A Report on Violence Against Asian Women and Children in Minnesota

Conducted by RAINBOW RESEARCH on Behalf of the Working Group on Violence Against Asian Women and Children 12/30/2016

Acknowledgments

Rainbow Research, Inc. would like to acknowledge the remarkable contributions of the Working Group Members; staff at partnering state agencies including Minnesota Department of Health (MDH), Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans (CAPM), Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) and Minnesota Department of Public Safety (DPS); and the Internal Advisory Group, whose guidance helped to make this research endeavor a successful journey. We would like to extend our heartfelt gratitude to members of the community who served as pilot participants, key informants, and particularly to the women who participated in focus groups and interviews and shared their deeply personal stories. A special thanks to Dr. Scott A. Homler (University of Minnesota) and Sipra Jha (Asian Women United of Minnesota) for providing trauma-informed interpreter training and to the interpreters and translators without whom this project would not have been possible. Last but not least, we want to share our deep appreciation of community based partners, research team and several community members for their dedicated time, outreach, and logistical planning efforts.

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Gail Chang Bohr, State of Minnesota Crystal Brown, Augsburg First Steps MayTong Chang, Hmong American Partnership (HAP) Raj Chaudhary, SEWA - AIFW Melissa Chiodo, Minneapolis Police Department Dokor Dejvongsa, Dejvongsa Myers & Associates, LLC Shellie S. Enright, Brooklyn Park Police Department Veena Iver, MN Asian Pacific American Bar Association Hannah Laniado, Minnesota Coalition against Sexual Assault Jewelly Lee, St. Catherine University Sushila Shah, SEWA - AIFW Claudia Waring (Chair), Asian Women United of Minnesota Dr. Zha Blong Xiong, College of Education and Human Development University of Minnesota Der Yang, Transforming Generations

STATE AGENCY PARTNERS

Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans (CAPM), Sia Her, Executive Director Department of Public Safety (DPS) Raeone Magnuson, Executive Director of Justice Program Minnesota Department of Health (MDH), Dan Pollock, Deputy Commissioner, Jeanne Ayers, Assistant Commissioner Department of Human Services (DHS), Jim Koppel, Assistant Commissioner ThaoMee Xiong Sara Chute Xiaoying Chen

INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUP

Xiaoying Chen, Minnesota Department of Health Sara Chute, Minnesota Department of Health Sia Her, Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans Anjuli Mishra, Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans Dr. Ruby Nguyen (Co P.I.), University of Minnesota Beki Saito (Co P.I.), Rainbow Research Claudia Waring, Asian Women United of Minnesota Katie Fritz Fogel, Rainbow Research Razeena Shrestha, Rainbow Research

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Sunny Chanthanouvong, Lao Assistance Center of Minnesota Raj Chaudhary, Sewa - AIFW (Asian Indian Family Wellness) Sipra Jha, Asian Women United of Minnesota Yen Pham and Dung Pham, Vietnamese Social Services of Minnesota Bao Vang and Laura Vang, Hmong American Partnership (HAP) Mary Zamacona, Open Door Learning Center Katie Eichele, Aurora Center, University of Minnesota

RESEARCH TEAM

Gifty Amarteifio, Rainbow Research Katie Fritz Fogel, Rainbow Research Maryan Gaafaa, Rainbow Research Kary Kuenzli, Rainbow Research Dr. Lauren Martin, University of Minnesota Dr. Mary McEathron, Rainbow Research Pang Moua, Rainbow Research Dr. Ruby Nguyen , University of Minnesota Beki Saito, Rainbow Research Razeena Shrestha, Rainbow Research

Contents

| A Report on Violence Against Asian Women and Children in Minnesota Acknowledgments | |
|---|----|
| Contents | 1 |
| Glossary of Commonly Used Acronyms | 2 |
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Section 1. Overview | 5 |
| Background | 5 |
| Purpose | 6 |
| The Working Group and the new Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey (MAWHS) | 7 |
| Definitions | 8 |
| Methods | 9 |
| Data Analysis | 14 |
| Limitations | 14 |
| Section 2. Prevalence of Violence against Asian Women and Children | 15 |
| Nature of Violence | 15 |
| Collective Values | 15 |
| Experience of Violence: From Childhood to Adulthood | 17 |
| Abusive International Marriage | 23 |
| Violence by Non-intimate Partners | 26 |
| Factors that Contribute to Violence | 27 |
| Section 3. Culturally Relevant Services and Programs | 29 |
| Reporting to Family, Friends or Community Leaders | 29 |
| Reporting to Law Enforcement and Professional Services | |
| Section 4. Recommendations | |
| Promote Primary Prevention: Change Cultural Norms and Practices about Gender Equity | |
| Reach and Support Women Experiencing Violence | |
| Strengthen Mainstream Organizations' Knowledge, Skills and Responses | |
| Closing | |
| References | 40 |
| Appendix | 43 |
| 1. Working Group Members | 44 |
| 2.a Statewide Random Sample Survey Documents: First Cover Letter | 45 |

| 2.b Statewide Random Sample Survey Documents: Survey | .47 |
|---|-----|
| 2.c Statewide Random Sample Survey Documents: Postcard | .51 |
| 3.a Convenience Sample Survey Documents: Participant Recruitment Script | .52 |
| 3.b Convenience Sample Survey Documents: Safety Referral Sheet for Participants | .54 |
| 4. Focus Group Interview Protocol | .55 |
| 5. Key Informant Interview Protocol | .60 |
| 6. Participant Consent Form | .62 |
| 7. General Flyer | .65 |
| 8. Fact Sheet | .66 |
| 9. Interpreter Training Material | .67 |
| 10. MAWHS survey data tables | .73 |
| 11. Boynton Health Service College Health Survey (CHS) data tables | .88 |
| 12. Boynton College Health Survey—Adverse Childhood Events by Race | .93 |
| 13. American Association of Universities Sexual Misconduct Survey (SMS) data1 | 107 |

Glossary of Commonly Used Acronyms

AIM: Abusive International Marriage
API: Asian Pacific Islander
CHS: Boynton College Student Health Survey
FG: Focus Group; denotes quotes from focus group and survivor interview participants
IPV: Intimate Partner Violence
KI: Key Informant; denotes quotes from key informant interview participants
MAWHS: Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey
MSS: Minnesota Student Survey
SMS: American Association of Universities Sexual Misconduct Survey

Executive Summary

Minnesota is unique among other states as home to among the largest population of Southeast Asian immigrants in the U.S. (Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, 2012). Further, Asian/Pacific Islanders are the fastest growing racial group in Minnesota with 253,338 statewide and 195,858 in the Twin Cities metro area (MN Compass, 2016).

During the 2015 Minnesota legislative session, Asian advocates and law enforcement officials testified about the need for additional and improved data on the prevalence, nature and scope of violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota. A legislatively-mandated Working Group was convened

to oversee a study focusing on domestic violence, abusive international marriage, trafficking, stalking, sexual assault and other violence.¹

This landmark study is the first major study of violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota. With the mandate to determine the prevalence of violence, a new survey, the Minnesota Asian Women's Health I had all of the proof of him wanting to kill me. I had pictures and recordings of him threatening to kill me. I didn't record it; my children had recorded them.

Survey (MAWHS), was created and mailed to a statewide random sample of 4,000 Asian women. Recognizing that women with limited English proficiency were unlikely to respond to a mailed survey,

community-based partners supported the distribution of surveys to an additional convenience sample of 700 Asian women in the metro area. A total of 425 completed surveys from Asian women were received for a response rate of 11%. Studies have shown that talking about violence with anyone outside the family is highly taboo, particularly in

Even if you get hit, you should be silent. Because if you speak up, you actually shame the whole community.

Asian cultures (Warrier, 2004). This, combined with reading difficulties, may account for the low response rate. The women in this sample were more highly educated than the general population of Asians in Minnesota which may result in under-reporting of physical and sexual violence. Nonetheless, new data from MAWHS indicates:

- 8% report intimate partner violence (IPV) defined as emotional, physical, or sexual abuse from a partner within the last year; 15% have experienced these types of IPV in their lifetime;
- 5% report they have experienced emotional, physical or sexual abuse by someone *other* than their partner within the last year; 12% have experienced these types of abuse by someone other than their partner within their lifetime;
- Of the women who experienced violence, only 11% reported the incident to the police; and
- 41% of women believe that about half of the men in their community hit their wives.

While the quantitative data from the survey presents statistics on the prevalence of violence among Minnesota Asian women, analysis of the qualitative data from 80 people who participated in focus groups and interviews sheds light on the context and factors that affect this issue. Used together, quantitative and qualitative data sources provide the essential information to understand both the breadth and depth of the problem in order to grasp the critical nature of the violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota.

Key findings from the qualitative data include the role of Asian cultural values, norms and practices in the decisions women make to stay in violent marriages or not seek help outside of the family, and the

¹ Source: 2015 Minnesota Statute, Chapter 71, Article 8, Section 58.

frequency of abusive international marriages for Southeast Asian and Asian Indian women. Abusive international marriages and relationships refers to "the practice of older men residing in the US marrying under-age girls in Asian countries. Abusive criteria include: age differences between the couple that can range from 20 to 70 years; men's duplicity in declaring their true marital situation in the US; wives in the US coerced into divorce; and the sexual victimization of young girls. The practice of abusive international marriages causes physical, emotional, sexual and/or economic harms" (Dabby-Chinoy, 2012).

Results from this study led to 14 specific recommendations in three broad categories:

- Promote primary prevention by changing social and cultural norms and practices on gender equity;
- Strengthen services, support and outreach for women experiencing violence; and
- Strengthen mainstream organizations' knowledge, skills and responses to Asian survivors.

Section 1. Overview

This landmark study, commissioned by the Minnesota State Legislature and led by the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH), in partnership with the Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, Department of Public Safety (DPS) and Department of Human Services (DHS), is the first major study of violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota. It examines the types and prevalence of violence against Asian women and children, as well as the cultural contexts for this violence. Understanding these contexts is critical to the development of effective strategies to address violence against Asian women and children.

This study is particularly important for Minnesota due to the number, projected growth, and diversity of Asians who reside in this state. From 2000 to 2010, Minnesota's population of individuals who identified as either Asian alone or in combination grew by 52.2%, an increase of 84,718. (Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, 2012). Progressing from 2010 to 2015, Asian/Pacific Islanders² (API) are the fastest growing racial group in Minnesota at 22%, an increase of 48,000 people (MN State Demographic Center, 2016). APIs account for approximately 14% of the population in Ramsey County and 7% in Hennepin County with a total of 271,609 APIs statewide and 168,956 in Ramsey and Hennepin counties combined (United States Census Bureau, 2016). Minnesota's Asian communities come from more than 40 different countries of origin; the ten largest Asian ethnic groups include Hmong, Asian Indian, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Filipino, Laotian, Cambodian, Japanese and Burmese (Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, 2012).

World events and economic opportunities have often been the drivers of immigration. In the 1970s, as the Vietnam War was entering its final phases, large numbers of Vietnamese and Hmong refugees from Southeast Asia began arriving in Minnesota seeking asylum.³ More recently, in the past two decades

Tibetans and Karen (an ethnic group from Burma and Thailand) have come to Minnesota seeking refuge from highly repressive governments. Asian Indians have been immigrating to the United States for educational and job opportunities for several decades; however, from 2000 to 2010, South Asians (particularly Asian Indians, Bangladeshis, Pakistanis, and Sri Lankans) were the fastest growing segment of Asians in Minnesota.



Background

Asians, particularly Asian American women, are a minority group historically understudied by social scientists. The settlement process of Asian women provides one explanation as Asian female immigrants were virtually nonexistent in the early phases of Asian immigration due to repressive immigrations laws, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, and the Immigration Act of 1924, which barred Asians from

² Asian Americans are persons having origins from East Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Indian subcontinent (also known as South Asia). Pacific Islanders are people having origins in Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific

Islands. <u>https://www.ssa.gov/people/aapi/</u> For the purposes of this report we will use the term Asians to mean all Asians, unless we specifically reference Southeast Asia (Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Myanmar (Burma), or South Asia (India, Nepal, Pakistan, Bhutan).

³ This analysis draws heavily on the State of the Asian Pacific Minnesotans, Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, April 2012

entering the US and stipulated quotes for Asian women and their children (Fong, 1997). Later, regulations created annual quotas for Asian women and children, leading to an influx of Asian women and gradually sparking interest in studying the population (Fong, 1997).

Previous research on prevalence of violence against Asian women in the United States has been inconsistent. The high degree of variation is due to differences in the definition of violence (e.g., some include only physical violence while others include emotional and psychological manipulation), the sample sizes (ranging from 20 to 200 in regional-based samples), and the methods for estimating prevalence (Goncalves & Matos, 2016). Results from the 2008 Minnesota Crime Victim Survey found 4% of Asians reported experiencing domestic violence in their lifetime (Buskovick & Peterson, 2009). The two major national datasets, the National Latino and Asian American Study and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence 2010 survey, estimate the lifetime prevalence of 19.6% for intimate partner violence (including rape, physical violence and stalking) committed against Asian women residing in the U.S. (Black et al., 2011) and the prevalence of "minor" intimate partner violence, defined as pushing, grabbing, throwing something, or slapping and hitting, from a current intimate partner at 10.2% (Chang, Shen, & Takeuchi, 2009). However, intimate partner violence prevalence rates for specific Asian ethnicities range from 3% (Chang et al., 2009) to as high as 77% (Adam & Schewe, 2007) or 80% (Yoshihama, 1999). In an often cited study, almost 50% of Asian and Pacific Islander women reported being physically abused (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000) while 41-61% of Asian women reported experiencing physical and/or sexual violence by an intimate partner during their lifetime (Raj and Silverman, 2002).

Research on the contextual factors surrounding violence against Asian women note that Asian cultures tend to reinforce traditional gender roles including enforcing hierarchy based on gender, generation, and age as well as encouraging male personal development while discouraging female aspirations in favor of female passivity and submissiveness (Fong, 1997). Asian women are socialized to believe and accept that violence in a relationship is normal, and are less likely to expose their situations to others in fear of bringing shame to their families and communities (Warrier, 2004). Research has also shown how violence against women tends to stem from a legacy of patriarchy and sexism that is widespread in many Asian American communities (Warrier, 2004) and the view of corporal punishment as salutary and educational, rather than minor victimization, across ethnic groups (Finkelhor, 2011). Asian women in western societies are also subjected to dominant cultural myths including the model minority myth and racialized sexual objectification, projecting Asian women as both docile and exotic, which have implications on how Asian women navigate identity in America (Fong, 1997).

In addition, many Asian cultures do not regard individual needs as of utmost importance and tend to put their family's interests and honor before their own (Weil and Lee, 2010). Subsequently, women are less likely to seek help or talk to others outside the family about their problems. Similarly, Asian students who have been sexually victimized have been found to be less likely than students of other races to report their experience (Cantor et al., 2015). Immigrant Asians face additional vulnerabilities and barriers including fear of deportation or losing their children, cultural and linguistic isolation and alienation, and economic dependency (Goncalves & Matos, 2016).

Purpose

While there is limited and inconsistent data available on the experiences of violence against Asian women in the US, there is a need for Minnesota-specific information to help our state prepare for shifting demographics. In 2015, in response to testimonials from Asian women and the community

organizations that served them, legislation⁴ was passed by the Minnesota legislature and signed by the Governor to create a Working Group⁵ to study violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota. The Working Group was charged with:

- Estimating the prevalence of violence against Asian women and children, with particular emphasis on domestic violence, abusive international marriage, stalking, sexual assault, trafficking and other violence;
- Deepening the understanding of the nature of violence in Asian communities, including particular cultural practices and immigrant and refugee circumstances that effect the experience of violence;
- Assess availability and use of culturally relevant services and programs; and
- Develop recommendations to address violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota.

This study was conducted in an effort to better understand the nature and prevalence of violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota, and to give voice to survivors. Multiple survivors who participated in the study said that while recollecting their horrific experiences was painful, they ultimately were thankful that someone was finally paying attention to their plight. With the use of a mixed-methods approach, this report brings their stories to state decision makers in the hope that attention and funding to address violence, specifically against Asian women and children, will come to fruition.

Additionally, this study was strengthened through the collaboration and partnership of five cornerstone organizations in Asian communities including Asian Women United of Minnesota, Hmong American Partnership of Minnesota, Lao Assistance Center of Minnesota, SEWA-AIFW, and Vietnamese Social Services of Minnesota. These organizations provided a trusted introduction between study participants and researchers, as well as access to and translation for community members who may have otherwise not participated, and played leadership roles in designing and implementing research protocols.

The Working Group and the new Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey (MAWHS)

The Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) was the lead agency for the Working Group, in partnership with the Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, Department of Public Safety (DPS) and Department of Human Services (DHS). Together, these agencies selected and invited 15 respected leaders who were highly knowledgeable about issues of violence in the Asian community representing advocacy and survivor services, judicial and law enforcement, and research perspectives. A full list of the members and their affiliation is included in the appendix.

MDH distributed the Request for Proposals for a research firm to work with the Working Group and lead the study in February, 2016 and a contract was signed with Rainbow Research, Inc., a local non-profit specializing in community-based research and evaluation, in May, 2016. Rainbow Research contracted

⁴ Authority: 2015 Minn. Laws Chap. 71 Art. 8 Sec 58

⁵ See Appendix for list of Working Group members

with Dr. Ruby Nguyen at the University of Minnesota, Department of Public Health, to be Co-Principal Investigator (PI) along with Rebecca Saito of Rainbow Research.

The Working Group met three times: June 8th, July 19th, and November 30th. During these meetings, Working Group members deliberated extensively and provided guidance to all aspects of the research design. Specifically, the Working Group determined that the prevalence of violence would be measured through a newly created instrument designed for this study called the Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey (MAHWS) (see appendix for copy of survey), and the nature of violence against Asian women and children would be assessed through focus groups with Asian women survivors and women from the general population of Asians, and key informant interviews.

The Working Group also decided that the focus groups with women should focus on three ethnic groups: Hmong, Asian Indian, and Karen. This was due to the fact that Hmong and Asian Indians are the largest Asian ethnic population in Minnesota (79,400 and 47,300 respectively) and the Karen from Burma (Myanmar) and Thailand, are the most recent group of immigrants to Minnesota.

The Ten Largest Asian Ethnic Groups in Minnesota



Figure 1. Population of Asian Ethnic Groups in Minnesota as reported by the 2014 American Community Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau. (Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, 2015).

Definitions

Listed below are the definitions of types of violence as defined by the largest multi-country study of violence to date (Fulu et al., 2013). These definitions guided the design of the MAWHS questionnaire that was created for this study.

Domestic violence or more recently intimate partner violence

• 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; can be physical, sexual, emotional, economic, or psychological actions or threats of actions that influence another person

Physical violence

- Was slapped or had something thrown at her that could hurt her
- Was pushed or shoved
- Was hit with a fist or something else that could hurt her
- Was kicked, dragged or beaten up
- Partner threatened to use or actually used a gun, knife or other weapon against her

Sexual violence

- Was physically forced to have sexual intercourse when she did not want to
- Had sexual intercourse when she did not want to because she was afraid of what partner might do

Emotional abuse

- Was insulted or made to feel bad about herself
- Was belittled or humiliated in front of other people
- Partner did things to scare or intimidated her on purpose such as by the way he looked at her, by yelling or smashing things
- Partner threatened to hurt her
- Partner threatened to hurt people she cares about as a way of hurting her or damaged things of importance to her

Economic/Financial abuse

- Was prohibited from getting a job, going to work, trading or earning money
- Had her earnings taken from her against her will
- Partner forced her or her children out of the house where she was living
- Partner refused to give her money she needed for household expenses even when he had money for other things

Methods

Based on the legislative charge and the Working Group discussions, this study focused on the prevalence and nature of domestic/intimate partner violence, sexual assault, abusive international marriage, stalking and trafficking. The research design for this study utilized a mixed methods approach to gather quantitative and qualitative data from primary and secondary sources. The primary data collection included a new survey of adult Asian women called the Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey (MAWHS), key informant interviews, and focus groups; secondary data analysis included existing data from the Minnesota Student Survey of middle school and high school youth, and two college surveys (details below). Quantitative data collection and analysis was led by Co-Principal Investigator, Dr. Ruby Nguyen, University of Minnesota School of Public Health. Qualitative data collection, including key informant interviews and focus groups, community relationships and workgroup facilitation was led by Co-Principal Investigator Rebecca Saito, Rainbow Research.

This study received institutional review board approval, a process to ensure safety and ethical treatment of human research participants, from the Minnesota Department of Health Institutional Review Board in October 2016. Individuals who participated in the focus groups and survivor interviews provided written (or in the case of telephone interviews, oral) informed consent. The need for written informed consent was waived for the prevalence survey because no personal identifiers such as names or telephone numbers were collected. Participant safety was an ongoing study priority, including the observations of cultural considerations and trauma-informed interview approaches. All research processes and tools were created, piloted, and updated with participant safety as the primary consideration.

Primary Data Collection – Prevalence Survey of Adult Asian Female Population in Minnesota Survey Design

The design of the new Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey (MAWHS) prevalence survey began with assembling questions previously utilized in other quantitative studies with a similar aim. The purpose of doing so was to build upon questions that had been validated to adequately measure violence and other issues of key importance to the Working Group and to allow for comparison to other samples. Questions were edited when needed to ensure the intended meaning was maintained when translated or perceived differently than intended by Asian respondents. The final questionnaire was

informed by multiple rounds of revision and feedback from members of the Working Group, staff at Minnesota Department of Health, Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans, pilot testing with Asian survivors of domestic violence, and review and revision with approximately twenty community members and community advocates. The reading level of the survey was assessed at the 6.7 grade level. It was printed in English with instructions to call if translation was needed in six additional languages (i.e., Cambodian, Hindi, Hmong, Karen, Lao, and Vietnamese). Translation was available as needed by phone through a partnership with Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM). There were two methods for administering and receiving the quantitative prevalence survey: a mailed statewide sample and an in-person distributed convenience sample. Both are described below.

