violence: Opposing viewpoints* (pp. 41-46). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.
- Freedman, E. B. (2002). *No turning back: The history of feminism and the future of women*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Golding, J. M. (1999). Intimate partner violence as a risk factor for mental disorders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 99-132.
- Gorton, D. (2009). Why stonewall matters after forty years. *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*, 16 (4), 6.
- Harper, G. W., & Schneider, M. (2003). Oppression and Discrimination Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered People and Communities: A Challenge for Community Psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(3/4), 23-30.
- Hassounah, D., & Glass, N. (2008). The Influence of Gender Role Stereotyping on Women's Experiences of Female Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 14(3), 310-325.
- Helfrich, C., & Simpson, E. (2005). Improving services for lesbian clients: What do domestic violence agencies need to do?. *Health Care for Women International*, 27(4), 344-361.
- Irwin, J. (2008). (Dis)counted stories: Domestic violence and lesbians. *Qualitative Social Work*, 7(2), 199-215.
- Kaiser Family Foundation. (2001). *Inside Out: A Report on the Experiences of Lesbians, Gays and Bisexuals in America and the Public's Views on Issues and Policies Related to Sexual Orientation*. Menlo Park, CA: Victory Publishing.

- Kameny, Franklin (2009). How It All Started, *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 13 (2): 76-81
- Kuehnle, K., Sullivan, A. (2003). Gay and lesbian victimization: Reporting factors in domestic violence and bias incidents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30 (1): 85-96
- Kulkin, H. S., Williams, J., Borne, H. F., de la Bretonne, D., & Laurendine, J. (2007) A review of research on violence in same-gender couples: A resource for clinicians. *Journal of Homosexuality* 53(4) 71-87
- L.A. Gay & Lesbian Center (2010, February 10) Retrieved from [http://www.lagaycenter.org/site/PageServer?pagename=YH\\_DV\\_Family\\_Violence\\_Partner\\_Abuse](http://www.lagaycenter.org/site/PageServer?pagename=YH_DV_Family_Violence_Partner_Abuse)
- L.A. Gay & Lesbian Center. (2001) *Highlights from the California Report on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual: and Transgender Domestic Violence 2000* Retrieved from <http://laglc.org/domesticviolence/>
- Letellier, P. (1996). Twin epidemics: Domestic violence and HIV infection among gay and bisexual men. In C. M. Renzetti, C. M. and C. H. Miley (Eds.), *Violence in gay and lesbian domestic partnerships* (pp. 69-82), Harrington Park, Binghamton, NY: Hawthorne Press.
- McClennen, J. C. (2005). Domestic violence between same-gender partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(2), 149-154
- McClennen, J.C. (2003). Researching gay and lesbian domestic violence: The journey of a non-LGBT researcher. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 15(1/2): 31-45.
- McClennen, J. C., Summers, A., & Dalay, J. G., (2002). The lesbian partner abuse scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 12(2), 277-292
- McClennen, J. C., Summer, A., & Vaughan, C. (2002). Gay men's domestic violence: dynamics, help-seeking behaviors, and correlates. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 14(1), 23-49.
- Mize, K.D., & Shakelford, Todd K. (2008). Intimate partner homicide methods in heterosexual; gay, and lesbian relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 23(1): 98-114
- People v. Silva. 27 Cal. App 4<sup>th</sup> 1160 (1994).
- Próspero, M.. (2009). Mutual partner violence: Mental health symptoms among female and male victims in four racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 24(12), 2039-2056.

- Rennison, C. M., & Welchans, S., (2000). *Intimate Partner Violence* (NCJ 178247). Washington D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Renzetti, C. M (1996). Building a second closet: Third party responses to victims of lesbian partner abuse. *Family Relations*, 38: 157-63
- Ristock, J. L. (2003). Exploring dynamics of abusive lesbian relationships: Preliminary analysis of a multisite, qualitative study. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(3-4), 329-341
- Russell, B., Ragatz, L., & Kraus, S. (2009). Does Ambivalent Sexism Influence Verdicts for Heterosexual and Homosexual Defendants in a Self-Defense Case? *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(3), 145-157.
- Seelau, E., Seelau, S., & Poorman, P. (2003). Gender and role-based perceptions of domestic abuse: does sexual orientation matter? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 21(2), 199-214.
- Seelau, S., & Seelau, E. (2005). Gender-Role Stereotypes and Perceptions of Heterosexual; Gay and Lesbian Domestic Violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(6), 363-371. <http://ebSCOhost.com> doi:10.1007/s10896-005-7798-4
- Scasta, David. (1998). Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 2(4), 3.
- Simpson, E.K. (2004). *Lesbian survivors of partner violence: Staff perspectives on service needs and barriers*. (Unpublished master's thesis) University of Illinois, Chicago.
- Todahl, J. L., Linville, D., Bustin, A., Wheeler, J., & Gau, J. (2009) Sexual assault support services and community systems: Understanding critical issues and needs in the LGBT community. *Violence Against Women*, 15(8): 952-976.
- Tully, C. (2000). *Lesbians, gays, and the empowerment perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Walsh, F. (1996). Partner abuse. In D. Davies & C. Neal (Eds.) *Pink therapy: A guide for counselors and therapists working with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients* (pp. 187-198). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press
- Waterman, C., Dawson, L., & Bologna, M. (1989). Sexual Coercion in Gay Male and Lesbian Relationships: Predictions and Implications for Support Services. *Journal of Sex Research*, 26(1), 118-124. <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York, NY: St. Martin's.