Statewide Sample. Adult Asian female residents in Minnesota were identified using address-based sampling through an external sampling contractor, Survey Sampling International (SSI). Because ethnicspecific mailing addresses are not available (for example drivers licenses do not include race or ethnicity) SSI uses an algorithm to determine whether a woman is Asian with inputs including the U.S. Postal Service, her current name, previous names if applicable, and the density of Asians within her geographic region. With these methods, SSI reports that at least half of the women on the list of names that they provide are in fact Asian. In the first round of sampling, a list of 3,000 women were provided and received a mailed survey including a cover sheet, survey, safety referral sheet, and a pre-paid return envelope (see Appendix). Phone calls were received from approximately 96 individuals reporting that they were not Asian, and these mailing addresses were removed from the mailing list. In addition, any survey that was received from an individual who did not self-identify as Asian was not included. If a survey was not returned within two weeks, participants then received a reminder post-card. The research team anticipated a 20% response rate from Asian women. Due to lower than expected response rate, an additional 1,000 names were provided from SSI and these women also received a copy of the survey with attachments. Of the 4,000 mailed surveys in the statewide sample, 166 were returned indicating a response rate of 4% for the statewide sample.

Convenience Sample. Supplemental survey distribution was designed in anticipation of a lower than desired response rate to mailed surveys, particularly for new immigrants who tend to be less educated and non-English speaking. For this reason, an additional 700 surveys were distributed in person through partnerships with Greater Twin Cities-based cultural agencies. Participating community partners were trained on the ethics of interpreting for research and confidentiality, participant safety protocols, and other aspects of survey administration. It should be noted that, like the statewide sample, the metro area convenience sample also did not specifically recruit women who had already experienced violence. Community partners and research staff distributed survey packets (including cover letter, survey, safety referral sheet, and prepaid return envelope) at religious temples and churches, community festivals, medical sites, market places and community venues such as restaurants and nail salons, English learning classes and other non-violence specific social service sites. Key community data collection partners included the following community service providers: Hmong American Partnership, Lao Assistance Center of Minnesota, SEWA-Asian Indian Family Wellness, and Vietnamese Social Services. Of the 700 surveys distributed in the convenience sample, 259 were completed for a response rate for the convenience sample of 37%.

Combined Sample. In total, 425 Asian women completed the Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey (MAWHS) with an overall response rate of 11%; participant characteristics are described below (Table 1).

| Characteristic | Number of Respondents (N=425) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| Immigrated to the U.S. (foreign born) | 31 | - |
| Asian Subgroups ⁶ | | |
| Asian Indian | 9 | 2 21.7 |
| Hmong | 8 | 6 20.2 |
| Vietnamese | 7 | 5 17.7 |
| Chinese | 4 | 0 9.4 |
| Japanese | 3 | 9 9.2 |
| Nepalese | 1 | 6 3.8 |
| Karen | 1 | 2 2.8 |
| Other | 6 | 5 15.3 |
| Status upon arrival to the U.S. | | |
| Immigrant | 14 | 9 35.1 |
| Refugee | 7 | |
| Fiancée visa | | 8 1.9 |
| Student visa | 3 | |
| No paperwork | | 1 0.2 |
| Other status | 15 | |
| Current marital status | | |
| Separated culturally | 12 | 1 28.5 |
| Separated legally | 12 | |
| Single, never married | 8 | |
| Married, legally | 3 | |
| Other category | 6 | |
| Other category | 0 | 2 14.0 |
| Education | | |
| None | 2 | 0 4.7 |
| Less than high school | 5 | 8 13.6 |
| High school graduate | 6 | 5 15.2 |
| Associate's degree | 4 | 1 9.6 |
| Bachelor's degree | 12 | 8 30.1 |
| Graduate degree | 12 | 2 28.7 |
| Median household income* | \$50,000 - \$74,999 | 9 |
| Mean age, year (range) | 4 | |
| *Based on 378 (not 125) responses | | |

Table 1. Characteristics of women who completed the MAWHS, 2016.

*Based on 378 (not 425) responses.

⁶ Only ethnicities with greater than 10 respondents are included.

In comparison to demographic data of all Asians in Minnesota, our sample is more highly educated (60% have a bachelor's degree or above, whereas for the state of Minnesota 34% have achieved this level of education). Median household income is about the same with U.S. Census Bureau (American Community Survey data 2011-2013) indicating \$64,000 as the median annual household income for Asians in Minnesota. It should be noted that in the U.S. Census data, the range of median annual household incomes ranges from \$47,000 for Hmong to \$89,000 for Asian Indian in Minnesota.

Primary Data Collection - Key Informant, Survivor and General Population Interviews and Focus Groups

Key Informants. Interviews were conducted with 24 women and men with expertise on violence in Asian Minnesota communities from various sectors including law enforcement and legal representatives; prevention and coalition-building organizations; domestic violence and sexual assault advocates; shelter and medical services for survivors of violence; state government staff; and formal and informal community leaders and elders. Key informants were initially identified by members of the Working Group; participating individuals also identified additional key informants. The key informant Interview protocol is included in the Appendix.

Focus Groups and Interviews with Female Survivors. Questions and processes for conducting the focus groups and interviews were designed in collaboration with Asian survivor-serving organizations and Working Group members. Women seeking services for violent victimization were invited to participate by Asian service organizations and given the option to participate in focus groups or individual interviews. Three women chose to do individual interviews. Additional Asian women from the general community who had not necessarily sought services for violence were also invited to participate in focus groups. In all cases, the invitations stipulated that women were not expected to disclose their personal experience with violence as a requirement for participation. The focus group protocol is included in the Appendix.

During the focus groups and interviews, participants were asked questions to identify issues of violence in their communities that they were most concerned about, barriers to seeking services and reporting, and recommendations. To prioritize participant safety and diminish re-traumatization, interviewers practiced trauma-informed data collection techniques focused on participant control over their experience, including the use of open-ended questions and protocol that allow participants to direct the flow and degree of disclosure. Interviewers were trained in how to provide non-judgmental, respectful responses to participants while building rapport. They were also trained to avoid words carrying stigma and behavioral labels (such as victim). At the conclusion of each interview or focus group, a short resource list (See Appendix) including culturally-appropriate mental health and crisis numbers were shared with each participant. Participants received a \$20 gift card as a thank you for their time and insights.

Overall, eight focus groups and three interviews were completed with 56 participating Asian women, ranging in age from 18 to 80. One focus group in particular recruited young adults ages 18-20; one focus group in particular recruited women ages 60+. Four focus groups were conducted in English and included women of various Asian ethnicities; two were conducted in Hmong, one in Vietnamese, and one in Karen.

| ETHNICITY | # |
|--------------|----|
| Hmong | 20 |
| Asian-Indian | 15 |
| Karen | 11 |
| Vietnamese | 6 |
| Chinese | 2 |
| Nepali | 1 |
| Burmese | 1 |
| Total | 56 |

Table 2: Characteristics of Women focus group/interview participants, by Ethnicity

Secondary Data Collection – Youth and Young Adult Prevalence

Due to critical time constraints and sensitivity of the study, the Working Group and research team decided not to collect new primary data from children and young people under the age of 18. Instead, the decision was made to include existing, secondary data from young people in middle school, high school, and college in lieu of collecting new data from young people. Secondary data from existing data sets gathered from Minnesota youth and young adults was analyzed to supplement the primary data gathered from adult Asian women in Minnesota. These data sets included the Minnesota Student Survey (MSS), University of Minnesota Boynton College Health Survey (CHS), and American Association of Universities Sexual Misconduct Survey (SMS).

Minnesota Student Survey Data (MSS). MSS data from Asian students in 8th, 9th, and 11th grade across the state was analyzed to estimate the prevalence of violence among students at three grade points. The MSS collects data on various expressions of violence including school harassment, sexual harassment, bullying, threats, and physical violence, online bullying, self-harming behaviors, dating/partner violence (including verbal, physical and sexual abuse), and caregiver violence (parental and familial including verbal, physical, and sexual abuse). MSS provides the racial and ethnicity data only for overall Asians and Hmong specifically. For this study, MSS data on adverse childhood events were reported for female students only. These data were used to compare the different rates of violence-related adverse childhood events across the different quantitative surveys, which include different ages among the lifespan.

Boynton College Health Survey (CHS). The CHS was designed at the University of Minnesota to provide Minnesota postsecondary institutions (2- and 4-year colleges and universities) a comprehensive evaluation of the health of their students. Several of the summary measurements assessed in the survey measure violence and its impact on the survivor including sexual health, personal safety, and mental health. The surveys include questions about violence experienced in the last year as well as violence in childhood and lifetime violence. Data from the 2015 administration of the CHS was used for this study.

American Association of Universities Sexual Misconduct Survey (SMS). The SMS includes measurements for harassment, stalking, intimate partner violence, and sexual assault. It also includes questions about opinions and actions in response to sexual violence such as reporting behaviors and reasons for not reporting violence to authorities or other people. Only data from the 2014-2015 school year from the University of Minnesota was analyzed for this report.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Data Analysis. The primary aim of the quantitative analysis of both the new MAWHS survey and the three secondary data sources was to determine the prevalence of types of violence, behaviors such as reporting violence, barriers to reporting, and cultural attitudes related to violence. Descriptive statistics of violence measures are provided in the appendix with actual numbers as well as percentages. In some situations, stratification by an important variable such as race, in the case of the secondary data analysis, or length of time in the U.S., for the new study, was performed. Statistical significance is presented as a p-value less than or equal to 0.05. All statistical analyses were conducted using the statistical package STATA/SE v. 14 (College Station, TX).

Qualitative Data Analysis. Interviews and focus groups were audio recorded, with participants' permission, and interviews were transcribed. Focus groups were recorded but not transcribed in order to protect confidentiality. Detailed focus group notes with no identifying information were taken. Transcribed data were uploaded into NVIVO, a computer software program designed to facilitate qualitative data organization and analysis. Data was deductively analyzed and coded for thematic content according to the study aims: the nature, scope and impact of violence; barriers and recommendations for appropriate services.

Limitations

The quantitative results presented in this report should be considered along with the following limitations and their potential effect on the results. First, mailed surveys to a random sample of individuals is a well-accepted method for determining population-level prevalence, and response rates (the percentage of individuals who return a completed survey out of the total number of people who received a survey) are commonly less than 40%. Our response rate for the mailed survey alone was much lower (4%), with 11% response rate when also including the convenience sample. This was not wholly unexpected because the population of interest includes women who do not speak English and for

whom topics of sex and violence are extremely taboo. In anticipation of a lower than desired response rate from the statewide mailed survey, the supplemental convenience sample collection of surveys was planned and implemented which resulted in a much higher response rate of 37%. However, the result of a low response rate for the mailed survey is that the data may not be representative of adult Asian women in Minnesota. For example, our sample has a higher proportion of college-educated Asian women compared to Asian women in the state of Minnesota, and the country as a whole. Sixty percent of the women in our survey had a bachelor's degree or higher, whereas for the

Sixty percent of the women in our survey had a bachelor's degree or more, whereas for the state of Minnesota 34% have achieved the same level of education (Minnesota State Demographic Center, 2016). Therefore, the results of the survey under-represent less educated Asian women in Minnesota.

state of Minnesota 34% have achieved the same level of education (Minnesota State Demographic Center, 2016). In this case, education level may be a proxy for literacy level and English proficiency. Therefore, the results of the survey underrepresent less-educated Asian women in Minnesota. If there are higher rates of violence among less-educated Asian women in Minnesota, *our results may underestimate the prevalence of violence among Asian women in Minnesota*. A second limitation is that several topics involved illegal behaviors such as polygamy with abusive international marriage and undocumented status. In order to inquire about these topics we asked several indirect questions. *Our assessment of these illegal behaviors using indirect questions may underestimate their prevalence*.

Section 2. Prevalence of Violence against Asian Women and Children⁷

The following is a summary of all data sets organized by key themes from qualitative focus groups and interviews beginning with 1) violence against Asian women and children including an explanation of the context of violence as well as the experience of particular types of violence followed by 2) responses to violence. Prevalence data is included throughout. All data sources, both quantitative and qualitative, were used in developing these findings and the report will specify particular data sources when applicable. Please also note that direct quotes from transcripts are included in this report with little or no editing by the researchers.

Nature of Violence

While we know that the circumstances of emigration and the specific cultural norms and practices of Asian ethnic groups are quite distinct, the Asian women in Minnesota who participated in this study described some shared cultural values and norms that influence their experience of violence. The following overarching concepts described by participants and supported in the literature apply broadly to all or most of the groups included in this study. Ethnic nuances and differences are highlighted when indicated by participants.

These cultural contexts are the lens through which findings are best viewed as they affect everything from women's willingness to talk about violence, report to police, and seek professional help.

Collective Values

Women in this study discussed strong family and community values that are the foundation of many Asian cultural norms and practices. While these *values* are constructive and positive, the way they are practiced, especially over time and in different countries, sometimes becomes problematic. For instance, study participants reported that in contrast to America's focus on the individual, Asians tend to value the family or clan over the individual. As a result, an individual's actions can have a far more reaching effect on all of the members of his/her family. Women discussed how in America, people will seek professional help for problems, while in their Asian cultures, there is extremely strong pressure to address problems inside the family or cultural community. Problems should not be shared with people outside the family; speaking ill of your family can result in shame. In this sense, cultural norms and practices can stand in the way of women reporting violence and seeking help.

There's something about the community and that you need to keep it private and secret and that you should not expose these issues to outsiders. And I think that's sort of reinforcing some of these norms about obedient and compliance norms. Because even if you get hit, you should be silent. Because if you speak up, you actually shame the whole community. (KI)

And so it's very hard for people to come out and talk about it because, at the end of the day, it's not about, if I expose my issue, I'm going to get more help. If I expose my issue, I'm going to get more vulnerable. (KI)

⁷ Throughout this report quote attribution will indicate whether it came from focus group (FG) participants or key informants (KI).

Patriarchal Practices

Another important aspect of Asian cultural context is the pervasiveness of strong, traditional patriarchal cultural norms. Traditionally, a husband may control all aspects of his wife's and daughter's life—from where she goes, who she talks to, and how she dresses.

In our culture, the Hmong culture, you can't call the police on your husband because, you know, by tradition, you're his property. (FG)

Because, in our [Asian Indian] community, it's pretty much like a boy is raised with those, what should I say – he is raised with all those things in his mind that, yeah, you are the superior gender. You're supposed to treat women like that. ...after you got married, if you abuse your wife, it's okay. You're supposed to do it. You're the superior gender. You are the male member of the house. ... You are the bread earner. So, yeah, you can do it. It's okay for you to do it. So that's how they are raised. So it's in their head. (FG)

From the time they are born, girls are under the control of their fathers. When they marry, often with a financial transaction between the bride's and groom's family, the new bride becomes part of the groom's family. The financial transaction of a dowry or bride price (described in more detail below) concretizes and reinforces the notion that women are property to be owned by their husbands. Participants described, in both Hmong and Asian Indian cultures that upon marriage, the wife becomes a part of the husband's family—both literally and figuratively—as the in-laws live with and are in positions of authority over the new bride.

Another aspect of patriarchal practices which women often reported was that polygamy or multiple mistresses was and is common, both in their country of origin or since emigration to the United States; their fathers, uncles, grandfathers, and cousins had multiple wives and mistresses. This practice becomes more salient when, later in this report, abusive international marriages are discussed.

Marriage and Divorce Norms

Traditional Asian marriage norms and practices can also be quite different from those practiced in the U.S. dominant culture. Arranged marriages, in which families search for and negotiate a suitable spouse for their child, are common in several Asian cultures. Traditional arranged marriages are not in themselves abusive.

Actually, our culture is more believing about arranged marriage. Arranged marriage in the sense boy's family and girl's family will search outside of the family. ... So they will search, and they will search within the caste. We do have so many castes and subcastes. So we only marry within our caste. (FG)

Along with arranged marriages, traditions also include an exchange of cash, goods, services, land, and precious minerals. In the dowry system described by Asian Indians, a dowry is paid by the bride's family to the newlywed couple to ostensibly help them set up a household and ensure the daughter's well-

being. A Hmong bride price is typically paid by the groom or the groom's family to the bride's family, providing a symbolic gesture indicating that their daughter will be well cared for. In addition, it provides some compensation to the bride's family since she will be leaving their family and becoming part of his family. As indicated earlier, in some Asian Indian and Southeast Asian traditional marriages, the bride becomes part of the husband's family.

In some Asian cultures there are cultural marriages as well as legal marriages. The former includes a number of cultural traditions including dowry and bride price; the latter is dictated by United States laws. Women often need to negotiate both their cultural and U.S. legal marriages, especially if seeking a divorce.

Immigration

A final contextual consideration for Asian women in Minnesota is the isolation and confusion of being an immigrant in this country. This isolation can be a critical component of intimate partner violence, especially in reporting and addressing the violence. New immigrants often do not speak English, have few if any local family or community connections, do not understand their civil rights (e.g., that it is against the law to beat your wife) and have steep learning curves and challenges navigating complex systems (e.g., schools, legal systems, health care, employment, other governmental systems, including how or when they can call 911).

But what we are seeing a lot in some of the Asian cultures...we see extreme emotional and extreme financial control. [Being new immigrants] makes women totally, you know, dependent on their abusers and also trapped. (KI)

They can't escape it because what do they do? I mean, if they don't have money, they can't go anywhere. And so the different kinds of violence – control and, you know, that we've been seeing. (KI)

Many of these women don't even know what sexual assault is. Or what rape is – or marriage rape is. This woman has said, every night he wants me to perform. First, he will go watch a porn movie on the computer, then he wants me to perform like the porn movie. She said, I don't know these American ways. I don't know what to do. So they're not able to perform what he is saying – seeing. And every night ...This bad habit of watching this pornography on computer, day and night. She asked me, is this how it is? Two times the husband really ripped her apart – on first [day of] night, she was traumatized so much. And then he told her, this is how it's done. I said, that's not how it's done. Don't let any man tell you that this is how it's done. They don't know. They have no sex education. (KI)

Asian Indian women in particular mentioned dependent visas that tied their immigration status to their husband's work visas. They described these dependent visas as "death visas" because it prevented them from working, thus keeping them financially tied to a potentially abusive husband. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) enacted in 1994 allows women to petition for immigration on the basis of abuse. However, there are substantial limitations and requirements that prohibit this from being a viable solution for most women.

Women described how important it was to understand these cultural and contextual issues as integral to the complexity of the experience and continuation of violence against Asian women as well as their respond to violent victimization.

Experience of Violence: From Childhood to Adulthood

Violence affects women throughout their lives. The following sections are organized to share women's stories at different stages of their lives, beginning with childhood and young people's experience of

violence, with the bulk of the discussion on adult women's experiences of intimate partner violence, which was described by the majority of participants as the key issue facing their communities.

Childhood Experience of Violence

Adult participants in focus groups and key informant interview were asked to reflect on their childhood experiences of violence, and about their own children's experiences with violence. Further, secondary data from the Minnesota Student Survey (MSS), College Health Survey (CHS), and the college Sexual Misconduct Survey (SMS) were analyzed as a proxy for data from children.

Women described the direct harm done to children by husbands or other male relatives through sexual, physical and verbal abuse; neglect; or other expressions of control. They also shared how children could be put in inappropriate roles of mediator, rescuer/protector, or being put in the position of being turned against one parent. Both the harm and the inappropriate roles resulted in additional consequences for their children, including having a negative effect on sleep, grades, emotional stress and behavioral issues. Women shared that they worried that their children would continue the cycle of violence in their own lives and relationships or had already seen the cycle repeat itself.

My children were being sexually abused, I was trying to fight it. (FG)

She was a 6-year-old, I believe, who was sexually assaulted by the uncle by marriage. Because she was sleeping over at her cousin's house. And then there was a power outage or something. And then the uncle was taking her upstairs to go use the bathroom. And then the wife of the uncle – so, like, her aunt – opened the door, and he – yeah. So there were things going on. ... And then the mother of the 6-year-old also found out that the same thing happened to the older child who was, like, nine years old. (KI)

He used to call me dumb and then he would link my children to me and call them dumb like me. (FG)

I had all of the proof of him wanting to kill me. I had pictures and recordings of him threatening to kill me. I didn't record it but my children had recorded them. (FG)

The kids said if I stayed they would distance themselves because we were always arguing and fighting. My children would stop us by taking the knife and gun every time. (FG)

Also her children were young so she stayed for them. When they got older they urged her to call the police. She refused so they called the police for her. Police came and arrested their father. The kids then felt guilty... (FG)

And [my grown son] said, you know, Mom, I did hit my girlfriend a few times. I feel so bad. And I said, don't. Because, you know, you don't ever want to do that to her. (FG)

Whenever it happened we would fight all night. My children couldn't go to sleep and they failed their school grades. (FG)

...the mother has four other kids, this 11-year-old becomes the mother. You know... and so her childhood is lost. And this girl would come back from school right away, changing diapers, and we were, like... No. She's a child. And so we had to kind of do the parenting education with the mother. (KI) These qualitative data are corroborated by data from the new Minnesota Asian Women's Health Study (MAWHS), as well as secondary data from the Minnesota Student Survey (MSS) and the College Health Study (CHS). For the CHS and MAWHS, women were asked to reflect back on their childhood (before the age of 18 years) and report the violence they saw as children.

- 14% of both college-age and adult women from the CHS and MAWHS report having **seen** their parents beat each other more than once.
- 13% and 12% of CHS and MAWHS respondents respectively report having been beaten by their parents more than once.
- In terms of sexual violence, between 5% and 8% of respondents report having been **touched once sexually by an adult as a child**; 3% to 5% were **made to touch an adult sexually as a child**; and 1-2% of adult Asian women report being **raped by an adult as a child**.
- In general, the older the respondent the less likely they were to report having seen or experienced physical violence. Whether this is because youth are more accurate reporters of violence, or whether violence is actually occurring more frequently in the lives of current children and youth is unclear from these data.

In addition, secondary data sources provided data about Asians and non-Asians experience of childhood physical and sexual violence. According to the CHS:

- Asian students were nearly **two times more likely than White students to grow up in a home in which there was physical violence** between the parents (22% of Asian female students vs. 13% of White female students; 20% Asian male students vs. 11% White male students).
- Asian students were more likely than White students to have been physically assaulted (slapped, punched, kicked, beat up) by a parent than white students (21% of Asian female students vs. 15%; 23% of Asian male students vs. 14% of White male students).
- Both female and male Asians were **more likely than White students to be touched sexually by an adult** than white students (14% of Asian female students vs. 11% of White female students; 8% of Asian male students vs. 4% of White male students).

These same trends in the violence-related childhood adverse effects were also seen in the MSS data:

- Asian students more commonly reported that their **parents had physical altercations** than White students (10% vs. 7%).
- Asian girls were more likely than White girls to have been physically attacked by their parents (17% vs. 11%)

Young Adult Experience with Violence

Key informants and focus group participants shared experiences of Asian women in their late teens and early twenties. This can be a time when the differences between the dominant U.S. culture and traditional ethnic cultures can become pronounced for young people. Young adults in their late teens and early 20's talked about dating violence, discomfort being touched or groped by both strangers and acquaintances when they went to parties or to other public gatherings.

For me, when I came to America, America culture and my culture is so different. In my culture we have friends with guys, but when they talk with us, they stay far away, they don't touch us. But here they touch your hip or touch you, but when you tell them here not to [touch you] they get angry at you. And then I don't know if I can have friends with them. If you say something to someone they get angry at you and say something back. (FG)

Experiencing or witnessing violence in childhood and young adulthood can have a rippling effect throughout a woman's life. It can affect her equilibrium and self-esteem, it can skew her understanding of what is acceptable and normal no matter what culture or country she is living in. This becomes all the more important in the next phase of life, when a woman marries or enters into an intimate partnership.

Intimate Partner Violence, Power and Control

When asked what the most pressing issues related to violence was for them and their communities, the majority of women talked about intimate partner violence. The manifestations of this were numerous and varied, including physical, sexual, emotional, spiritual and verbal abuse as well as direct control of finances, passports, driver's license and other important papers. In order to prevent re-traumatization our protocol intentionally did not probe for explicit stories of women's direct experience of violence. Instead, we asked women to share examples of violence and abuse that they have witnessed or about which they are familiar. Nonetheless, women did share their own personal experiences.

Since birth, I never had a dad. I was my mother's 6th child. We were really poor. My brothers raised me up. I was young when they came to marry me. (...) I don't know much but according to my first marriage, he was already an adult but I was still really young. He was really mean always telling me to do everything. If I couldn't do anything, he would treat me really bad and threaten me to leave. I don't know if other women have been tortured. (...) My husband tortured me a lot. (FG)

He does lots of pinching, lots of grabbing, under my arm, my love handles, under my thighs. That's mostly where the bruises are. The more you cry, the more he – harder. So I learned – so I learned that I do not cry. Because if he see tears – it's, like, he enjoy it. (FG)

My husband threatened to kill me with a gun and a knife, altogether 10 times. (FG)

And also physical violence. I was pregnant within a week. I was married in 2000, met him 2 days before, I was pregnant in February. I got very sick with pregnancy, I wasn't driving. I didn't know anyone here. I had no family here. I had a sisters in [state] but he would isolate me from her. But also physical and sexual abuse. (FG)

So lots of controlling.... Physical abuse happened behind closed doors only. (FG)

Quantitative data from the new MAWHS survey suggest Asian women in Minnesota experience a wide variety of aspects of violence, power and control as indicated below.

• 3% report having **experienced physical violence in the last year** in which a woman was slapped, punched or kicked, and 6% **experienced physical violence more than a year ago**.

• When intimate partner violence is **defined as emotional, physical or sexual abuse**, 8% of the 277 respondents to the IPV questions reported some type of IPV experience within the last year; this rises to 15% of women who have experienced these types of violence in their lifetime.

The overall prevalence of intimate partner violence and control from MAWHS is similar to other studies in the U.S. Although, as indicated earlier, the range of reported prevalence of violence is quite large, going from 3% for Vietnamese (Chang, et al, 2009) to 77% for Indian and Pakistani (Adam and Schewe, 2007).

Because each of the following transgressions has its particular aspects of control and subjugation, we will present comments and discussion separately for sexual violence, emotional abuse, and stalking.

Sexual Violence

Asian women who participated in the focus groups and interviews said they usually do not talk about sex in general nor do they talk about sexual violence in particular. However, women described many cases of experiencing forced sex or marital rape.

[He was abusing] me sexually. Yeah. Forced me. In fact, I can say that is the main reason I wanted to separate from him. (FG)

Sexual violence ... when I was pregnant – seven months' pregnant, and it was a crucial time for me. And my doctor – my gynecologist has asked me to just, you know, just take rest. ... my husband ... used to just force things on me. (FG)

... she finally broke down and told her sister, "I'm not getting along with my husband. I've never even slept with him, he's involved with someone else. His parents got him married to settle him down, they take care of me, but my husband's not in the picture." (FG)

Others in the study said that many Asian women don't know what marital rape is, and don't know they have a right to say no.

And so somebody said, you know, some nights I don't even want to have sex. But my husband, you know, says that I have to have sex. So I'm obligated. And I said, do you sometimes tell him no? And the woman said, yeah, but my husband still climbs on me and, you know, gets his way. I said, you know what we call that, right? And she's, like, what? I'm, like, that's called rape. You know, when you don't give consent, but, you know, he climbs on you, you know, and forces himself on you. (KI)

According to the MAWHS, sexual violence (2%) and rape by partner (2%) was reported to have occurred within the last year, while 4% and 3% respectively, reported at least one occurrence more than a year ago.

Emotional Abuse, Power and Control

While physical abuse was the most pressing concern for women, they also said emotional and verbal abuse was most common. They describe power and control over finances, over what they did, how they dressed, who they talked to, and where they went as the most pervasive of this type of abuse.

Mental abuse is number one in [Asian] Indian communities, men downgrading women when they talk. Shut them down all the time. (FG)

Like if a woman is talking, a guy will say, 'You just shut up now.' Tell you to shut your mouth, might say that in public with five people sitting there. 'You be quiet.' Or say, 'Why are you speaking?'(FG)

They won't let their wives buy nice clothes, put on makeup or work and because of that it causes disagreement. (FG)

He won't let me dye my hair... Said my nose is too flat. My face is too flat. My neck is too short. Always say I'm ugly. (FG)

Men will often go and marry women in Vietnam, bring them to America and control them. The husbands will keep the wife's green cards, won't allow her to work, or drive a car, and they will often use the children to control their mother. (FG)

Data from the MAWHS supports the findings from the qualitative data, indicating that:

- The three most common forms of intimate partner violence (IPV) in the past 12 months were: Being insulted (6%); restricted from financial decisions (4%); and physically assaulted (3%).
- The three most common forms of IPV more than 12 months ago were: Being insulted (6%); kept from family/friends (5%); physically assaulted (5%).
- **3% of women reported having their** identification withheld **from them.**

Stalking

During the focus groups and interviews, stalking was mentioned only once or twice and generally under the auspices of a husband's intense jealousy and scrutiny.

So I didn't know he was out there until people started telling me that. You know, we saw your husband driving around the building. We saw your husband park, you know, car out there. (FG)

In the MAWHS, women reported the following types of stalking and harassment in the past year:

- 9% women had experienced someone making unwanted phone calls or left messages
- 6% had experienced receiving unwanted letters, emails or texts
- 3% had been secretly followed or watched
- 2% had someone waiting for them at home, work or other places
- 2% had someone show up at a place where the woman was located
- 3% had someone post offensive comments about them on the internet
- 2% had intimate/private photos or videos shared electronically (via internet or mobile phone)
- 12% of the women who responded to the stalking questions reported **some type of stalking** experience **within the last year**.
- 24% of the women who responded to the stalking questions reported **some type of stalking** experience during their **lifetime**.

The SMS survey assessed stalking using three methods, and the results for these Asian American college students were:

- 6% received unwanted calls or text messages or other social media contacts.
- 13% had experienced unwanted waiting or following, which was significantly higher than what was reported among White female students (9%).
- 7% were spied upon in person or using devices.

The findings from these prevalence studies indicate that Asian women face a variety of stalking behaviors, although at relatively low rates.

Abusive International Marriage

About 10 years ago, Hmong advocates across Wisconsin began hearing from Hmong women that their husbands would leave for weeks or months, returning home with news of a second, under-age wife most often from Laos and Thailand (Abusive International Marriage, 2012). This practice, which they termed as abusive international marriage⁸ (AIM) involves deception and monetary transactions. A husband may force his wife to divorce him or remain married while sending money to the new young bride overseas. Or, he may bring the second wife back to the United States, neglecting his American wife and family. Women describe deception and eventual abuse for both the first, second and subsequent wives.

First, many men want, I've talked to about a dozen, they all said they want an obedient wife, someone who'll be a servant. They want the wife to love them just as they wish. Not as the woman chooses to love, and with gender equality. But us women, we can't do it. The society that we're living in now is different. We won't do it. So they think they have to marry someone from overseas who obey them even if the man is old. The man will take care of the wife in every aspect but make her bear child as much as possible. These men will keep their young wife in check and not give her freedom. But she'll also change when she realizes her rights and it'll lead to divorce. (FG)

You know, I once had this youth that was in my program. And I remember she came into my program, and she said ... you know, I don't know how to really categorize my family because my stepmom is the same age as me. And I said, what do you mean? You're only 16. She's, like, yeah. My dad, you know, divorced my mom, and so he went and married this girl and brought her over. And she's the same age as me. So when I look at her, you know, I don't know if I can respect her because, you know, she's the same age as me. How do I even start to call her my mom? (KI)

Of the married women who responded to the new MAWHS, 5% indicate that their spouse has another wife.

Findings from the focus groups and interviews indicate that abusive international marriages are happening not just in the Hmong community but also Thai, Pakistani, and Indian. We noted some differences between stories of AIM in Asian Indian communities versus Southeast Asian communities.

⁸ Later termed abusive international marriage and relationships

For instance, for Hmong men, the motivation seemed to be around gaining a new younger wife who was more easily controlled.

The advocates who were serving Hmong women started to identify these other trends that were happening ... where the woman would say, my husband's been gone for six months. I don't even know where he is. Or he took all the money, and then he came back with a new wife ... or he's making my son marry a girl, and then when she comes, she's actually his wife. (KI)

Some of the Southeast Asian populations have a particular problem with family violence- violence and the breakup of families caused by men, going to Southeast Asian countries and bringing back younger brides. For example, we had a client who was the 8th wife of an Asian citizen, she was the 8th one he has brought over. He wanted to go get another wife, and so he divorced her, he let the house be foreclosed upon, when she protested and got an attorney, he took the children, he reported to the police that she had abused the children, he got criminal charges against her, he reported to child protection that she had abused the children, and of course didn't pay any child support. So those things, took years, years, to unwind. ... And in the meantime she had to be in shelters... he also reported to her work that she was violating the children; she had to get a new job. Can you image the years when she didn't have a home, had to get a new job, and the permanent damage suffered by the children in all of this. (KI)

Many men here – American citizens who go back to Laos or Cambodia or China or Thailand, and they are marrying second time. So they have a wife here, but they go and bring another younger woman ...On a fiancée visa, yeah. So that's – so that's happening. And when the woman comes here, she is almost used as a slave. Second brides are usually put to work. Take care of the children, work on the farms, or, you know, do a lot of that. ... And these are conditional green cards. And those are typically for two years, and then their, you know, green card expires and visa expires, and they're in abuse, so ...They don't know where to go and what to do. And they have – most of the time, they have children by that time. So there are children involved. (KI)

Hmong women are becoming so assimilated that Hmong men are still looking for those women who they can control or women who can still be very traditional and take care of the family and take care of him. And then they go back to Laos or Thailand and find these girls who are very—who are uneducated, who have no idea what the world looks like, except they only know what it look like in their little village. And then they come here, and there's so much culture shock. And then they get isolated, and then they don't have relatives here. And then they get victim-blamed by the community [who say] the only reason why they married these older men is because they're using these men as a bridge to get to this country. (KI)

In describing why Hmong women don't divorce their husbands when they return with younger brides and stop supporting their original family, many women told us that in Hmong culture when a woman marries a man, she literally, figuratively and spiritually joins the husband's family. When she dies her husband's family pays for and takes responsibility for funeral and burial costs and responsibilities, and her spirit belongs to and resides with the husband's family. Traditionally, if Hmong women leave their husbands, their spirit will not be accepted into to the husband's family and cannot and may not return to her family of birth. Therefore her spirit (as well as her physical body) will literally be left unattended and adrift.⁹

For Asian Indian men, people described a financial motivation due to the process of men gaining a dowry upon marriage. Men would marry, acquire the dowry, divorce and repeat the process; a theme commonly heard in the study.

Guys will get married come here, get divorced, take the money she has, her dowry, which is acceptable in Indian society, especially if it's a well off family. They want the daughter to be happy, the in-laws are expecting it, something in compensation, depending on how rich you are, jewelry... it's still done under cover, you do see a lot of that. And there was a case of a guy who did it 14 times- got married, brought wives, back, took land property, and then left the wives there. (FG)

I just had a recent case from northern India where it was – you know, there was so much fraud built into that marriage. This woman didn't know that he had a wife before. And he got married and came here, and then she realized that, oh, he had another wife. (KI)

Mechanisms that Enable AIM

Across all ethnicities, we heard similarities in the processes and mechanisms that enable AIM to occur, including 1) forced divorce, whereby a man would seek divorce without the woman's involvement or knowledge; 2) the process of meeting women through forced (verses traditional arranged) marriage; and 3) acquiring additional wives by legally changing their names in the US or sending their sons and nephews to marry women for them. Here again women talked about a unique struggle with immigration procedures because a woman's fiancée Visa status, and legal presence in the U.S., is tied to her marriage so a forced divorce also meant a loss of immigration status. In addition, several people criticized the State Department of Naturalization and Immigration that does not adequately screen for older men returning with younger women, sometimes multiple times.

... most of these cases ... come legally.... They've been vetted through a process that the State Department feels comfortable about. [laughs] And so they're coming. And they're victims now of domestic violence. (KI)

Usually I'm dealing with the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th wife who is trying to prevent the next one from coming. I've successfully worked with the State Department to stop someone from coming when we have so much information about the girl that we can prove that they're not the age on their papers...The state department does have a list of people who are not allowed to get visas, but if you change your name or send your nephews.... That's another way of getting girls in that are being sold by their parents-- the parents get the bride price. The [traditional] customs are being thwarted, true of every country we serve, the customs of each country are different, but each country's customs are being diverted into ways of trafficking younger and younger girls for men. ... We're trying to be more effective in trying to get the State Department to enforce those documents. (KI)

⁹ One of our key informants noted that recently one of the 18 Hmong Clan families, the Moua's, has said that they will take a Hmong woman's spirit back into the Moua clan, even after she divorces her husband due to family violence.

We work with the State Department to try to stop the underage importation of girls, and I have a civil law suit pending about it, -I've had maybe 100 clients of that type. 100 Asian [clients). We don't see that same pattern in other immigrant clients. We see those actions of mostly men, speeding up, and increasing in intensity. And getting more and more bizarre--for one, when the man's visa was denied so he couldn't go back, he came and got a legal name change; many of them change their names frequently to escape consequences of that. They are hiring nephews to go over and get the girls, they are getting them directly from families, in-laws who are participating in changing the ages of the children/girls— they've changed Laos, it's distorting the culture. Most parents would not have participated in selling their girls before, there are many now who do. (KI)

Inaccurate Age of Victims

Another confounding variable is that the actual age of the second wife is often questionable. This appears to occur both intentionally and unintentionally, and results in under-aged girls coming through immigration and getting married in the United States.

In Laos, in the villages, there's no hospitals. So you have babies in villages, and there's no paperwork or certificates or anything. And so when you go to the embassy and file sponsorship paperwork, you don't really know how old you are. And so then birthdays could be really off. ...When we first came to the United States as new refugees, a lot of us don't know our birthdays. Because we didn't have documentation or birth certificates. And even if a girl – a young girl is 14 or 15, they can easily say, well, she looks like she could pass for somebody who's 19. So we can ...They fabricate it. And because – if you're under 18, you can't get married or come to the U.S. (KI)

Under-reporting of AIM

There appears to be both mistaken reporting as well as under-reporting of AIM, with sometimes deadly consequences.

And so when you're a child, and you're trying to tell your father, no, what you're doing is wrong, then things like – if you remember the case a few years ago when that father killed his son. And in the newspaper, they said it was over a cable bill. But the real issue was because he was trying to stop his father from sending money to his girlfriend in Laos. And so the father threatened that, if the son couldn't stop, then he was going to be the first one to die. And he did die. (KI)

Violence by Non-intimate Partners

While the majority of women described violence perpetrated by intimate partners, a few also discussed violence, control, and humiliation perpetrated by in-laws. Women reported additional experiences of non-intimate partner violence in MAWHS.

• When violence is defined as emotional, physical or sexual abuse at the hands of **someone other than a partner**, 5% reported that they had experienced some type of violence by someone other than their partner **within the last year** • When violence is defined as emotional, physical or sexual abuse at the hands of someone other than a partner, 12% reported that they had experienced some type of violence by someone other than their partner in their lifetime.

Factors that Contribute to Violence

In addition to contextual factors such as patriarchal norms for violence in marriage and female roles that encourage subservience, women and key informants most commonly reported drug and alcohol use as a precursor or confounding variable to domestic violence. Besides alcohol, women reported men using heroine, methamphetamine, and cocaine. Alcohol and drug use initiated or exacerbated violence by making men angry or easily irritable, which could then escalate to violence.

When they over drink, they have lots of things going on in the house, they're mad at kids, mad at wife, then everything is a trigger. (FG)

The men often engage in smoking and drinking, and then they can't control their behavior when they are drunk they becomes violent. (FG)

I thought my second marriage would be better. But, he was a drug addict. The abuse from hatred wasn't as bad as the abuse from the one who used drugs. (FG)

Additionally, multiple women reported that using drugs and alcohol put a financial strain on their husband, who then used violence or threats of violence to control the woman's income or to demand more money.

Most of the husband drink to the level of intoxication, and some of them are using drugs. When they run out of money, they come back and ask their wife for money. And if the wife doesn't have money or won't give it, they get angry and start punching the wife and hurting the children. (FG)

A husband who was stealing money from his wife to pay for his drug habit. When his wife question him about her money he would become violent and hurt her and the children. (FG)

Women reported that drug and alcohol use also influenced how family and community members responded to the violence, generally reporting that by blaming the behavior on alcohol and drug use, the husband could escape personal responsibility of his behavior.

And then in the morning they forget everything. Society says it's okay... he drank too much. He drank too much. That's how men are. You don't blame him, blame the alcohol. In turn, women reported that men's excessive alcohol use is normalized and permissible. (FG)

Liquor- hard alcohol is like drinking water. As a rite of passage for men, it's not a big deal. (FG)

In a few instances, alcohol use by women also instigated violence as men sought to 'punish or control' a woman's behavior that was viewed as unacceptable. Women also reported the following situations as factors that exerted pressure on relationships and caused disputes that could turn violent.

- Infidelity or suspicions of infidelity
- Money issues; income inequality
- Too much gambling, partying, or playing video games
- Pressure from in-laws
- Issues with children
- Mental health issues like post-traumatic stress disorder

Section 3. Culturally Relevant Services and Programs

According to focus group participants and key informants, there are significant cultural barriers that prohibit Asian women from discussing violence and sexuality at all, which then also inhibit them from formally seeking help or reporting violence. According to the MAWHS, of the women who had experienced violence, "shame or embarrassment" (20%) was the most common reason why they did not report it. Professionals from all sectors (law enforcement, prosecution, medical, and support services) expressed concerns about widespread underreporting by Asian survivors.

They do go through all of this... But they rarely discuss it with anybody. Because, you know, that becomes a prestige issue, somewhere at some point, that they're discussing their husband, which is not regarded as a good point. (FG)

Because it's such a sensitive issue in the culture, in the tradition around the Hmong community and just the norm around marriage, the domestic violence does happen. We just don't talk about it. You know, we try to sweep it under the – under the rug to not let it, you know, be known in the community that your immediate, you know, marriage or union – domestic union with your partner is in a crisis. And so we put on this – we tend to put on this happy face. And even, you know, family members that do know of the, you know, outbursts of violence, they have a tendency to just kind of keep quiet so that it doesn't bring shame to the family. (KI)

So one, there is a very strong sense of a stigma and shame to speak out about violence. So they don't – they don't report.... reporting is not accurate at all....They're not – no. They're not reporting. (KI)

The following sections present the findings, based both on survey data and interview and focus group data, about with whom and when women share information as well as the common barriers to reporting.

Reporting to Family, Friends or Community Leaders

When women do disclose experiencing acts of violence or abuse, MAWHS data show that the most common people to whom survivors reported was a friend (39.8%), followed by their mother or sister (27.3%). Reporting to their other family members, the family of the perpetrator, professionals (medical or social work), or cultural leaders occurred at approximately the same rate (all each around 3%). Virtually no one disclosed to the perpetrator's mother (<1%).

During the interviews and focus groups, some women reported that when they would tell their family members about the abuse, often family members would try to talk with their husband and stop the abuse or attempt to calm down the situation.

And there are a lot of people out there to calm down. When a problem get severe, there are so many people out there or in the home to calm down each other. To calm down both in the couple. (FG)

And my mom wasn't happy, so Mom called his two cousins come and talk to him. (FG)

A few women reported that family members helped connect them to Asian-specific services. So I got connected to (services) through my brother-in-law from my maternal side.... And I called him, and he told me that he had talked to somebody through the – you know, getting all the information from the internet. He called (service provider). And (they) called me. And then I was able to get connected. (FG)

Key informants reported that a woman's friends and peers would also informally take on advocate roles and assist in identifying appropriate services and resources.

Hmong women who advocate – who are, like, just natural advocates, and they tell other women where to go for services, those are things that they say. (FG)

In some instances, women reported that telling in-laws could help the situation because men were likely to listen to the advice and direction of their mothers. In other instances, women reported that in-laws might not take action because they wanted to avoid conflict with their son.

But, you know, she can't say anything. Otherwise, you know, her and her son will have confrontations, and they will argue. (FG)

I think his sister kind of knew later on. I opened up a little to her. My mother probably – my mother-in-law probably knew, but, you know, she's afraid. Yeah, she's afraid (of) losing her son. Losing me. (FG)

Women reported family members—both her family and his—often encouraged the woman to stay in the relationship and follow their husband's lead.

My mother-in-law told me I had to go with my husband and his girlfriend, and if I didn't then I'm the one who loses. In marriage ceremonies, they impart words to the couple that says if your husband acts a certain way you have to follow them too. If he steals, you should steal too. (FG)

The in-laws told me that I should just make way for him and let him have his way. (FG)

My aunt, she came to our family and we gave her advice, and said be patient, maybe he will become better in the future. Whenever she is really hurt, she always comes and visit us and we give her encouragement. (FG)

I did leave. But then his cousin came and asked me to go back. Said I will talk to him. You know, I had been in the family for so many years, and we haven't – you know, you're a good wife, and you have – you know, you love all of us. Not just him, but you love all of the family [right]? Come back, and we'll talk to him. He changed a little bit, but ... (FG)

When women disclosed the situation to religious or community leaders and elders, the response generally would be for the leaders to visit with the husband and wife and attempt to mediate their conflict, give advice or offer prayers.

The church leader go to visit the husband or bring something to him, give him advice not to do it. And then they pray for them. (FG)

The leader was trying to visit her at home and educate the husband to treat the wife nicer/kinder. So later the husband changed, but the woman still is afraid for her life. (FG)

Some people tell the church leader to pray for them and pray for the husband to get better. That's good. (FG)

We trust our religious leader to do something. (FG)

One key informant described the community response to sexual assault allegations in the following manner.

So if a man rapes a woman, and she knows who he is, and she accuses him, they would have to go through the clan system. And the clan system is what upholds, like, Hmong customary law. ... And so the clan leaders then would force the woman to marry her rapist to make it right. (KI)

If they're in the same clan, then what will happen is, if I accuse somebody of the same clan to – that that person raped me, and that person said yes, he did it, then what would happen is he would have to pay some sort of restitution to my parents to purify their face – or their name so that they can say that I've been cleansed because he paid restitution to my parents. (KI)

Lastly, one women reported disclosure to medical professionals when bruising was observed during a pregnancy exam.

Why Women Do Not Seek Help from Informal Supports

There were many reasons why women did not ask for help, even from informal resources such as friends or family members. The greatest barrier to disclosure and asking for help is the fear of negative consequences including experiencing personal blame, stigma and shame for the abuse as well as setting off ripples of negative consequences for their entire family. No matter who women shared their story with, they were often concerned about the lack of confidentiality within their community. The following quotations are provided as illustrations of these barriers.

Lack of Confidentiality

If you tell relatives then you will fear that they'll take it and tell the whole community. (FG)

They're scared of them talking, they're afraid of them gossiping, not only that but by telling someone in the community it will get back to their husband, it will get back to the circle they're trying to get away from. (FG)

Women Experience Blame, Stigma, and Shame

It's not good. Those who are not victims just don't understand it. If we don't tell others, then relatives (in-laws) and the husband will call us a good wife. If a little bit gets out, then we'll be called a bad wife. (FG)

In-laws will call you the bad one and side with the perpetrator. They'll say that we're the bad one... That's why we feel like we have to hide it all. (FG)

Then the relatives are going to blame us for pushing our husbands away. (...) The relatives will say that too, they'll say if she isn't good kick her out and just get another one. That's what my mother in law had said. (FG)

If I told an aunt, she'll say it's my fault. (FG)

And oftentimes there's constructs of not being able to talk about it with family members for a lot of different reasons. You know, personal shame and blame, but then also the shame and blame that would happen on a family level. And that connection of, again, the fear of being cast out. (KI)

Negative Consequences for Family Members

We tolerate it because: 1) for ourselves, 2) to protect our family, extended family too. (FG)

If I get divorced, you know. Even though my dad's, you know, passed away, it's still going to give him— that reputation. (FG)

The key thing was that women sacrifice their life for their family. Family is first. (FG)

Reporting to Law Enforcement and Professional Services

For many women, going beyond telling family or friends would only happen in certain situations. In our study, of the women who had experienced violence, only 11.5% said they had reported the incident to the police. Women reported seeking professional help or calling 911 only when they believed they were in lethal danger.

So if he treats you bad, you should just endure it because there might be something good. But after you've learned enough and you get older, you realize that people might not change. This past year in 2015 my dad told me to get out of my life otherwise he'll kill me. So I went to go find shelter for a few days and that's when I found women who helped me and gave me shelter. (FG)

When I got older I knew that if I didn't leave I would die. (FG)

It depends on the situation, if it's a small problem people go to friends and family, if it's a big problem maybe then they call. I think like a big problem for me is like your husband tried to shoot you- that's a big problem. (FG)

Multiple women reported that it was actually neighbors, children, or family members who ultimately called the police.

When he got mad, he would yell for 24 hours and chase me with a gun. The neighbors saw it. They would call the cops but I protested to not take him. (FG)

Even when women actually sought formal assistance, they did not necessarily disclose that they are experiencing abuse. Multiple women talked about seeking shelter or legal assistance for divorce because they were experiencing abuse, but not wanting to disclose to those services the occurrence or extent of that abuse.

When I sought for people who could help me file for a divorce ... I found out I could go downtown to file the papers. When I went, I didn't think I wanted to tell them about the abuse but I knew if I didn't no one would help me. So, I did share it. (FG)

I was lucky because all I did was seek shelter ... I never told anyone. (FG)

Key informants also reported that women were more likely to disclose victimization indirectly to service providers by emphasizing related concerns that they had.

They would be experiencing sexual or physical abuse but that was not the way that these would present. It would be about something else. And often they would not talk about themselves in the situation. They would talk about things people were doing to them, but it wasn't, like, this is happening to me. It'd be, like, my family's getting hurt. Or this person is – I just want them away from me. And then to get the details of what is going on was so hard. Their complaint is that they're being culturally shamed. Or that their husband is embarrassing them, and their friends don't like them. And so they might come in and say, can you look at my documents? And it's through sort of a lot of talking, then you realize, oh, this is a woman who is being abused at home, right? ... And it would take, sometimes, one or two conversations to get to, like, oh, yeah, and he's raping me all the time. Like, of course, that's happening. But that wasn't the main concern. It was, like, my son doesn't have his car because Dad stole it. Or there would be another way that I would find out about the violence. And so the violence was harder to uncover. Sexual violence specifically. They would start talking about domestic violence much easier. (KI)

Why The Abuse is Not Reported

Women shared numerous barriers and concerns that they felt they needed to weigh carefully before reporting violence to law enforcement. The main five concerns from MAWHS are listed in the table below with quotations from the qualitative studies illustrating the concern. It should also be remembered that women – and many community members – viewed going to outside professionals as a path of action that would only lead to divorce.

| Main Concerns | Example Quotations from Female Participants |
|---|--|
| Do not want bad consequences for husband | I didn't want anything bad to happen to my husband. I really didn't want to say anything because I wasn't looking for punishment for him. |
| The abuser would also harm family members | When I sought for people who could help me file for a divorce, I didn't want to get anyone involved because he said he would kill anyone who tried to help me, he would kill any relative who tried to help me, so I looked for help myself. I didn't want anyone else's life to die with me. |
| Protect kids & family stability | As a mother, I didn't want to destroy the marriage because I didn't want my children to fail school so that they can go to work and school without stress. So I held myself together for about 10 yearsI controlled my feelings because I didn't want to be a mother who punished the kids, I wanted them to grow up to see I |

| Table C. Main Conserve Mission | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Table 6. Main Concerns Womer | I Do Not Report Violence | with Supporting Quotations |
| Main Concerns | Example Quotations from Female Participants | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | was a good mother. I wanted them to be able to go to school and work stress free. | | |
| | I grew up without a dad. I don't want my kids to grow up without a dad. | | |
| | It's a fear of the outside. It's what you do now. I don't know what I'm going to do by myself out there. At least in here, my children are in here. At least I have food, clothing, yes my husband is a jerk, there's some safety. | | |
| Cultural pressures | Women don't have the right to talk to other people if they have been through DV in the family. They just need to hide it. | | |
| | Family issues should remain in the family. They shouldn't go outside the walls of the house. | | |
| Distrust/Fear of the Police | Police- don't have a reputation of trust. That's universal. That's the way it is. | | |
| | Especially among communities of color, there's a lot of, like, fear of police. Like, I know family members, like, old and young, who are just afraid of, like, getting pulled over. And so I don't know how much confidence and trust that instills in them to make a police report. (KI) | | |

In the college SMS there were several indications that Asian college women needed additional information before they would be able to report an incident. For example, 16% of female Asian students had no knowledge of how to report sexual misconduct to the University, which was higher than White female students (14%). In terms of reasons for not reporting, female Asian college students report that they didn't know where to go (32%), were embarrassed/ashamed/emotionally difficult (36%), not serious enough to report (84%), feared social consequences (32%), nothing would be done (41%), and would not be confidential (23%).

Interviews with key informants corroborated the experiences and reasons provided by the women in focus groups as well as in survey responses. Additional factors shared by key informants included that women felt interpreters, service providers, and the legal system may not hold their story confidential.

They will get blamed. ... [People will say] remember that she report her husband to police? (KI)

And so, when a woman escapes, she will usually be disowned by her whole community. She'll be shunned. Because she's seen as this person who are taking her children away from their father and are just breaking families apart. (KI)

Because we live in a very small community, and everybody is related to everyone somehow. Or I know that person, or that person know the other person. So it's about the confidentiality, it's very – it's another layer that we see. (...) Because they're in a time where they're, like, deciding whether they want to leave or not leave. But if they share the information with interpreter who they don't trust, and then the interpreter will share that with someone that they know and things spread out in the community, it really gives them a hard time. (KI) Key informants also reported that women do not formally report because of challenges in recognizing violence and a cultural norm that sex is expected and dictated by husbands in marriage.

And a lot of women who have been sexually abused are still not speaking up or not reporting because they still believe that it's okay for your husband to rape you. (KI)

They also identified negative community perceptions of Asian domestic violence services as being anti-man and pro-divorce. I was told that [community organization] is known in the community as that place where women go to – and then leave their husbands. Like, you know, it's a pretty negative connotation about that place where women go, and it ruins their marriages. (KI)

Key informants also identified a trend of the abuser calling the police on the victim as a mechanism of discouraging and undermining the victim in being able to call the police in the future.

She had an incident where she got drunk one night. He came home. The cops were called on her because she – like, he called the cops on her because she, like, had hit him, but there had been a lot of violence towards her, and this was, like, you know, one time she reacted back, and then she got arrested for that. (KI)

So he calls the police on them. They get arrested. Now they have a record. Now they're having to deal with all the court stuff. Now the police are reading them as a crazy person, so next time she calls, like, you were arrested last time. I don't understand. So it's mutual violence now. Or she's just nuts. We get a lot of guys just being, like, she's try got commit – I had a couple guys who would cut their girlfriends' wrists and then, like, call the police and say she's trying to commit suicide so they could try to get custody of the kids. Like, just crazy stuff. And so the police get there, and they see this hysterical, frantic woman. They see a really calm, collected guy who's, like, man, I don't know what she's doing. She's just crazy, right? And she's, like, losing her shit and trauma and, like, all that stuff. And then she gets arrested. (KI)

With these extensive barriers and severe social, financial, and cultural consequences to reporting and seeking services, women and key informants identified service-seeking behaviors as a last attempt when seeking support through family or community structures did not end the violence. Key informants noted that while women from other ethnicities tend to cycle in and out of an abusive relationship before they are able to leave permanently, the ramifications for women of Asian ethnicities tend to mean once they seek formal services, they will not be able to return to family supports.

Because they can't move back in with their own parents and family. And so they're essentially – you know, in America, people leave and often will leave five, six, seven times. The average number of times is seven times before somebody finally goes. So they go to shelter, they come home, then they go to shelter, and come home. Because there's an individual family system that's separate, right? So when a woman chooses to leave in some of these cultures, it's one and done. That when she leaves, she's not permitted back into the family home again. She can't go to her family of origin. And she can't go to her family because, once she leaves, she has to be gone for good. And so it becomes this monumental decision. And ambivalence – not knowing what you want – is a core component of trauma. And so, for these women that are experiencing so much ambivalence because of this trauma, they're not permitted to act that out. Right? They have to make a final decision. –KI All of the barriers to reporting identified above are exacerbated for new immigrant women and women who are not fluent in English and do not understand the legal system or cultural milieu of the U.S. In particular, the potential consequences of divorce—which may come from reporting violence—causes many women with dependent visas to fear potential deportation and loss of custody for their children. New immigrant women may also be more fearful of the heightened consequences of reporting violence for their husband if he is not a U.S. citizen, with concerns that their own or his immigration status will be at risk. On the other hand, men who are citizens of the U.S. are able to take advantage of the legal and court system to actually force divorce, gain financial benefits and legal custody of children by manipulating or threatening women to sign documents they do not understand. A man may choose to take these steps in retaliation if a woman reports any abuse.

There are some specific trends around Muslim Asian women --- that needs to be on our forefront, especially victims of DV and reporting. My main concern is that the more heightened the punishment of the abuser, the less likely the women are to report. Often within the Muslim community, the families are connected, you might be married to someone whose family you know, it's one thing to talk to the police but if your husband disappears... that's a big thing. After 911, there were men who disappeared... because they were under some accusations, so there is similar concern that there is less willingness to report because of the fear of how their men will be treated because of the other government agenda about what happens to Muslim men, and this could become the pretext (to arrest Muslim men). – (KI)

If the experience of communities is that police will not respond to victims in trauma-informed, culturally sensitive ways, Asian victims of violence are less likely to come forward. Women and key informants identified several ways police practices could be improved to respond to Asian victims and encourage women to seek police intervention. They suggested that police do not interview a woman with her husband present; expect a wide range of responses from women and children who have been victims of trauma, including but not limited to women being frantic, emotional, agitated; avoid asking questions that feel victim-blaming; focus on listening to the victim; and do not focus too much on details as that can signal to a woman that she is not being understood.

Simple things like having to explain your name. I have a big problem here, but I'm sitting here having to explain and repeat my name over and over again and spelling it. When that happens, I don't want to talk. It already starts there-I tell you my name and you don't get it. How will you get anything else? (FG)

Section 4. Recommendations

The following recommendations are drawn primarily from participants in the study and Working Group members, and are informed by other research. There are opportunities to build on the strengths of Asian communities and existing leaders to develop, fund, and implement culturally-specific strategies to prevent violence against Asian women and children, support families and individuals experiencing violence, and foster community, family and individual healing. Key recommendations are grouped into three overarching categories:

- Promote primary prevention by changing social and cultural norms and practices about gender equity in the Asian community
- Strengthen services, support and outreach for Asian women experiencing violence
- Strengthen mainstream organizations' and individuals' knowledge, skills and responses to Asian survivors

Across all recommendations, study participants called for community-based and community-driven solutions, indicating that people from each of the ethnic communities are in the best position to create the strongest, most grounded and useful strategies that will help them address the issues related to violence against Asian women and children in Minnesota.

Promote Primary Prevention: Change Cultural Norms and Practices about Gender Equity

- 1. Create a vehicle through which community members and cultural leaders can create an educational and awareness-raising campaign and community conversations that:
 - a. Shifts cultural norms from patriarchal practices toward gender equality and women's and girls' human rights;
 - b. Enlists a broad cross-section of people including survivors, advocates, faith, and cultural leaders to speak against violence against women and children;
 - c. Deepens understanding of women's and children's rights in this country as well as how to access existing resources and recognize abuse;
 - d. Promotes the potential advantages of disclosure and reporting of violence;
 - e. Uses multiple methods of and strategies for outreach that are developed to target the unique segments of the Asian population.
- 2. Fund efforts to work with new immigrant Asian men to explore new ways of expressing anger and love in their familial relationships, and encourage fidelity.
- 3. Fund opportunities for Asian youth to talk and learn about healthy relationships and gender equity in the context of their cultural community.

Reach and Support Women Experiencing Violence

- 4. Fund ethnic-specific agencies to serve more women and families to deal with issues related to shelters and housing, legal issues, immigration, child custody and support, education, employment, mental health and marital problems.
- 5. Fund transitional housing for Asian women and children experiencing violence or abuse.

- 6. Fortify ethnic-specific services that work to strengthen the family (e.g., family/marital counseling and support groups) and focus on healthy relationships and families to transform the belief that anti-violence is inherently anti-male and pro-divorce.
- 7. Bolster education and awareness-raising with informal resources (family, friends, faith and cultural leaders who may interact with victims of violence) so that they know how to best intervene and identify when situations require professional help and intervention.

Strengthen Mainstream Organizations' Knowledge, Skills and Responses

- 8. Mandate that mainstream organizations that reach substantial numbers of Asian Minnesotans including police, judicial, immigration, schools, health, and faith organizations, receive training to help them identify Asian-specific expressions of domestic violence and create informed action plans that enable them to better support families through these times of crisis.
- 9. Fund ethnic-specific organizations to train and coach mainstream organizations that reach substantial numbers of Asian Minnesotans or any organization needing to deepen their knowledge and expertise in addressing family violence in culturally consistent ways.
- 10. Require that state and local law enforcement ask the ethnicity of the people involved, and whether they need an interpreter, so that trends and responses can be tailored to the specific ethnic group.
- 11. Prohibit law enforcement from using children as interpreters.
- 12. During any legal proceedings, require that there are well trained, competent translators available to all parties.
- 13. Ensure that the state is making all possible efforts to ensure that the Department of Immigration and Naturalization is taking all possible measures to reduce abusive international marriages.
- 14. Increase awareness of abusive international marriages among mainstream institutions in Minnesota and increase their capacity to serve victims, whether the wife who has been abandoned or the new wife who has been recently brought here.

Closing

Throughout the interviews and focus groups we heard reference to Asians being the model minority. While the intent may be to depict Asians as people who do not cause trouble and who tend to be well educated, model citizens, the consequence of this social concept is that little attention is brought to the needs of Asian Americans, thus possibly preventing law-makers from attending to the harrowing nature of violence in Asian communities. Further, while many Americans may perceive Asian Americans to be a homogeneous group, in Minnesota, Asians come from over 40 different countries.

As reported in this study, new data from the Minnesota Asian Women's Health Study (MAWHS) indicate that:

- 8% report intimate partner violence (IPV) as defined by emotional, physical or sexual abuse at the hands of a partner within the last year; 15% report experiencing these types of IPV in their lifetime;
- 5% report they have experienced emotional, physical or sexual abuse by someone other than a partner within the past year; this rises to 12% in their lifetime;

- 12% of women who responded to the stalking question report having experienced some type of stalking in the past year; this doubles to 24% in their lifetime;
- Of the women who experienced violence, only 11% reported the incident to police;
- 41% of women believe that about half of the men in their community hit their wives

These results are similar to other national studies of violence against Asians; however, there is limited high-quality research available, especially about the Asian ethnic groups specific to Minnesota such as the Hmong and Karen. Minnesota is uniquely positioned to lead the nation in understanding the differences in Asian ethnic groups and how to prevent violence within them.

Over and above the importance and clarity of the quantitative data, the stories we heard were heartbreaking. We hope these women's voices are compelling evidence to warrant funding critically needed, ethnically-specific transitional housing, expansion of ethnic-specific advocacy and treatment services, widespread training of mainstream organizations including law enforcement, courts, schools, health and faith sectors, as well as individuals in the community, which would lead to community-led violence prevention.

References

Adam, N. M., & Schewe, P.A. (2007). A Multilevel Framework Exploring Domestic Violence Against Immigrant Indian and Pakistani Women in the United States. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health, 2*(1), 5-20. doi: 10.1080/15564900701238468

Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/nisvs_report2010-a.pdf.

Boynton Health Services. (2015). College Student Health Survey Report. Retrieved from http://www.bhs.umn.edu/surveys/survey-results/2015/UofMTwinCities_CSHSReport_2015.pdf

Buskovick, D. & Peterson, E. (2009). *Domestic Violence: Results from the 2008 Minnesota Crime Victim Survey.* Minnesota Department of Public Safety. Retrieved from https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/109%20Domestic%20Violence%20Report.pdf

Chang, D. F., Shen, B., & Takeuchi, D.T. (2009). Prevalence and demographic correlates of intimate partner violence in Asian Americans. *International Journal of Law & Psychiatry, 32*, 167-175. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2009.02.004

Cho, H. (2012). Intimate Partner Violence Among Asian Americans: Risk Factor Differences across Ethnic Subgroups. *J Fam Violence, 27*, 215-224. doi: 10.1007/s10896-012-9413-9

Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans. (2012). *State of the Asian Pacific Minnesotans: 2010 Census and 2008-2010 American Community Survey Report*. Retrieved from https://mn.gov/capm/assets/StateoftheAsianPacificMinnesotans_tcm1051-114507.pdf

Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans. (2015). Annual Report. Retrieved from https://mn.gov/capm/assets/AnnualReport2015_tcm1051-115997.pdf

Dabby-Chinoy, C. (2012). Abusive International Marriages Hmong Advocates Organizing in Wisconsin. Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence. Retrieved from http://www.api-gbv.org/files/Abusive.International.Marriages_APIIDV_4.2013.pdf

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). (2014). *Violence Against Women: an EU-wide Survey-Main Results*. Publications Office of the European Union Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results-apr14_en.pdf

California Department of Social Services. (2003). *Family Assessment Questionnaire II AD 918*. Retreived from http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/cdssweb/entres/forms/English/AD918.PDF

Finkelhor, D. (2011). Prevalence of Child Victimization, Abuse, Crime, and Violence Exposure in Violence. In J.W. White, M. P. Koss & A.E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and children: Mapping the Terrain* (pp. 9-29). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/CV189.pdf

Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S., Turner, H., & Ormrod, R. (2011). *The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire: 2nd Revision (JVQ-R2).* Durham, NH: Crimes against Children Research Center. Retrieved from http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/jvq/available_versions.html

Fong, L.Y.S. (1997). Asian-American Women: An Understudied Minority. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 24*(1), 91-111. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol24/iss1/7

Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedema, S., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T. and Lang, J. (2013). *Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women And How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-Country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific.* Bangkok: UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV. Retrieved from

http://www.partners4prevention.org/sites/default/files/resources/p4p-report.pdf

Gonçalves, M. & Matos, M. (2016). Prevalence of Violence against Immigrant Women: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Fam Viol*, *31*(6), 697–710. doi:10.1007/s10896-016-9820-4

Kim, E., & Hogge, I. (2015). Intimate Partner Violence among Asian Indian Women in the United States: Recognition of Abuse and Help-Seeking Attitudes. *International Journal of mental Health*, *44*, 200-214. DOI: 10.1080/00207411.2015.1035073

Leung, P. & Cheung, M. (2008). A prevalence study on partner abuse in six Asian American ethnic groups in the USA. *International Social Work*, *51*(5), 635-649 doi: 10.1177/0020872808093342

Liles, S., Usita, P., Irvin, V.L., Hofstetter, C.R., Beeston, T., & Hovell, M.F. (2012). Prevalence & Correlates of Intimate Partner Violence Among Young, Middle, and Older Korean Descent in California. *J Fam Violence*, *27*(8), 801–811. doi: 10.1007/s10896-012-9471-z

Mahapatra, N. (2012). South Asian Women in the U.S. and their experience of Domestic Violence. *J Fam Viol. 27*, 381-390.doi: 10.1007/s10896-012-9434-4

Moyer, V.A. (2013). Final Recommendation Statement: Intimate Partner Violence and Abuse of Elderly and Vulnerable Adults. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 22*. Retrieved from http://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Document/RecommendationStatementFinal/intim ate-partner-violence-and-abuse-of-elderly-and-vulnerable-adults-screening

Minnesota State Demographic Center. (2016). *Education.* Retrieved from <u>http://mn.gov/admin/demography/data-by-topic/education/</u>

Minnesota State Demographic Center. (2016). *Age, Race, & Ethnicity.* Retrieved from https://mn.gov/admin/demography/data-by-topic/age-race-ethnicity/

Raj, A., & Silverman, J.G. (2002). Intimate Partner Violence Against South Asian Women in Greater Boston. *J Am Med Womens Assoc. 57*(2), 111-4. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1447758/.

Rianon, N.J. & Shelton, A.J. (2003) Perception of Spousal Abuse Expressed by Married Bangladeshi Immigrant Women in Houston, Texas, U.S.A. *Journal of Immigrant Health and Social Work, 5*(1), 37-44. doi:10.1023/A:1021052212981

Sayem, A.M. (2012). Preventing Domestic Violence in the South Asian Context: Men's or Family Involvement? Asian Social Work and Policy Review, 6, 218-236. DOI: 10.1111/j.1753-1411.2012.00072.x

Thapa-Oli, S., Dulal, H.B., & Baba, Y. (2009) A preliminary study of intimate partner violence among Nepali women in the United States. *Violence Against Women, 15,* 206-223. doi: 10.1177/1077801208329389

Tjaden, P. and Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence against Women*. National Institute of Justice. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf

Tjaden, P. and Thoennes, N. (1998). *Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. National Institute of Justice. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/172837.pdf

United States Census Bureau. (2016). *Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin for the United States, States, and Counties: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015.* Retrieved from https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk

Vang, P.D. & Bogenschutz, M. (2011). Teenage Marriage and the Socioeconomic Status of Hmong Women. *International Migration*, *52*(3), 144-159. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.2010.00674.x

VERA Institute of Justice. (2014). *Screening for Human Trafficking. Guidelines for Administering the Trafficking Victim Identification Tool (TVIT).* Retrieved from

http://www.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/human-trafficking-identification-tooland-user-guidelines.pdf

World Health Organization (WHO). (2005). WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women: summary report of initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from

http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/summary_report/summary_report_Eng lish2.pdf

Yoshihama, M. (1999). Domestic Violence Against Women of Japanese Descent in Los Angeles: Two Methods of Estimate Prevalence. *Violence Against Women, 5*(8), 869-897. doi: 10.1177/10778019922181536

Yoshioka, M.R., Dinoia, J., & Ullah, K. (2001). Attitudes toward Marital Violence: an examination of four Asian communities. *Violence Against Women*, 7(8), 900-926.

Appendix

- 1. Working Group Members
- 2. Statewide Random Sample Survey Documents
 - a. First Cover Letter
 - b. Survey
 - c. Post card
- 3. Convenience Sample Survey Documents
 - a. Participant Recruitment Script
 - b. Safety Referral Sheet for Participants
- 4. Focus Group Interview Protocol
- 5. Key Informant Interview Protocol
- 6. Participant Consent Form
- 7. General Flyer
- 8. Fact Sheet
- 9. Interpreter Training Material
- 10. MAWHS survey data tables
- 11. Boynton Health Service College Health Survey (CHS) data tables
- 12. American Association of Universities Sexual Misconduct Survey (SMS) data

1. Working Group Members

| No. | Name | Title | Organization |
|-----|------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | Gail Chang Bohr | Senior Judge | State of Minnesota |
| 2. | Crystal Brown | Instructor | Augsburg First Steps |
| 3. | MayTong Chang | Family Advocate | Hmong American Partnership (HAP) |
| 4. | Raj Chaudhary | Executive Director | SEWA - AIFW (Asian Indian Family Wellness) |
| 5. | Melissa Chiodo | Lieutenant of Sex Crimes | Minneapolis Police Department |
| 6. | Dokor Dejvongsa | Attorney | Dejvongsa Myers & Associates, LLC |
| 7. | Shellie S. Enright | Domestic Violence Prevention Specialist | Brooklyn Park Police Department/Investigations |
| 8. | Veena lyer | Attorney & Shareholder | Minnesota Asian Pacific American Bar Association; Shareholder, Nilan Johnson Lewis |
| 9. | Hannah Laniado | Sexual Violence Prevention Specialist | Minnesota Coalition against Sexual Assault (MNCASA) |
| 10. | Jewelly Lee | Assistant Director of the Center for Community Work and Learning at St. Catherine University and Board Member of Hmong Women Achieving Together | St. Catherine University & Hmong Women Achieving Together |
| 11. | Sushila Shah | Volunteer | SEWA - AIFW (Asian Indian Family Wellness) |
| 12. | Claudia Waring (Chair) | Executive Director | Asian Women United of Minnesota |
| 13. | Dr. Zha Blong Xiong | Associate Professor | College of Education and Human Development - University of Minnesota |
| 14. | Der Yang | Chair of Board | Transforming Generations |

2.a Statewide Random Sample Survey Documents: First Cover Letter

RAINBOWRESEARCH

621 WEST LAKE STREET, SUITE 300 | MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55408 | 612.824.0724 | WWW.RAINBOWRESEARCH.ORG





DATE

«fstname» «lastname» «stnum» «stname» «aptnum» «City», «State» «Zip»

Dear Mis. «lastname»:

We are asking for your help in a study of Asian women's health. You have been randomly chosen. The study is being led by the Minnesota Department of Health and Rainbow Research. We want to hear your voice!

If you need a translator to help you, please call Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

Yog koj xav tau daim ntawy no txais ua lus hmoob thoy hu rau tus xoy tooj Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

यदि आपको हिंदी में सर्वेक्षण अनुवाद की जरूरत है, इस नंबर पर कॉल करें । Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

vadi aap sarvekshan anuvaad kee jaroorat hai is nambar par kol karen. Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

ຖ້າຫາກວ່າຫ່ານ ຕ້ອງການ ການແປພາສາ ການສຳຫຼວດ ໃນ ລາວ ກະລຸນາ ໂຫຫາເບິ່ ນີ້ Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

thahakvathan tongkan kanaepphasa kansoaruad nai lav kaluna othhaboe ni Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

နမ့ၢ်လိဉ်ဘဉ်ကညီပုၤကိုးထံတာ်နဉ်ဝံသးစူၤဆဲးကျ၊ဘဉ်ဖဲလီတဲ စိအံၤနဉ်တက္ခါ

Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

Nêu quý vi cân tìm hiêu tài liêu này bằng tiếng Việt Nam, xin gọi Cơ Quan Xã Hội Việt Nam, Cộ Pham Ngọc Dung Đt: 651-641-7270 hoặc Ông Nguyễn Công Bình Đt: 651-644-1317

This survey asks adult Asian women in Minnesota to answer questions about health and culture. Many people do not like to talk about their health. But, it is important to understand the health issues of Asian women. With the information from this survey,

we will describe how many Asian women are facing these issues. MDH and others will use this information to provide services that meet the needs of Asian women in Minnesota.

Participation is completely voluntary. You do not have to answer this survey if you don't want to. Your answers will be kept private. No one will know your answers to the survey. Your name will not be linked to this survey when you return it to us in the mail.

Your answers will be very helpful for us to learn more about Asian women's health and culture. You can skip any question that you do not wish to answer. None of your responses in the survey will affect your participation in government programs now or in the future.

You can complete this survey in one of three ways:

- 1) By mail: Just complete the survey and return it in the pre-paid envelope.
- 2) By phone: Call 612-724-8823.
- 3) In person: If you need help, give us a call and we can tell you where you can get help in person.

If you have any questions *about this study*, we would be happy to talk with you. Please call Razeen a at 612-824-0724, ext.209.

If you do not want to participate, please return the blank survey in the enclosed pre-paid envelope. We will not contact you again after we receive it.

Thank you for helping with this study.

Sincerely,

Everia M. Jaito

Beki Saito Principal Investigator

You are not alone. Below are resources you can call if you or someone you know needs help. All of the numbers are available to call 24 hours a day.

- Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) Multilingual Crisis line: 612.724.8823.
- Minnesota Day One Crisis line: 1.866.223.1111.

2.b Statewide Random Sample Survey Documents: Survey





Asian Women's Health Survey

This survey is voluntary. You do not have to take the survey if you don't want to. Your answers to this survey will be kept private. If you are in any government program, your survey responses will not affect those government programs. If you are an immigrant, completing this survey will not affect your immigration status.

The survey will 20-30 minutes or more to complete. Some of the questions may make you very uncomfortable. The survey asks questions about general health, marriage, sex, culture and experiences with violence. You can skip any question that you don't want to answer. Please find a safe and quiet place to complete the survey by yourself. (If you need it, it is OK to have someone with you who you trust and who can help with translation or questions.)

Thank you for helping us understand the health issues of Asian women in Minnesota! We need to hear your voice.

| If you are single or never married, please skip questions asking about a spouse/partner, but do answer for yourself. | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| VAU | Spouse/Partner (SKIP IF SINGLE) |
| YOU | |
| How old are you? | |

| | | _ |
|----|--------------------------------|-------|
| 2. | lf you were <u>not</u> born in | |
| | the U.S., what year did | |
| | you arrive in the US? | |

Which of the following best describes you: (Check all з. that apply). If single, please answer just for yourself.

| | You | Spouse/Partner |
|---------------|------------|----------------|
| Asian Indian | □ 1 | <u>□</u> 1 |
| Bangladeshi | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Bhutanese | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Burmese/Karen | □ 1 | □ 1 |
| Cambodian | D 1 | D 1 |
| Chinese | □ 1 | □ 1 |
| Filipino | □ 1 | □ 1 |
| Hmong | D 1 | D 1 |
| Japanese | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Karen | □ 1 | □ 1 |
| Korean | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Laotian | □ 1 | □ 1 |
| Nepalese | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Pakistani | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Sri Lankan | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Thai | □ 1 | D 1 |
| Tibetan | D 1 | D 1 |
| Vietnamese | □ 1 | □ 1 |
| Other: | | |

If you were not born in the U.S., what was your status 4. when you arrived to the U.S.? (Check all that apply).

| un minigranz Lawrun | Fermanenii Residenii Green | Cai |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|
| Refugee/Asvice | 🗖 Adoptee | |

| In Fiancée Visa | 🗖 Dependent Visa |
|-----------------|------------------|

□1 Student Visa □1 Employment Visa

- □1 Exchange Visa (i.e., nanny or au pair)
- □1 Don't have any documents □1 I don't know Other Visa:

4a. If you arrived as a permanent resident or had a green card, who sponsored you? (Check all that apply). □1 Spouse □1 Fiancé/Fiancée D1 Parent

- □1 Other family 🗖 Siblina
- D1 Employer I You were the child of someone in the above groups
- D1 Other:
- It is common in some Asian cultures for women to be 5. married both legally and culturally, or only culturally. What is your current marital status? 2 Married, legally 1 Single, never married
 - S Married, culturally only □4 Married, legally & culturally □s Living with partner ∎₀Widowed □7 Separated legally □9 Sep. legally & culturally □₈ Separated, culturally Divorced, legally □ 11 Divorced, culturally □ 12 Div. legally & culturally
 - 5a. SKIP IF NEVER MARRIED: If you have ever been married (including a legal and/or a cultural marriage) how old were you when you first got married? _years

For questions, 5b to 5e Please check ("X") for yes or no. SKIP IF NEVER MARRIED

- Yes No 5b. Did you have a traditional arranged marriage? 5c. If yes, were you forced into the marriage? 5d. To the best of your knowledge, were any financial transactions (cash, gold, cars, land/property or other assets) involved in your marriage? 5e. Do you or your parents continue to receive periodic demands for cash and
- goods from your spouse or their family? 6. Do you have a driver's license? Do No D1 Yes
- 7. How many children live in your household (under the age of 18)? children
- Including yourself, how many adults (18 years old or 8. older) live in your household? _ adults

9. Who are those adults? (Check all that apply).

| ⊔i Spouse/Partner | □1 Your parents |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| I Friends | I Your grandparent(s) |
| I Spouse/Partner's parents | 1 Spouse/Partner's other |
| 1 Spouse/Partner's | wife/partner |
| grandparents | 1 Others: |

10. What is your highest level of schooling? Select one.

| | In US | Other Country |
|---|------------|---------------|
| Less than High School | D 1 | D 1 |
| High School Grad or GED | D 2 | 2 |
| Some college, no degree | 3 | D 3 |
| Associate's (2-year) degree | 4 | 4 |
| Bachelor's (4-year) degree | □ 5 | 5 |
| Master's, Professional, or Doctoral degree | D 6 | D 6 |
| None | D 7 | D 7 |

11. What is your spouse/partner's highest level of schooling? Select one. SKIP IF SINGLE.

| | In US | Other Country |
|-----------------------------|------------|---------------|
| Less than High School | D 1 | 1 |
| High School Grad or GED | D 2 | \square_2 |
| Some college, no degree | D 3 | 3 |
| Associate's (2-year) degree | 4 | 4 |
| Bachelor's (4-year) degree | ⊡s | 5 |
| Graduate degree | 6 | \Box_6 |
| None | D 7 | D 7 |

12. During the past week, were you working full-time (35 hours or more) or part-time?

- 1 Yes, working full-time (# hours: ____)
 2 Yes, working part-time (# hours: ____)
 3 No, I have a job but was not at work because of

temporary illness, vacation or strike 4 No, I do not have a job

12a. If you reported that you do not work, which one of the following best describes your current situation? 1 Unemployed and looking for work 2 Unemployed and not looking for work

- □ 3 Disabled and not looking for work
- 4 Retired
- 🗅s In school
- □6 Stay at home mother/wife
- □7 Spouse/partner does not allow me to work
- as Other:

You deserve to feel safe. If you need help, call. AWUM Crisis Line: 612.724.8823. Minnesota Day One: 1.866.223.1111.

MDH Minnesota Department of Health



13. During the past week, was your <u>spouse/partner</u> working full-time (35 hours or more) or part-time? SKIF IF SINGLE

□1 Yes, working full-time □2 Yes, working part-time □ 3 No, my spouse/partner has a job but was not at work

- because of temporary illness, vacation or strike □4 No, they do not have a job
- 13a. If you reported that your <u>spouse/partner</u> does not work, which one of the following best describes their current situation? SKIP IF SINGLE I Unemployed and looking 2 Unemployed and not for work Disabled and not looking
 - for work mother/wife □s In school 6 Retired D7 Other:
- 14. If you and your spouse/partner works either part/full time, would you say that your <u>spouse/partner</u> earns less than you, your earnings are about the same, or that your spouse/partner earns more than you? SKIP IF SINGLE □1 Spouse/partner earns less □2 Earn about the same
 - than me amount □3 Spouse/partner earns more 🗖 4 Don't know than me □s Not Applicable

- GENERAL HEALTH
- 15. Do you have health insurance? □1 Yes, Public (Medicare, Medicaid, MNsure, MNCare) 2 Yes, Private (through work, or purchased)
 3 Yes, Private but underinsured (e.g., worry about copays)
 - 🗖 o No
 - 4 Don't know

15a. If you have health insurance, do you have access to your insurance card? 🗅 No 👘 🗅 Yes

- 16. When did you last see any doctor including a gynecologist?
- □1 Within the past 12 months 2 More than 12 months ago
- 🛛 3 Don't know
- 17. Thinking about your physical health, which includes physical illness and injury, for how many days during the past 30 days was your physical health not good? days (answer from 0 - 30 days)
- 18. Thinking about your emotional health, which includes stress, feeling sad or worried a lot, and problems with emotions, for how many days during the past 30 days was your mental health not good? ______days (answer from 0 – 30 days)
- 19. During the past 30 days, on how many days did poor physical or emotional health keep you from doing your usual activities, such as work, or recreation? days (answer from 0 - 30 days)

20. How often do you or your spouse/partner drink alcohol? If you are single, please fill only for yourself.

| YOU | SPOUSE/PARTNER |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Never drink | 🛛 1 Never drink |
| □2 A few times a year or less | 2 A few times a year or less |
| Once every two months | I 3 Once every two months |
| 4 Once a month | 4 Once a month |
| □5 A couple of times a month | D5 A couple of times a month |
| D6 Once or twice a week | D6 Once or twice a week |
| IT Every day or almost every day | Transformed and the second |
| 🛯 8 Don't know | 🛯 8 Don't know |

Have any of the following behaviors or substances been a problem for <u>you or your spouse/partner? (Place</u> an "X" for all that apply). If you are single, please fill only for yourself.

| | You | Spouse/Partner |
|--------------------|-----|----------------|
| Gambling | | |
| Alcohol | | |
| Drugs | | |
| Controlling temper | | |
| Smoking | | |
| None of the above | | |

22. In the past 30 days, on how many days did alcohol or drug use keep <u>you or your spouse/partner</u> from doing usual activities, such as work, or recreation? If you are single, please fill only for yourself.

| | openser altre |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| days (answer from 0 – 30 days) | days (answer from 0 – 30 days) |
| | |

CULTURE AND LANGUAGE

23. What is <u>your</u> familiarity with English and with the language from your ethnic group? (Check all that

| <u>appiyi.</u> | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Not at all | Not too well | Pretty well | Very well |
| Understand English | 0 | D 1 | D 2 | •3 |
| Speak English | 0 | D 1 | D 2 | •3 |
| Read English | 0 | D 1 | D 2 | Q 3 |
| Write in English | 0 | D 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Understand origin language | 0 | D 1 | 2 | Q 3 |
| Speak origin language | | D 1 | D 2 | Q 3 |
| Read origin language | | D 1 | D 2 | Q 3 |
| Write origin language | 0 | D 1 | D 2 | 3 |

24. What is your spouse/partner's level of familiarity with English and with the language from their ethnic group? (Check all that apply). SKIP IF SINGLE

| | Not at all | Not too well | Pretty well | Very well | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|--|
| Understand English | 0 | D 1 | D 2 | Q 3 | |
| Speak English | • | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Read English | 0 | D 1 | 2 | Q 3 | |
| Write in English | | D 1 | D 2 | 3 | |
| Understand origin language | 0 | 01 | 2 | Q 3 | |
| Speak origin language | 0 | D 1 | D 2 | •3 | |
| Read origin language | 0 | D 1 | 2 | Q 3 | |
| Write origin language | | D 1 | 2 | •3 | |

25. What is your use of English compared to the language for your ethnic group? (Check all that apply)

| | Only Origin | Mostly Origin | Origin /English equally | Mostly English | Only English |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| With most of your friends | 0 | 01 | 2 | D 3 | 4 |
| With most of your neighbors | ••• | 01 | 2 | Q 3 | 4 |
| At family gatherings | 0 | D 1 | D 2 | □ 3 | 4 |

Important Note: The following questions on the next page ask about events that happened during your childhood before you were 18 years old. Some of these questions will not relate to you, while others may make you very uncomfortable, including questions around violence and sexual abuse. Please remember that you may skip questions that make you uncomfortable and that all of your responses are confidential.

You deserve to feel safe. If you need help, call. AWUM Crisis Line: 612.724.8823. Minnesota Day One: 1.866.223.1111.





Looking back before you were 18 years old ... 26. Did you live with anyone... (Check all that apply)

| | No | Yes | Not sure |
|---|----|------------|------------|
| Who was sad a lot, mentally ill, or suicidal? | • | D 1 | D 2 |
| Who was a problem drinker or alcoholic? | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |
| Who used illegal drugs or who abused prescription medications? | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |
| Who served time or was sentenced to serve time in a prison, jail, or other correctional facility? | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |

27. Before you were 18 years old, were your parents separated or divorced? No 🛛 1 Yes

🗖 o No 2 Not sure

28. Before you were 18 years old, how often did... (Check all that apply)

| | Never | Once | More than once |
|---|-------|------------|----------------------|
| Parents or adults in your home ever slap, hit, kick, punch or beat each other up? | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |
| A parent or adult in your home ever hit, beat, kick, of physically hurt you in anyway? Do not include spanking. | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |
| A parent or adult in your home ever swear at you, insult you, or put you down? | • | D 1 | D 2 |

29. Before you were 18 years old, how often did... (Check

| all that apply) | | | |
|--|-------|------------|----------------------|
| | Never | Once | More than once |
| Anyone at least5 years older than you, or an adult, ever touch you sexually? | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |
| Anyone at least5 years older than you, or an adult, try to make you touch them sexually? | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |
| Anyone at least5 years older than you, or adult, force you to have sex? | 0 | 01 | D 2 |

EVENTS AS AN ADULT (ages 18 and above) The following questions are about events that happened to you as an adult when you were age 18 or older.

30. Has anyone frightened, concerned, angered, or annoyed you in any of the following ways (not including bill collectors or sales people)? (Check all that apply)

| | Never | Yes, in past 12 months | Yes, 12+ months ago |
|--|-------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Made unwanted phone calls or left messages | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Sent you unwanted letters, emails, texts | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Secretly followed or watched you | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Waited for you at home, work, other places | 0 | D 1 | Q 2 |
| Showed up at places where you were | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Posted offensive comments about you on the internet | 0 | D 1 | Q 2 |
| Shared intimate/private photos or videos of you on the internet or by mobile phone | 0 | D 1 | 1 2 |

Have <u>any of the following people threatened to harm</u> <u>you</u> by hitting, physically attacking, or using a weapon against you? (<u>Check all that apply</u>)

| Never | Yes, in past 12 months | Yes, 12+ months ago | |
|-------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 0 | D 1 | Q 2 | |
| 0 | D 1 | Q 2 | |
| | 1 | D 2 | |
| 0 | 1 | D 2 | + |
| 0 | 1 | D 2 | |
| 0 | D 1 | D 2 | |
| 0 | 1 | Q 2 | |
| | 1 | Q 2 | |
| | | past 12 months 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 00 01 | past 12 months months ago 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 |

32. Have any of the following people taken your children, money or official papers away from you by using violence or threat of violence? <u>(Check all that apply)</u>

| | Never | Yes, in past 12 months | Yes, 12+ months ago |
|--|-------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Spouse/partner's parents or grandparents | | 01 | D ₂ |
| Your parents or grandparents | | | |
| Spouse//partners other wife, wives | | | \square_2 |
| Your children or your spouse/partner's children | | D 1 | D ₂ |
| Otherfamily | | | \square_2 |
| Friends | | | \square_2 |
| Stranger | | | \square_2 |
| Other | | | D ₂ |

33. Did anyone ever take and keep your identification, for example, your passport or driver's license and not allow you to have it back when you wanted it? 🗖 o No 🗖 1 Yes

34. Has your current or previous spouse/partner... (SKIP IF NOT HAD SPOUSE/PARTNER) (Check all that apply)

| | Never | Yes, in past 12 months | Yes, 12+ months ago |
|---|-------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Attempted to keep you from seeing your friends or family? | | □ 1 | 2 |
| Prevented you from leaving your home or seeking help? | 0 | □ 1 | 2 |
| Prevented you from making decisions about family finances or from shopping independently? | 0 | □ 1 | 2 |
| Threatened to hurt or take away your children? | 0 | □ 1 | 2 |
| Insulted, humiliated or embarrassed you? | 0 | D 1 | 2 |
| Slapped, kicked, or pushed you? | | D 1 | D 2 |
| Touched private body parts against your will? | | □ 1 | 2 |
| Had sexual intercourse against your will? | 0 | □ 1 | 2 |

35. Has ANYONE other than your current or previous spouse/partner... (Check all that apply.)

| | Never | Yes, in past 12 months | Yes, 12+ months ago |
|---|-------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Attempted to keep you from seeing your friends or family? | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Did not allow you to leave your home or prevented you from seeking help? | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Prevented you from making decisions about family finances or from shopping independently? | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Threatened to hurt or take away your children? | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Insulted, humiliated or embarrassed you? | 0 | □ 1 | Q 2 |
| Slapped, kicked, or pushed you? | 0 | D 1 | D 2 |
| Touched private body parts against your will? | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |
| Had sexual intercourse against your will? | 0 | □ 1 | D 2 |

Note: If you did <u>NOT</u> experience any type of violence listed in questions 30 and 31, please SKIP TO question 39.

36. Of the violence you experienced in question 34 or 35, think about the most recent incident. Did you talk to the police about the incident? $\Box O N \circ \Box 1$ Yes

36a. If you did not talk to the police about the incident,

| why not? <u>(Check all that apply).</u> | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Incident not that bad | Don't trust police | |
| Incident would get worse | Don't want partner arrested | |
| Against my culture | I Shame or embarrassment | |
| Worried about money or | Did not know where to go or | |
| housing or children | how to access support | |
| Dealt with it myself/involved a | 1 Thought it was my fault | |
| friend/family matter | Other reason: | |
| | | |

You deserve to feel safe. If you need help, call. AWUM Crisis Line: 612.724.8823. Minnesota Day One: 1.866.223.1111. 3

MDH Minnesota Department of Health Note: Many of the following questions may make you 37. If you shared about that incident with someone, who uncomfortable. You may skip any question. did you tell? (Check all that apply) 1 Mother/Sister 1 Friend 45. Have you ever exchanged sex or sexual activities to I Medical Practitioner 1 Mother-in-law obtain anything of value, such as money, a place to 1 Social worker/Counselor stay, food, drugs, gifts or favors? If yes, please □1 Community/Religious/Spiritual/Clan Leader complete the questions 45a – 45c. 1 Another family member of yours □1 A family member of the abuser 45a. Do you feel someone pressured, tricked, or forced you to do this? 🔷 No 🔤 Yes 1 Other: 37a. If no, what were the reasons that you did not seek 45b. Do you think someone else profited or made help from any of these people or organizations? (Check money from this? all that apply) 1 Incident not that bad □ 1 Don't trust police 45c.Were you under the age of 18 when this first 1 Incident would get worse 1 Don't want partner arrested occurred? □ 1 Against my culture 1 Thought it was my fault
 1 Did not know where to go or 1 Worried about money or 46. If you are currently married (culturally or legally) or how to access support housing or children living with your male partner, does your spouse/partner have another wife? SKIP IF SINGLE □ 1 Dealt with it myself/involved a □1 Shame or embarrassment friend/family matter . □ No □1 Yes □1 Other reason: 46a. If yes, has your husband forced another wife into Note: Below is a list of information, advice, or support that divorce? people sometimes need after experiencing an incident. 46b. Are you the "first wife"? 46c. How many other wives are there? 38. What types of information, advice or support would be 46d. Do you currently experience any of the following helpful following an incident? (Check all that apply) 1 How to keep safe/prevent incident from any other wife? (Check all that apply). □1 Hitting, slapping, punching □2 Put-downs, swearing, extreme criticism 1 Housing or shelter 1 Resources for children (e.g., new school, counseling) □ 3 Control over your access to money, paperwork □1 Someone to talk to/moral support 4 Control over where you go, who you see, talk to □1 Help in reporting to the police I Medical help/Help with health insurance 47. Which of the following terms best describes your □1 Financial support sexual identity? □1 Legal resources (e.g., order for protection, divorce) 1 Heterosexual/Straight 1 Other: 🗅 3 Bisexual □s I am not sure what this question means Note: The next questions ask about the services and □6 Something else: resources available in your community for people affected by violence. 48. Are you a trans woman? 39. Do you know where to find support or services for What is your current immigration status? If you are single, only answer for yourself. women who are experiencing violence? 1 Yes Do No 40. How would you rate your level of knowledge of U.S. Citizen programs (shelters, counseling, legal or police Dual Citizen assistance) for Asian women needing assistance? Permanent Resident/Green card □1 I want to learn a lot more Temporary Visa (e.g. student Dependent, employment, etc.) 2 I want to learn a little more □3 I do not wish to know more Other Visa Don't have any documents I don't know 41. If you wanted to learn more about community resources (e.g., shelters, counseling, legal or police assistance) for women like you needing resources to prevent violence, where you would seek out this 50. Which of the following categories best represents your information? (Check all that apply). combined family income? (Please include all sources □1 Internet income, including money from jobs, social security, public assistance, and any other money income received for 2 Friends □3 Community/Clan/Religious/Spiritual Leaders everyone who lives with you). 4 Healthcare Provider □1 Less than \$10.000 □s Other: □3 \$15.000 - 24,999 □s \$35,000 - 49,999 🗖7 \$75,000 - 99,999 CULTURAL NORMS 🗅 9 \$150,000 or more 42. In your opinion, should a woman ever be beaten? Thank you for your time with this important survey! If you 🗖 1 Yes □2 Mavbe Do No have anything you would like us to know, please use this 43. Among the men you know in your ethnic group, how space or additional paper. many do you think sometimes hit their wives? 2 About half of them 1 All or most of them 4 None of them □3 A few of them 44. If a man hits his wife, do you think most of the men in your ethnic group would...? Disapprove of his action □ 3 Not have an opinion / Think it was none of their business Thank you for your help! Please return the 🗖 4 Don't know questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. You deserve to feel safe. If you need help, call. AWUM Crisis Line: 612.724.8823. Minnesota Day One: 1.866.223.1111.

🗖 o No

Ōo No

2 Lesbian

🗖 4 I am not sure

D1

D'

D1

D1

D2 \$10,000 - 14,999

4 \$25,000 - 34,999

□6 \$50,000 - 74,999

10 I don't know

□8 \$100,000 - 149,999

🗖 🛛 No

□1 Yes

D1 Yes

🗖n Nn

D1 Yes

1 Yes

🗖 1 Yes

Spouse Partner

□1 □1

D1

 $\Box 1$

D1

D1

<u>_</u>1

2.c Statewide Random Sample Survey Documents: Postcard

<<Date>>

Last week, an important survey on women's health was mailed to you. Your name was chosen randomly.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire to us we want to thank you! If not, please do so today. We are especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking women like you to share your experiences that we can understand how many women have these types of health issues and concerns.

If you did not receive a survey, or if it was lost, please call us at 612-824-0724 x207 or send an email to <u>RShrestha@rainbowresearch.org</u> and we will get another one in the mail today.

MDH Minnesota Department of Health

Beki Saito Rainbow Research



3.a Convenience Sample Survey Documents: Participant Recruitment Script

MDH Minnesota Department of Health



Cover Page for Survey Participants

The Minnesota Department of Health wants to better understand the health issues that Asian women are facing. This survey asks adult Asian women in Minnesota to answer questions about health and culture. With the information from this survey, we will describe how many Asian women are facing these issues. We will also learn what is needed to better support Asian women. Your answers will be very helpful for us to learn more about Asian women's health.

<u>Participation is completely voluntary</u>. You do not have to answer this survey if you don't want to. Your answers will be kept private. No one will know your answers to the survey.

You can skip any question that you do not wish to answer. None of your responses in the survey will affect your participation in government programs now or in the future. If you are an immigrant, completing this survey will not affect your immigration status.

In addition to general health questions, this survey has questions about marriage, sex and experiences with violence. Remember, you can skip any question that you don't want to answer. Some of the questions may make you very uncomfortable, for this reason, some people might prefer to do this survey in a safe and private place.

The survey will take 20-30 minutes or more to complete. You are free to not participate and it will not affect in any way the services you receive.

- If you are 18 years of age or older, living in Minnesota, and you identify as a woman of Asian ethnicity you are eligible to take the survey.
- If you have previously completed the 2016 Asian Women's Health Survey please do not re-take the survey.

If you would like to complete the survey, you can either:

1) By mail: Just complete the survey and mail it to Rainbow Research, 621 West Lake Street, Suite 300, Minneapolis, MN 55408. Do not put your return address on the envelope.

2) Or: if you'd prefer help or translation in completing the survey, we can have someone help you.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. The study coordinator, Razeena, can be reached at 612.824.0724 ext. 209.





If you need a translator to help you, please call Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

Yog koj xav tau daimintawy no txais ua lus hmoob thoy hu rau tus xov tooj Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

यदि आपको हिंदी में सर्वेक्षण अनुवाद की जरूरत है, इस नंबर पर कॉल करें । Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

yadi aap sarvekshan anuvaad kee jaroorat hai is nambar par kol karen. Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

<u>ກ້າຫາກວ່າທ່ານ, ຕ້ອງການ ການແປພາສາ ການສຳຫວດ ໃນ ລາວ ກະລຸນາ ໂທຫາເບີ ນີ້, Asian</u> Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

thahakvathan tongkan kanaepphasa kansoaruad nai lav kaluna othhaboe ni Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

နမ့်၊လိဉ်ဘဉ်ကညီပှၤကိုးထံတာ်နှဉ်ဝံသးစူၤဆဲးကျာဘဉ်ဖဲလိတဲ စိအံၤနှဉ်တက္၊

Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

Nều quý vị cần tìm hiểu tài liêu này bằng tiếng Việt Nam, xin gọi Cợ Quan Xã Hội Việt Nam, Cô Phạm Ngọc Dung Đt: 651-641-7270 hoặc Ông Nguyễn Công Bình Đt: 651-644-1317

3.b Convenience Sample Survey Documents: Safety Referral Sheet for Participants

You deserve to feel safe & you are not alone. Below are resources you can call if you or someone you know needs help.

All of the following numbers are available to call 24 hours a day.

Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) Multilingual Crisis line: 612.724.8823.

Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) is a safe place for all women and their children dealing with domestic violence, including physical, emotional, or sexual abuse. Offering:

- A domestic violence shelter
- Support and care for victims of domestic violence
- Legal and financial advocacy
- Employment assistance

Minnesota Day One Crisis line: 1.866.223.1111.

Whether you're experiencing domestic violence, sexual assault or sexual violence, human trafficking or simply questioning aspects of your relationship, advocates are available 24/7 to listen and give information and resources including emergency shelter and temporary housing.





4. Focus Group Interview Protocol

Introduction for Focus group:

Thank you all for coming this afternoon and thank you for taking the time to join us in this important conversation.

My name is <u>(name)</u> and I'm from Rainbow Research. We are working in partnership with Minnesota Department of Health and <u>(host agency name)</u>. The Minnesota Department of Health is trying to better understand how violence is uniquely experienced in Asian communities in Minnesota, identify opportunities to prevent future violence and find ways to better support women and children who have experienced violence. The state has very little information about Asian Minnesotan's opinions on this issue. Generally, we know that Asians are less likely than white individuals to report having experienced violence. That means it is incredibly important that you are here and are able to give your input. This is a unique opportunity we have to tell the state about our experiences, highlight Asian voices, and bring about necessary change in better supporting Asian communities around this sensitive issue. We will be talking with several different ethnic groups of Asian Minnesotans about violence. The information you share will be combined with the information from other groups and will be included in a report that will be shared publically with the state legislature and across MN. Nothing that can identify you as a participant will be shared; your names will not be included in any reports or other documentation.

In this conversation, we will be asking you questions like, what types of violence are you seeing in your community, what are cultural beliefs or practices that might influence how violence occurs, and what keeps people from reporting when they've experienced violence. By violence we mean a broad range of experiences including but not limited to being hurt, harassed, or beaten up; being threatened, or having someone else control you, your children or your finances. It may also include sexual assault or being forced to have sex when you don't want to. These things can be done by strangers, family members, friends, or romantic partners. We will <u>not be specifically asking if you have ever experienced violence</u>; however, if you decide you want to share a personal story, you will be welcome to. However, if you tell us a story that indicates a child (including your own child) is being abused or has been abused in the last 3 years, we will need to work with you to call child protection. Similarly, if you tell us that you are actively in danger of hurting yourself or others, or are currently unsafe, we will need to follow up with you about that information after the conversation. <u>If you think it's important to share a story, but don't want to share it about yourself</u>, we encourage you to tell that story as if you are talking about a friend.

Apart from a disclosure of current or recent child abuse, everything you say in this room is confidential. As we mentioned earlier, we will not identify the individuals who have participated in the process or include names in any reports or documentation. Likewise, we encourage you all to keep this attitude of respect for each other when you leave here and please don't share with anyone outside of this room what someone says.

We want to hear everyone's opinions: there are no right or wrong answers. The point of this conversation isn't to all agree, it's to get everyone's perspective, so even if you disagree with someone else that speaks, please still share your opinion.

So that we can remember what everyone says later, this conversation with be recorded.

You are free to leave at any point; participating or not participating in this conversation has no effect on your ability to receive services from (host agency) or any government services or immigrant. Likewise, you are free to not answer any questions you wish. If you experience stress from this conversation, staff will be available afterwards to talk with you.

This session will last 1.5 hours; at the end you will receive a \$20 Target gift card as a way of saying thank you for your time. We won't be taking a break, but if you need to get up feel free to exit quietly and rejoin us when you're ready. Thanks again for joining us; we so appreciate your willingness to talk with us and help other women in Minnesota.

What questions do you have?

Would anyone like to leave now and not participate?

[Share consent form and read it aloud in English and, as necessary, in participant's language. Ask if they understand the consent form, and if they have any questions. Have individuals sign consent form and return it to you.]

[Begin Questioning Route; Begin recording]

Focus Group Questioning Route

Introduction: Cultural Rootedness: Belief systems, roles and cultural values

[First question set will be asked as a circle process.] Key Ideas in red are notes to the facilitator, not to be read out loud.

1. We are interested in understanding you and your family background and we'd like to hear a little about you.

Key Ideas:

- Tell me about yourself: what do you do? How long have you lived in Minnesota?
- Tell me about your family.
- What are some traditional roles or expectations for women in your culture? How do you experience these expectations?
- a. Round 1 :
 - i. What is your name?
 - ii. What is your ethnicity?
 - iii. What do you do? Are you studying/working inside/outside the home?
 - iv. How long have you lived in Minnesota?
- b. Round 2:
 - i. Who all are in your family?
 - ii. What roles do you play in your family or community?
 - iii. (Probe: Once they mention children/elderly/disabled members in the familywho takes care of them primarily?)
- c. Round 3:
 - i. What are some traditional roles, stereotypes, or expectations placed on women in your culture?
 - ii. Have these expectations for women changed or are they still current? How do you experience these expectations?

Violence: Nature and Scope

We are going to begin with a few questions about the types of violence that you think is most pressing in your cultural group.

We are understanding the word violence to include a range of experiences including abusive international marriages, violence within the family (child and/or partner abuse), physical and sexual assault, stalking or forced sex. These actions can be done by a romantic partner, family member, friend or a stranger.

Key Idea: What types of violence are most common in your community, what are some examples?

Listening to these examples of the definition of violence,

2. In your opinion, what types of violence are most common in your community? What makes you think this?

- 3. If you think of your daughters, your mothers, your sisters, or other important women in your lives, which issue(s) related to violence are you most concerned about and why?
 - a. Which of these different issues require utmost attention? Why?
- 4. What are the most common stories or experiences of violence in your specific cultural/ethnic community? Can you give an example?

Key Idea: What are some of the causes of violence in your community?

- 5. In your opinion, what are some of the underlying causes of violence within Asian American/ your specific ethnic community/ies?
 - a. Probes: Substance use such as alcohol or drug use?
 - b. Gender roles or power dynamics in the home, family, or clan group?
 - c. Income inequality? Shame?
 - d. Other cultural norms that enable violence to continue?

Barriers to Disclosure & Services

Key Idea: Why do women in your community not disclose they are experiencing violence to police or seek services? If they do, who do they ask for help and why?

- 6. Our next few questions are about why people do or do not tell others when they have experienced violence and about the availability of services to support people who have experienced violence. Violence is a deeply personal matter for many who've had to endure it. Some have said that violence is particularly a silenced/ taboo issue in Asian American communities. Would you agree/disagree? Why do you think that is?
- 7. If people do tell others they have experienced violence, who would they tell? [Listen for police, elders, friends, service providers, religious/spiritual/community leaders, who?]
 - a. Why would they tell THAT person (and not others)?
 - b. If you told someone you have experienced violence, how would they respond?
 - c. What are the factors that play into the decision to report/tell others or not?
 - d. How do people know who they should tell if they've experienced violence?

Key Idea: What additional services or supports would you like to see for women & children who are experiencing violence; including those who decide to stay in their marriages?

- 8. Thinking about other women who have experienced violence or your own experience, what would have helped in that situation? What support would be helpful?
- 9. What services and supports for Asian women and children who have experienced violence are missing? Are there certain types of women or children who are missed/underserved?
 - a. What is the best way for women experiencing violence to learn about available services? (Probe through these options: radio, TV, newspaper, social media, doctor's office, elsewhere?)
- 10. What prevents people in your ethnic/cultural group from seeking services?

Recommendations

Key Idea: What can be done to prevent violence in your community or support women to reach out for help?

- 11. What could be done to prevent violence against Asian women?
 - a. What specifically in your ethnic community needs to change to help prevent violence?
- 12. What could be done to encourage people to reach out for help earlier?
 - a. What needs to happen for women to be able to reach out earlier?

Closing

Key Idea: Anything else? What do you want to make sure people know about the issue of violence in your community?

13. In summary, what is your most important recommendation for MN law makers around preventing violence towards MN Asian women and children or supporting women who have experienced violence?

5. Key Informant Interview Protocol

Who are Key Informants?

Service providers, community leaders, law enforcement and other individuals with knowledge of the experience of violence within the Asian MN community.

Purpose

- To understand the nature and scope of violence
- To recognize the cultural perspective and considerations for understanding violence in Asian communities
- To identify needs in cultural specific service provision
- To identify gaps in services and service delivery (need assessment)
- To identify barriers to accessing services, resources, information, and support
- Surface recommendations

Introduction Organizational Background/ Services Scan

- 1. Can you start off by telling us a little about yourself and the work of your organization?
 - a. Does your organization explicitly serve Asian communities in Minnesota?
 - i. What are the basic demographics of the populations you generally serve? (ie. specific ethnicities, ages, immigration status etc.)
 - ii. Who are your largest service recipients? Tell us a little about their background in general.
 - iii. What kinds of services do you provide?
 - iv. Are you aware of Asian populations you are not serving well?
 - b. Does your organization explicitly serve individuals who have experienced violence? If so, how/in what way? Tell us a little about their background.
 - i. Does your organization have any efforts towards violence of prevention? If so, what are they? Do you know of any other agencies doing violence prevention work specifically for Asian audiences?
 - ii. What do you consider your biggest strengths in serving or responding to survivors of violence?
 - iii. Are there shortcomings in service delivery or response that you have encountered? If so, what/how?

Violence: Stories of Prevalence and Scope

- 2. We are looking to understand the nature and impact of violence among Asian women and children. What types of violence are you seeing most commonly among Asians in your work?
 - a. We know from experience and the existing literature that violence occurs commonly and exists in all communities, ethnicities, and races. How do you think violence as experienced in Asian communities is similar or different to other ethnic/racial groups?
 - b. We also expect to see differences in the experience of violence within Asian communities: Can you think of similarities or differences in the experience of violence across specific Asian groups? Ie. Hmong, Karen, versus Chinese, Indian etc. ? Can you think of examples? What trends are you noticing?
 - c. What are the main ways violence impacts Asian Minnesotan communities as you see it?

Violence can include a range of experiences including abusive international marriages, violence within the family (child or partner abuse), violence within the community (witnessing violence, bullying or fights at school, assault/threats from strangers, school/work/community), intimate partner violence/abuse as well as suicide/self-harm, sexual exploitation (selling sex etc.), etc.

Listening to these examples,

- 3. Based on your experience and observations, which ones among these examples of violence are more common in your community/ the community in which you work? Why do you think that is the case?
 - a. Have you observed any patterns/trends?
 - b. Which of these different issues require utmost attention? Why? [Please share examples/stories from your experience working with survivors and/or families.]
 - c. Are there other issues related to violence that are more important to you but we may have missed? What are they?
- 4. In your opinion, what are some of the underlying causes of the experience of violence within Asian American communities?
 - a. We have also learned that violence is particularly a silenced/ taboo issue in Asian American communities. Would you agree/disagree? Why do you think that is?

The next set of questions are about seeking services and access to services.

Barriers to Services

- 5. Where do people turn for help if they experience violence in Asian American communities, their homes, or elsewhere?
- 6. What do you think are the main barriers to Asian Americans seeking support or disclosing their experience of violence (to police, service providers, spiritual leaders, and/or friends)?
- 7. What would make services/police/systems etc., more welcoming, comfortable, and accessible for Asian American women and children?
 - a. What additional services/supports are needed? Do the methods of service delivery need to be improved? How?
- 8. What changes in legislation, policy or staffing would help the community better serve Asian Minnesotans who have experienced violence?

Closing

9. Thank you for your time and insight. Is there anything else you'd like to share with me on this topic?

6. Participant Consent Form

CONSENT FORM: Focus Group on Violence Against Asian Women & Children in Minnesota



You are invited to be in a research study that focuses on Asian women's experiences, beliefs and opinions on violence. Please read this form and feel free to ask any questions you may have about the project.

This study is being conducted by Rainbow Research under the direction of Minnesota Department of Health (MDH).

The purpose of this study is to better understand the kinds of violence experienced by Asian women and children in Minnesota. We want to learn about things that make it hard for women who have experienced violence to get the help they need. We also want to learn how to prevent violence. We will share the results of the study with MDH and Asian community organizations. We will also make recommendations to the Minnesota State Legislature. Additionally, at the end of the project, we will host a community event to discuss the issue of violence within Asian communities and share the study results directly with the community.

This focus group will last around two hours. It will be a conversation with only other women. It will be audiotaped so that the researchers can write down what is said after the focus group. However, it will not be possible to identify you from the written notes because your name will not be used. No questions will be asked about your personal experience with violence.

Potential Risks and Benefits

There are two risks of participating in this study. First, there is a risk that some one in the group might share your story or comments with people outside the group. We will ask everyone in the group not to do this, but we cannot guarantee this. Please keep this in mind when considering what comments to share. Second, during the discussion you may recall difficult experiences that you have had. There is the risk that you might have an emotional response, such as sadness or panic, during or after our conversation.

There are no direct benefits to you for participating.

Compensation for your time in the study

We will give you a \$20 Target Gift Card for participating in the focus group. If you experience emotional distress during the focus group and feel that you need to leave before the end, you will still receive your compensation.

Privacy

The opinions expressed in the focus group will be kept private. In reports published, we will not include any information that could be used to identify a participant. Your name will never be used in reports. Only the research team will have the original recordings. Recordings will be destroyed after analysis. Please note that we may not be able to keep all the things said in the group private. We may have to release the following information as required by law: 1) information about a child being maltreated or neglected, 2) information about an individual's

Focus Group Consent



plan to seriously harm him/herself, 3) information about an individual's plan to seriously harm another person. If you share such information, research staff are required to report it to the authorities or take action.

This Study Is Voluntary

You do not have to be in this focus group if you do not want to. You do not have to answer any particular questions if you don't want to. You can stop being in the focus group at any time. Your decision whether or not to be in the focus group will not affect current or future relations with any of the participating organizations or any government services.

Beki Saito is the leader of this study. If you have any questions you may contact her at the number below.

Beki Saito: 612-824-0724 ext. 207 <u>bsaito@rainbowresearch.org</u>

Yog koj xav tau daim ntavv no txais ua lus hmoob thov hu rau tus xov tooj Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

यरि आपकोहिंरी में सर्वेक्षण अनुवार की जरूरत है, इस नंबरपर कॉल करें। Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

yadi aap sarvekshan anuvaad kee jaroorat hai is nambar par kol karen Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

ຖ້າຫາກວ່າທ່ານ ຕ້ອງການ ການແປພາສາ ການສຳຫຼວດ ໃນ ລາວ ກະລຸນາ ໂທຫາເບີ ນີ້ Asian Women. United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

thahakvathan tongkan kanaepphasa kansoaruad nai lav kaluna othhaboe ni Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

နမ့ၢ်လိဉ်ဘဉ်ကညီပုၤကိုးထံတၢ်နှဉ်ဝံသးစူၤဆဲးကျ၊ဘဉ်ဖဲလိတဲ စိအံၤနှဉ်တက္ခ၊

Asian Women United of Minnesota (AWUM) at 612-724-8823.

ếu quý vị cấn tìm hiểu tài liệu này bằng tiếng Việt Nam, xin gọi Cơ Quan Xã Hội Việt Nam, Cô Phạm Ngọc Dung Đt: 651-641-7270 hoặc Ông Nguyễn Công Bình Đt: 651-644-1317

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, contact Pete Rode of the MDH Institutional Review Board at 651-201-5942 or <u>peter rode @state.mn.us</u>.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Focus Group Consent

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature

(Firstname only is required)

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date



RAINBOW RESEARCH beloing organizations effectively reach their goals 621 West Lake Street, Suite 300 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55408 612,824,0724 rainbowresearch.org

Focus Group Consent

7. General Flyer

Your participation matters MN ASIAN WOMEN'S HEALTH STUDY



WATCH YOUR MAIL FOR AN INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS IMPORTANT STUDY THAT WILL HELP IMPROVE SERVICES AND SUPPORTS FOR ASIAN WOMEN'S HEALTH

The Minnesota Department of Health is conducting a study for the MN State Legislature on the health needs of Asian women in Minnesota. We need your voice! PLEASECOMPLETE THE SURVEY IF YOU ARE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY. We want to hear your voice!



FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: RAZEENA SHRESTHA, AT 612-824-0724 X 209 RSHRESTHA@RAINBOWRESEARCH.ORG

8. Fact Sheet

RAINBOWRESEARCH

621 WEST LAKE STREET, SUITE 300 MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55408 612.824.0724 WWW.RAINBOWRESEARCH.ORG





Study of Violence against Asian Women and Children in Minnesota FACT SHEET

The "Working Group on violence against Asian women and children" is a Legislatively mandated group that aims to assess the prevalence of violence among Asian women in Minnesota as well as to determine the current processes and services available, with an eye on identifying gaps.

The Working Group is led by Minne sota Department of He alth, Center for He alth Equity in partnership with Council on Asian Pacific Minne sotans (CAPM), Minne sota Department of Human Services (DHS), and Minne sota Department of Public Safety (DPS). For more information about the working group, the legislation and other information about the study go to http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/che/violence/index.html

Working Group on Violence Against Asian Women and Children

Authority:2015Minn Laws Chap. 71 Art.8Sec.58

Function: To study the nature, scope, and prevalence of violence against Asian women and childrenin Minnesota, including domestic violence, trafficking, international abusive maniage, stalking, sexual assault, and other violence.

Rainbow Research, Inc., a research and evaluation nonprofit in Minne apolis was awarded the contract to lead this legislative study. The study includes collecting both quantitative and qualitative data:

- A survey of Asian women in Minnesota,
- Interviews with key experts in the field, and
- Focus groups with women who have a deep insight on the issues, the socio-cultural context of Asian ethnic groups in Minnesota, and particularly the barriers Asian women face in accessing services.

Data collection will occur during October 2016 with preliminary results shared at the November 30th meeting of the Working Group which is open to the public. A final report will be completed by the end of December 2016.

For more information about the study contact Raze ena Shrestha, project manager, at Rainbow Research, 612-824-0724 × 209 or <u>rsrestha@rainbowre search.org</u>.

9. Interpreter Training Material

| Community Partner Training: Violence Against Asian Women & Children | 9.27.16 |
|---|--|
| Detailed Agenda: | |
| Introductions, Purpose & Overview Welcome/Project Overview Beki Icebreaker Pang INTRODUCE Sipra Jha, Shelter Director for AWUM | 6-6:15pm |
| Trauma & Domestic Violence in MN Asian Communities Sipra | 6:15-7pm |
| Review of Survey Katie starts (with Razeena) Quick bubble interlude Expectation of community partners- assisting in 1-1 or small group survereruitment in some cases, word to word translation or assistance as not moment emotional support or referral as needed. | eeded. Also providing in the e listening, we want to know lly—the hope is that literal |
| Consent, Data Collection Process & Participant Safety Katie Consent (review invitation script, in some cases actually inviting won't the COERCIVE! -your job is to invite people to take the survey and inform the They can stop at any point, they can refuse a question. They can decide question translation or just help as needed. No harm to gov. services Confidential/anonymous Doesn't hurt their participation in programs or services Your job is to hold this information as confidential- no one need what was said. Data Collection Process Pre-survey questions | hem, NOT convince them to do it. e if they want question by |
| After survey questions After survey, put in envelope, close with seal, sign name (examp Ongoing connection with Rainbow- call before & after data coll Participant safety Key issues: harm to self or others, medical emergency, mandato | lection |
| Interpreter in Research: Ethics & Standards of Practice, Common ErrorsScott | t 8-8:45pm |
| Open Discussion & Closing Scott & Beki Discussion of Challenges that might be encountered in the field, how th distribute surveys | 8:45-9pm is will work in practice, how to |

o Closing Reflection (take aways or hopes)----- Pang

A brief presentation of the role of interpreter

- The interpreter must be well prepared. The purpose of the interview, any forms that difficult to interpret should be obtained in advance. It is helpful to always have a note pad and pen ready.
- The interpreter should always introduce her/himself briefly and familiarize both will be discussed, and any terms that may be unfamiliar or parties with the interpreter's role.
- ✓ The interpreter needs to make a quick but well-informed decision about seating arrangements and the predominant mode to be used.
- The interpreter's role is to communicate messages across languages and cultures accurately, not to edit, summarize, or embellish. The interpreter is responsible for an appropriate interpretation, not for the decisions that clients and providers make.
- The interpreter does not give his/her own opinion, counsel, advise, or make decisions for the client.
- The interpreter must be well aware of the cultural dimensions of each interpreted interview.
- The interpreter manages the flow of communication. The interpreter will ask for clarification and pauses as needed in order to fully understand, process, and convey the message.
- ✓ Each interpreter needs to be very aware of his/her own skills, biases, and limitations, and not let these factors interfere with the interpreted encounter.
- Through eye contact, positioning, and use of the first person, the interpreter encourages the two parties to communicate with each other as directly as possible.
- ✓ The interpreter accepts assignments appropriate for his/her own skill level and knows what to do when a situation becomes too difficult for his/her skill level.
- ✓ The interpreter is responsible for providing an accurate and complete interpretation. The interpreter is not responsible for solving the problems of the client or the provider.

©2006 PROGRAM IN TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA CATEGORIES OF INTERPRETER ERROR. In each example, the "interpreted version" is incorrect. Explain why!

| | ADDITION Original: | Did you feel like you weren't allowed to disagree with your husband? |
|---------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | Interpreted Version: | Did you feel like you weren't able to disagree with your husband, you know go against his wishes? |
| | OMISSION | |
| | Original: | Have you or other women in your family been told they were inferior to men? |
| | Interpreted Version: | Have women in your family been told they were inferior? |
| | | • |
| | LEXICAL ERROR Original: | Do you feel that a shelter for women and children is someplace you could turn to if you need help? |
| | Interpreted Version: | Do you feel that a home for women and children is someplace you could turn to if you need help? |
| GRAMMATICAL ERROR | | |
| | Original: | If you were in fear for your safety, would you be able to turn to family members or friends? |
| | Interpreted Version: | Can you turn to family members when you are unsafe? |
| | DISTORTION | |
| | DISTORTION Original: | Children often repress feelings of embarrassment or shame if violence occurs in their home. |
| | Interpreted Version: | A lot of times, children don't show embarrassment or shyness, even if they feel it, if violence occurs in their home. |
| LITERAL TRANSLATION | | |
| | Original: | There are more items to fill out on the back side. |
| | Interpreted Version: | There are more questions to fill out on the buttocks. |
| REGISTER Original: | If a girl has sex with a boy, she'll be called a slut. |
|-----------------------|--|
| Interpreted Version: | If a girl goes all the way, she'll be called a bad girl. |
| FILLERS | |
| Original: | When he called meuhoh, well he called methatwellthat name, I started to cry. |
| Interpreted Version: | When he called me that name, I started to cry. |
| PROTOCOL | |
| Original: | I know some of these topics are hard to talk about, but if we can get a sense of issues in the community, we can identify good resources to help. |
| Interpreted Version: | Ok, she says sometimes this is hard to talk about, so tell her what you can, and don't worry, they want to help. But don't talk about female excision because they don't understand that here. |



Code of Ethics for Interpreters in Health Care

- The interpreter treats as confidential, within the treating team, all information learned in the performance of their professional duties, while observing relevant requirements regarding disclosure.
- The interpreter strives to render the message accurately, conveying the content and spirit of the original message, taking into consideration its cultural context.
- The interpreter strives to maintain impartiality and refrains from counseling, advising or projecting personal biases or beliefs.
- The interpreter maintains the boundaries of the professional role, refraining from personal involvement.
- The interpreter continuously strives to develop awareness of his/her own and other (including biomedical) cultures encountered in the performance of their professional duties.
- The interpreter treats all parties with respect.
- □ When the patient's health, well-being, or dignity is at risk, the interpreter may be justified in acting as an advocate. Advocacy is understood as an action taken on behalf of an individual that goes beyond facilitating communication, with the intention of supporting good health outcomes. Advocacy must only be undertaken after careful and thoughtful analysis of the situation and if other less intrusive actions have not resolved the problem.
- The interpreter strives to continually further his/her knowledge and skills.
- The interpreter must at all times act in a professional and ethical manner.

A National Code of Ethics for Interpreters in Health Care . July 2004 . Page 3 of 23

ROLE PLAY FOR PRACTICE INTERPRETING

For a group of three: one person will read the provider's role, one person will repeat each statement as if he or she were interpreting, and the third person will read the role of the client. At a certain point the provider and client will stop talking THROUGH the interpreter and will start talking TO the interpreter. What should the interpreter do?

Provider: Mrs. Shah, welcome. We're very glad you're here.

Client: Thank you.

Provider: Maryam Abad is here to interpret for us. Please let her know if you don't understand anything, if you need anything repeated, or if you have any trouble with the questions.

Client: OK.

Provider: First, I wonder if you can tell me a little about yourself?

Client: Yes. My name is Jamila Shah. I was born in Pakistan and I moved here about five years ago to join my husband. He was already living in America and he sent for me. We had been married for only a year when he left, and I was pregnant.

Provider: Right, I see all that in the questionnaire you filled out. I was wondering if you could tell me anything more about yourself professionally. And also, what kind of hobbies you have.

Client: Well, I helped my parents in our shop back in Islamabad. I only went to school for about five years, so I didn't have any other job. What do you mean by hobbies?

Provider: By hobbies I mean anything you like to do in your spare time to relax or have fun.

Client: Well, I have three children now, and my husband is always gone, so I don't have a lot of time to take a break. I do like to talk to my sister on skype though.

Provider: And she's in Pakistan, right?

Client: Yes. She lives with her husband's sisters.

Provider (speaking to the interpreter): Is that because her parents died? Do you think she means they have a polygamous marriage? What does it mean when she says her sister lives with her husband's sisters?

Client: (speaking to the interpreter): What did she say? Please don't tell her, but my brother-in-law is in prison back home.

10. MAWHS survey data tables

Data Tables Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey

Unless otherwise noted, all of the tables below present information from the Minnesota Asian Women's Health Survey (MAWHS).

Contents

| _Toc470339804 | |
|--|------|
| Table 1. Characteristics of women who completed the MAWHS, 2016; N=425 | 74 |
| Table 2. Characteristics of employment for women in the MAWHS by working status, | |
| comparison to partners' wage, and status of unemployment. | 75 |
| Table 3. General health of women respondent and partner. | 76 |
| Table 4. Acculturation of women respondent and partner. | 77 |
| Table 5. Selected Adverse Childhood Events experienced by Asian females before age 18 | |
| from three data sources: Minnesota Student Survey, College Health Study, and the | |
| Minnesota Asian Women's Health Study. | 78 |
| Table 6. Experience with stalking behaviors among Asian women. | 79 |
| Table 7. Experience of being threatened by harm, taking something of value, or actual cont | trol |
| of documents of value. | |
| Table 8. Type and frequency of Intimate Partner Violence. | 82 |
| Table 9. Type and frequency of abuse from someone besides an intimate partner. | 83 |
| Table 10. Reporting practices for women who have experienced violence. | 84 |
| Table 11. Information & Services that would be helpful. | 85 |
| Table 12. Knowledge of resources available. | 85 |
| Table 13. Attitudes and Beliefs about Cultural norms. | 86 |
| Table 14. Sexual Exploitation, Multiple Wives and Forced Divorce. | 87 |

| | Number of | Percentage |
|---|---------------------|------------|
| | Respondents | |
| Immigrated to the U.S. | 312 | 73 |
| | | |
| Asian Subgroup | | |
| Asian Indian | 92 | 21.7 |
| Hmong | 86 | 20.2 |
| Vietnamese | 75 | 17.7 |
| Chinese | 40 | 9.4 |
| Japanese | 39 | 9.2 |
| Nepalese | 16 | 3.8 |
| Karen | 12 | 2.8 |
| | | |
| Status upon arrival to the U.S. | | |
| Immigrant | 149 | 35.1 |
| Refugee | 79 | 18.6 |
| Fiancée visa | 8 | 1.9 |
| Student visa | 34 | 8.0 |
| No paperwork | 1 | 0.2 |
| Other status | 154 | 36.2 |
| | | |
| Current marital status | | |
| Separated culturally | 121 | 28.5 |
| Separated legally | 120 | 28.2 |
| Single, never married | 86 | 20.2 |
| Married, legally | 36 | 8.5 |
| Other category | 62 | 14.6 |
| | | |
| Education | | |
| None | 20 | 4.7 |
| Less than high school | 58 | 13.6 |
| High school graduate | 65 | 15.2 |
| Associate's degree | 41 | 9.6 |
| Bachelor's degree | 128 | 30.1 |
| Graduate degree | 122 | 28.7 |
| | | |
| Median household income* | \$50,000 – \$74,999 | |
| Mean age, year (range) *Based on 378 (not 425) responses | 47 | 18-95 |

Table 1. Characteristics of women who completed the MAWHS, 2016; N=425.

*Based on 378 (not 425) responses.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|---|--------------------------|------------|
| Woman's working status (N=406) | | |
| Full time | 216 | 53.2% |
| Part time | 63 | 15.5% |
| Out of work for some reason (e.g., disability) | 4 | 1.0% |
| Unemployed | 123 | 30.3% |
| | | |
| If woman is working, her partner's wage compared to her own (N=158) | | |
| Partner earns less | 49 | 31.0% |
| Partner earns about the same | 29 | 18.4% |
| Partner earns more | 80 | 50.6% |
| | | |
| If woman is unemployed, reason for unemployment (N=123) | | |
| Looking for work | 23 | 18.7% |
| Not looking for work | 6 | 4.9% |
| Disabled and not looking for work | 6 | 4.9% |
| Retired | 51 | 41.5% |
| In school | 10 | 8.1% |
| Stay-at-home mother/wife | 16 | 13.0% |
| Partner will not allow | 0 | 0% |
| Other | 8 | 6.5% |

Table 2. Characteristics of employment for women in the MAWHS by working status, comparison to partners' wage, and status of unemployment.

Table 3. General health of women respondent and partner.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Health Insurance Status (N=425) | | |
| Private | 153 | 36.0% |
| Public | 234 | 55.1% |
| Private but underinsured | 8 | 1.9% |
| No | 14 | 3.3% |
| If insurance, woman has access to insurance card (N | J=318) | |
| No | 14 | 4.4% |
| Yes | 304 | 95.6% |
| Woman's last visit to a doctor (N=425) | | |
| Never | 19 | 4.5% |
| Within the last year | 306 | 72% |
| More than a year ago | 67 | 15.8% |
| | | 1010/0 |
| Average number of days in the last month that the was not good (N=384) | | |
| | Average: 2.8 | Range: 0 – 30; Median: 0 |
| | | |
| Average number of days in the last month that the health was not good (N=383) | woman's emotional | |
| | Average: 4.1 | Range: 0 – 30; Median: 0 |
| | | |
| Average number of days in the last month that the physical health prevented her from doing things (National Strength Str | | |
| | Average: 2.2 | Range: 0 – 30; Median: 0 |

Table 4. Acculturation of women respondent and partner.

| | Number of | Percentage | Number of | Percentage |
|------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| | Respondents | . creentage | Respondents | |
| | Woman Herself | | Partner | |
| Understand English | N=403 | | N=285 | |
| Not at all | 16 | 4.0% | 16 | 5.6% |
| Not too well | 60 | 14.9% | 37 | 13.0% |
| Pretty well | 77 | 19.1% | 47 | 16.5% |
| Very well | 250 | 62.0% | 185 | 64.9% |
| | 230 | 02.070 | 105 | 04.570 |
| Speak English | N=402 | | N=287 | |
| Not at all | 14 | 3.5% | 18 | 6.3% |
| Not too well | 60 | 14.9% | 40 | 13.9% |
| Pretty well | 82 | 20.4% | 48 | 16.7% |
| Very well | 246 | 61.2% | 181 | 63.1% |
| - | | /- | | /- |
| Read English | N=401 | | N=286 | |
| Not at all | 22 | 5.5% | 20 | 7.0% |
| Not too well | 57 | 14.2% | 40 | 14.0% |
| Pretty well | 75 | 18.7% | 44 | 15.4% |
| Very well | 247 | 61.6% | 182 | 63.6% |
| | | | | |
| Write English | N=396 | | N=281 | |
| Not at all | 24 | 6.1% | 22 | 7.8% |
| Not too well | 63 | 15.9% | 42 | 15.0% |
| Pretty well | 66 | 16.7% | 40 | 14.2% |
| Very well | 243 | 61.4% | 177 | 63.0% |
| | | | | |
| Understand Original Language | N=379 | | N=255 | |
| Not at all | 23 | 6.1% | 24 | 9.4% |
| Not too well | 28 | 7.4% | 24 | 5.5% |
| Pretty well | 86 | 22.7% | 40 | 15.7% |
| Very well | 242 | 63.9% | 177 | 69.4% |
| | | | | |
| Speak Original Language | N=382 | | N=259 | |
| Not at all | 29 | 7.6% | 22 | 8.5% |
| Not too well | 34 | 8.9% | 18 | 7.0% |
| Pretty well | 83 | 21.7% | 40 | 15.4% |
| Very well | 236 | 61.8% | 179 | 69.1% |
| | | | | |
| Read Original Language | N=379 | | N=260 | |
| Not at all | 57 | 15.0% | 39 | 15.0% |
| Not too well | 55 | 14.5% | 28 | 10.8% |
| Pretty well | 57 | 15.0% | 35 | 13.5% |
| Very well | 210 | 55.4% | 158 | 60.8% |

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|
| | | | | |
| Write Original Language | N=380 | | N=260 | |
| Not at all | 69 | 18.2% | 39 | 15.0% |
| Not too well | 64 | 16.8% | 32 | 12.3% |
| Pretty well | 50 | 13.2% | 38 | 14.6% |
| Very well | 197 | 51.8% | 151 | 58.1% |

Table 5. Selected Adverse Childhood Events experienced by Asian females before age 18 from three data sources: Minnesota Student Survey, College Health Study, and the Minnesota Asian Women's Health Study.

| | Minnesota Student Survey* (MSS) Percentage | College Health Survey (CHS) Percentage | Minnesota Asian Women's Health Study (MAWHS) Percentage |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Parents slap, hit, kick or be | eat each other up | | |
| Once | 9.9 | 8.8 | 2.8 |
| More than once | | 13.9 | 14.1 |
| Parents slap, hit, kick or be | aat the girl | | |
| Once | 16.5 | 8.4 | 4.7 |
| More than once | 10.5 | 12.9 | 12.3 |
| | | | |
| Parents put down, insulted | d or swore at girl | | |
| Once | 16.8 | 12.2 | 5.7 |
| More than once | | 30.4 | 21.7 |
| Touched sexually by any a | dult as a child | | |
| Once | 4.5 | 7.9 | 6.6 |
| More than once | | 6.2 | 2.8 |
| | | | |
| Made to touch any adult s | • | | |
| Once | 3.2 | 2.8 | 4.7 |
| More than once | | 4.0 | 0 |
| Raped by any adult as a ch | ild | | |
| Once | Not asked | 2.2 | 1.0 |
| More than once | | 1.1 | 0 |
| | | | |

* The MSS did not assess the frequency of events, nor did it ask about childhood rape.

Table 6. Experience with stalking behaviors among Asian women.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|---|--------------------------|------------|
| Unwanted phone calls (N=391) | | |
| Never | 326 | 83.4% |
| Within the year | 33 | 8.4% |
| Longer than a year ago | 32 | 8.2% |
| Unwanted letters, emails or texts (N=390) | | |
| Never | 332 | 85.1% |
| Within the year | 24 | 6.2% |
| Longer than a year ago | 34 | 8.7% |
| Secretly followed or watched (N=383) | | |
| Never | 353 | 92.2% |
| Within the year | 9 | 2.4% |
| Longer than a year ago | 21 | 5.5% |
| Waited at home or work (N=390) | | |
| Never | 363 | 93.1% |
| Within the year | 8 | 2.0% |
| Longer than a year ago | 19 | 4.9% |
| Showed up at places (N=385) | | |
| Never | 356 | 92.5% |
| Within the year | 7 | 1.8% |
| Longer than a year ago | 22 | 5.7% |
| Posted offensive online comments (N=387) | | |
| Never | 366 | 94.6% |
| Within the year | 14 | 3.6% |
| Longer than a year ago | 7 | 1.8% |
| Shared private photos or videos online or via phone (N=387) | | |
| Never | 375 | 96.9% |
| Within the year | 8 | 2.1% |
| Longer than a year ago | 4 | 1.0% |

| | Number of | Percentage |
|--|----------------|------------|
| | Respondents | |
| Threatened with physical force by any of the fol | lowing people: | |
| In-laws (N=387) | | |
| Never | 375 | 96.9% |
| Within the last year | 8 | 2.1% |
| Over a year ago | 4 | 1.0% |
| | | |
| Parents (N=379) | | |
| Never | 364 | 96.0% |
| Within the last year | 1 | 0.3% |
| Over a year ago | 14 | 3.7% |
| | | |
| Other wives (N=370) | 0.00 | 07.00/ |
| Never | 360 | 97.3% |
| Within the last year | 4 | 1.1% |
| Over a year ago | 6 | 1.6% |
| | | |
| Children (N=369) | 204 | 00.00/ |
| Never | 364 | 98.6% |
| Within the last year | 3 | 0.8% |
| Over a year ago | Ζ | 0.5% |
| Other family (N=274) | | |
| Other family (N=374) Never | 360 | 96.3% |
| Within the last year | 6 | 1.6% |
| Over a year ago | 8 | 2.1% |
| Over a year ago | 0 | 2.170 |
| Friends (N=371) | | |
| Never | 364 | 98.1% |
| Within the last year | 4 | 1.1% |
| Over a year ago | 3 | 0.8% |
| | j | 0.076 |
| Stranger (N=369) | | |
| Never | 358 | 97.0% |
| Within the last year | 4 | 1.1% |
| Over a year ago | 7 | 1.9% |
| | , | 1.370 |
| Other person (N=338) | | |
| Never | 328 | 97.0% |
| Within the last year | 4 | 1.1% |
| Over a year ago | 7 | 1.9% |
| | | |

Table 7. Experience of being threatened by harm, taking something of value, or actual control of documents of value.

| | Number of | Percentage |
|---|---------------------------|------------|
| Have had something or someone taken away b | Respondents | |
| following people: | y any one of the | |
| In-laws (N=382) | | |
| Never | 375 | 98.2% |
| Within the last year | 2 | 0.5% |
| Over a year ago | 5 | 1.3% |
| , , | | |
| Parents (N=382) | | |
| Never | 375 | 98.2% |
| Within the last year | 2 | 0.5% |
| Over a year ago | 5 | 1.3% |
| | | |
| Other wives (N=376) | | |
| Never | 369 | 98.1% |
| Within the last year | 2 | 0.5% |
| Over a year ago | 5 | 1.3% |
| | | |
| Children (N=372) | | |
| Never | 369 | 99.2% |
| Within the last year | 3 | 0.8% |
| Over a year ago | 0 | 0% |
| Other family (N=376) | | |
| Never | 373 | 99.2% |
| Within the last year | 0 | 0% |
| Over a year ago | 3 | 0.8% |
| | | |
| Friends (N=375)) | | |
| Never | 374 | 99.7% |
| Within the last year | 1 | 0.3% |
| Over a year ago | 0 | 0% |
| Stranger (N=370) | | |
| Never | 260 | 99.7% |
| Within the last year | 369 0 | 99.7% |
| Over a year ago | 0 | 0.3% |
| טיכו מ אכמו מצט | 1 | 0.5% |
| Other person (N=342) | | |
| Never | 338 | 98.8% |
| Within the last year | 1 | 0.3% |
| Over a year ago | 3 | 0.9% |
| | | |
| Has anyone taken the woman's identification a | nd denied her access to i | it (N=343) |
| Νο | 331 | 96.5% |

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage | |
|-----|--------------------------|------------|------|
| Yes | 12 | | 3.5% |

Table 8. Type and frequency of Intimate Partner Violence.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Prevented woman from seeing loved ones or frie | ends (N=317) | |
| Never | 295 | 93.1% |
| Within year | 4 | 1.3% |
| Longer than a year ago | 18 | 5.7% |
| Prevented woman from leaving a location (N=31 | | |
| Never | 295 | 93.1% |
| Within year | 4 | 1.3% |
| Longer than a year ago | 18 | 5.7% |
| Threated woman (N=303) | | |
| Never | 288 | 95.0% |
| Within year | 6 | 2.0% |
| Longer than a year ago | 9 | 3.0% |
| Insulted or humiliated woman (N=306) | | |
| Never | 269 | 87.9% |
| Within year | 17 | 5.6% |
| Longer than a year ago | 20 | 6.5% |
| Slapped, punched or kicked (N=305) | | |
| Never | 278 | 94.0% |
| Within year | 10 | 3.3% |
| Longer than a year ago | 17 | 5.6% |
| Touched sexually without consent (N=304) | | |
| Never | 286 | 94.0% |
| Within year | 6 | 2.0% |
| Longer than a year ago | 12 | 4.0% |
| Raped by partner (N=304) | | |
| Never | 289 | 95.1% |
| Within year | 5 | 1.6% |
| Longer than a year ago | 10 | 3.3% |

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|---|-----------------------|------------|
| Prevented woman from seeing loved ones or f | riends (N=359) | |
| Never | 341 | 95.0% |
| Within year | 6 | 1.7% |
| Longer than a year ago | 12 | 3.3% |
| | | |
| Prevented woman from leaving a location (N= | - | 1 |
| Never | 344 | 96.6% |
| Within year | 4 | 1.1% |
| Longer than a year ago | 8 | 2.3% |
| Prevented from making decisions (N=355) | | |
| Never | 338 | 95.2% |
| Within year | 6 | 1.7% |
| Longer than a year ago | 11 | 3.1% |
| | | |
| Threated woman (N=355) | | |
| Never | 338 | 95.2% |
| Within year | 6 | 1.7% |
| Longer than a year ago | 11 | 3.1% |
| Insulted or humiliated woman (N=350) | | |
| Never | 320 | 91.4% |
| Within year | 12 | 3.4% |
| Longer than a year ago | 18 | 5.1% |
| | | |
| Slapped, punched or kicked (N=350) | | |
| Never | 334 | 95.4% |
| Within year | 7 | 2.0% |
| Longer than a year ago | 9 | 2.6% |
| Touched sexually without consent (N=350) | | |
| Never | 338 | 96.6% |
| Within year | 338 | 0.9% |
| Longer than a year ago | 9 | 2.6% |
| | | 2.070 |
| Raped by anyone (N=349) | | |
| Never | 342 | 98.0% |
| Within year | 2 | 0.6% |
| Longer than a year ago | 5 | 1.4% |

Table 9. Type and frequency of abuse from someone besides an intimate partner.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| If the woman experienced violence, did she report | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | to the police (N=78) |
| No | 69 | 88.5% |
| Yes | 9 | 11.5% |
| | | |
| Reasons why she did not report to police (N=46) | | |
| Incident not that bad | 12 | 26.1% |
| Would make the abuse worse | 3 | 6.5% |
| Against my culture | 0 | 0% |
| Worried about money, housing or children | 2 | 4.4% |
| Dealt with it herself or with family | 6 | 13.0% |
| Doesn't trust police | 1 | 2.2% |
| Doesn't want partner arrested | 3 | 6.5% |
| Shame/Embarrassment | 7 | 15.2% |
| Did not know where to go to receive assistance | 4 | 8.7% |
| Thought it was her fault | 4 | 8.7% |
| Other reason | 4 | 8.7% |
| | | |
| Types of people that the woman told about the in | ncident (N=88) | I |
| Mother/sister | 24 | 27.3% |
| Medical provider | 3 | 3.4% |
| Social worker/Counselor | 2 | 2.3% |
| Community/Religious/Spiritual/Clan leader | 3 | 3.4% |
| Another family member of the woman's | 6 | 6.8% |
| Another family member of the man's | 2 | 2.3% |
| Other | 9 | 10.2% |
| Friend | 35 | 39.8% |
| Mother –in-law | 4 | 4.6% |
| | | |
| Reasons for not seeking help from anyone (N=49) | | |
| Incident not that bad | 9 | 18.4% |
| Abuse would get worse | 0 | 0% |
| Against my culture | 4 | 8.2% |
| Worried about money/housing/children | 4 | 8.2% |
| Dealt with it herself or with family | 4 | 8.2% |
| Other reasons | 9 | 18.4% |
| Doesn't trust the police | 3 | 6.1% |
| Didn't want the partner arrested | 2 | 4.1% |
| Thought it was her fault | 0 | 0% |
| Did not know where to go or get help | 4 | 8.2% |
| Shame or embarrassment | 10 | 20.4% |

Table 10. Reporting practices for women who have experienced violence.

Table 11. Information & Services that would be helpful; N=425.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| How to keep safe / Prevention | 59 | 13.9% |
| Housing or shelter | 34 | 8.0% |
| Resources of children | 36 | 8.5% |
| Someone to talk to/moral support | 64 | 15.1% |
| Help in reporting to police | 33 | 7.8% |
| Medical health | 37 | 8.7% |
| Financial support | 40 | 9.4% |
| Legal resources | 39 | 9.2% |

Table 12. Knowledge of resources available.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|--|--------------------------|------------|
| Woman knows where to find information (N=367) | | |
| No | 163 | 44.4% |
| Yes | 204 | 55.6% |
| | | |
| Desire to learn more about violence services for | the Asian community (N=3 | 71) |
| Wants to learn a lot more | 98 | 26.4% |
| Wants to learn a little more | 108 | 29.1% |
| Does not wish to know more | 165 | 44.5% |
| | | |
| Desired method to learn more about services (N | =425) | |
| Internet | 256 | 60.2% |
| Friends | 162 | 38.1% |
| Community | 132 | 31.1% |
| Health care provider | 127 | 29.9% |
| Other | 20 | 4.7% |

Table 13. Attitudes and Beliefs about Cultural norms.

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| In the woman's opinion, should a man ever beat | a woman? (N=393) | |
| No | 369 | 93.9% |
| Yes | 11 | 2.8% |
| Maybe | 13 | 3.3% |
| | | |
| Perception of the proportion of men in the Asian | community who hit their | wives (N=380) |
| All of the men | 13 | 3.4% |
| Half of the men | 156 | 41.1% |
| Few of the men | 39 | 10.3% |
| None | 172 | 45.3% |
| | | |
| Perception within the male Asian community of | physical abuse of a wife (N | l=317) |
| Approve | 37 | 11.7% |
| Disapprove | 192 | 60.6% |
| Don't have an opinion/None of their business | 88 | 27.8% |

| | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|---|--------------------------|------------|
| Has ever exchanged sex to obtain anything of valu | | 1 |
| No | 373 | 99.2% |
| Yes | 3 | 0.8% |
| If so, was the woman: | | |
| Pressured (N=2) | 1 of 2 | |
| Believe that someone else profited (N=2) | 1 of 2 | |
| Occurred for the first time before the woman was 18 years old (N=2) | 1 of 2 | |
| Commentation with a supervise side side has an other wife | - (N-201) | |
| Currently with a spouse who also has another wife | e (N=281) 268 | OF 40/ |
| No Yes | 13 | 95.4% |
| res | 13 | 4.0% |
| If so, the husband has forced another wife into div | vorce (N=11) | |
| No | 8 | 72.7% |
| Yes | 3 | 27.3% |
| The woman is the "first wife" (N=10) | | |
| No | 5 | 50% |
| Yes | 5 | 50% |
| Number of other wives (N=6) | | |
| 1 | 5 | 83.3% |
| 2 | 1 | 17.7% |
| Experiences at the hands of another wife (N=13) | | |
| Physical abuse | 4 | 30.8% |
| Insults | 4 | 30.8% |
| Control over money or paperwork | 3 | 23.1% |
| Control over where to go, see, or talk to | 4 | 30.8% |

 Table 14. Sexual Exploitation, Multiple Wives and Forced Divorce.

11. Boynton Health Service College Health Survey (CHS) data tables

BOYNTON COLLEGE HEALTH DATA – RECENT AND LIFETIME VIOLENCE

Working Group Meeting November 30, 2016

| | College Healt N | h Data - Mir Women | nesota |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Key frequency row percentage column percentage | | | |
| During the past 12 months, how have the following affected by sexual assault? | White | Asian PI | Total |
| No assault | 5,810 93.74 97.11 | 388 6.26 99.23 | 6,198 100.00 97.24 |
| Assaulted, no effect on academics | 104 99.05 1.74 | 1 0.95 0.26 | 105 100.00 1.65 |
| Assaulted, effect on academics | 69 97.18 1.15 | 2 2.82 0.51 | 71 100.00 1.11 |
| Total | 5,983 93.87 100.00 | 391 6.13 100.00 | 6,374 100.00 100.00 |
| Pearson chi2(Within past 12 months- Have you Experienced actual or attempted intercourse | 2) = 6.4240 | Pr = 0.04 | 0 |

| against your will? | White | Asian PI | Total |
|-----------------------|-------|----------|--------|
| Yes | 188 | 6 | 194 |
| | 96.91 | 3.09 | 100.00 |

| | 3.44 | 1.69 | 3.34 | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| No | 5,270 93.77 96.56 | 350 6.23 98.31 | 5,620 100.00 96.66 | |
| Total | 5,458 93.88 100.00 | | 5,814 100.00 100.00 | |
| Pe | earson chi2(1) | = 3.200 | 63 Pr = 0 | .073 |
| Within pa months-actua attempted se touching aga | al İ | White | Asian PI | Total |
| Yes | | 388 95.10 7.11 | 20 4.90 5.60 | 408 100.00 7.02 |
| No | | 5,067 93.76 92.89 | 337 | 5,404 100.00 92.98 |
| Total | | 5,455 93.86 | 357 6.14 100.00 | 5,812 100.00 100.00 |
| Pe | earson chi2(1) | = 1.172 | 13 Pr = 0 | .279 |
| Within past 12 months-Hav e you been hit slapped | White | Asian PI | Tota | 1 |
| Yes | 171 90.96 3.13 | 17 9.04 4.76 | 188 100.00 3.23 | |
| No | 5,287 93.96 96.87 | 340 6.04 95.24 | 5,627 100.00 96.77 | |
| Total | 5,458 93.86 100.00 | 357 6.14 100.00 | 5,815 100.00 100.00 | |
| Pe | earson chi2(1) | = 2.842 | 18 Pr = 0 | .092 |

| Within past 12 months-Hav e you been put down | White | Asian PI | Total |
|---|-----------------------|----------|--------|
| Yes | 594 | 33 | 627 |
| | 94.74 | 5.26 | 100.00 |
| | 10.87 | 9.22 | 10.77 |
| No | 4,870 | 325 | 5,195 |
| | 93.74 | 6.26 | 100.00 |
| | 89.13 | 90.78 | 89.23 |
| Total | 5,464 | 358 | 5,822 |
| | 93.85 | 6.15 | 100.00 |
| | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Pearson chi2(1) = 0.9557 Pr = 0.328

| Within your lifetime-rape | ed White | Asian I | PI Total |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Yes | 1,154 | 40 | 1,194 |
| | 96.65 | 3.35 | 100.00 |
| | 19.45 | 10.28 | 18.89 |
| No | 4,778 | 349 | 5,127 |
| | 93.19 | 6.81 | 100.00 |
| | 80.55 | 89.72 | 81.11 |
| Total | 5,932 | 389 | 6,321 |
| | 93.85 | 6.15 | 100.00 |
| | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Pearson chi2(1) = 20.0404 Pr = 0.000

| Within your lifetime-H ave you touched | White | Asian PI | Total |
|--|-----------------------|----------|--------|
| Yes | 1,768 | 71 | 1,839 |
| | 96.14 | 3.86 | 100.00 |
| | 29.81 | 18.35 | 29.11 |
| No | 4,162 | 316 | 4,478 |
| | 92.94 | 7.06 | 100.00 |
| | 70.19 | 81.65 | 70.89 |
| Total | 5,930 | 387 | 6,317 |
| | 93.87 | 6.13 | 100.00 |
| | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| White | Ngian DT | Total |
| | +- | 10tai |
| 877 | 41 | 918 |
| | | 100.00 |
| 14.79 | 10.54 | 14.53 |
| 5,052 93,56 | 348 6,44 | 5,400 100.00 |
| 85.21 | 89.46 | 85.47 |
| 5,929 | 389 | 6,318 |
| 93.84 | 6.16 | 100.00 |
| 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| | 95.53 14.79 5,052 93.56 85.21 5,929 93.84 | 877 41 95.53 4.47 14.79 10.54 5,052 348 93.56 6.44 85.21 89.46 5,929 389 93.84 6.16 |

Pearson chi2(1) = 5.3141 Pr = 0.021

| Within your lifetime-H ave you been put down | White | Asian | PI Total |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Yes | 1,564 96.13 26.42 | 63 3.87 16.24 | 1,627 100.00 25.80 |
| No | 4,355 | 325 | 4,680 |
| | 93.06 | 6.94 | 100.00 |
| | 73.58 | 83.76 | 74.20 |
| Total | 5,919 | 388 | 6,307 |
| | 93.85 | 6.15 | 100.00 |
| | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Pearson chi2(1) = 19.7378 Pr = 0.000

| You reported experienci ng sexual intercours e/sexual touching against your will, did you tell anyone | | Asian PI | Total |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Yes | 1,114 95.62 59.70 | 51 4.38 66.23 | 1,165 100.00 59.96 |
| No | 752 96.66 40.30 | 26 3.34 33.77 | 778 100.00 40.04 |
| Total | 1,866 96.04 100.00 | 77 3.96 100.00 | 1,943 100.00 100.00 |
| Pe | arson chi2(1) | = 1.315 | 50 Pr = 0.251 |
| You reported experienci ng being hit, slapped, verbal threatened verbal put-down did you tell | | | |
| anyone + | White | Asian PI + | Total |
| Yes | 977 95.88 58.61 | 42 4.12 56.00 | 1,019 100.00 58.50 |
| No | 690 95.44 41.39 | 33 4.56 44.00 | 723 100.00 41.50 |
| Total | 1,667 95.69 100.00 | 75 4.31 100.00 | 1,742 100.00 100.00 |
| Ре | arson chi2(1) | = 0.201 | 1 Pr = 0.654 |

12. Boynton College Health Survey—Adverse Childhood Events by Race

BOYNTON COLLEGE HEALTH DATA – ADVERSE CHILDHOOD EVENTS BY RACE

| | | Male | | | | Female | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------|
| Adverse Childhood Event | Overall Sample N (%) | White N (%) | Asian/PI N (%) | p-value | Overall Sample N (%) | White N (%) | Asian/PI N (%) | p-value |
| Lived with someone who was depressed, mentally ill, or suicidal | 747(25.3) | 705(26.5) | 42(14.3) | < .001 | 2,348(35.4) | 2,237(36.7) | 111(20.2) | < .001 |
| Lived with a problem drinker or alcoholic | 567(19.3) | 532(20.1) | 35(11.9) | .001 | 1,610(24.2) | 1,548(25.4) | 62(11.3) | < .001 |
| Lived with someone who used illegal drugs or abused prescription med. | 384(13.0) | 366(13.8) | 18(6.2) | < .001 | 904(13.6) | 873(14.4) | 31(5.7) | <.001 |
| Lived with someone who served time/sentenced to serve time | 207(7.0) | 190(7.2) | 17(5.8) | .010 | 576(8.7) | 550(9.0) | 26(4.7) | .001 |
| Parents were separated/divorced | 730(24.8) | 686(25.8) | 44(15.1) | <.001 | 1,746(26.3) | 1,647(27.0) | 99(17.9) | < .001 |
| Parents never married | 99(3.4) | 93(3.5) | 6(2.1) | | 254(3.8) | 239(3.9) | 15(2.7) | |
| Parents/adults in home slapped, hit, kicked, punched, or beat each other up Once | 158(5.4) | 129(4.9) | 29(10.0) | <.001 | 390(5.9) | 342(5.6) | 48(8.8) | < .001 |
| More than once | 185(6.3) | 157(5.9) | 28(9.6) | | 554(8.4) | 478(7.9) | 76(13.9) | |
| Parents/adults in home slapped, hit, kicked, punched, or beat respondent Once | 185(6.3) | 160(6.0) | 25(8.5) | < .001 | 438(6.6) | 392(6.4) | 46(8.4) | < .001 |
| More than once | 243(8.2) | 202(7.6) | 41(14.0) | | 561(8.5) | 490(8.1) | 71(12.9) | |
| Parents/adults in home swore/insulted/put down respondent | | | | .024 | | | | .437 |
| Once | 263(8.9) | 243(9.2) | 20(6.9) | .024 | 773(11.7) | 706(11.6) | 67(12.2) | 57 |
| More than once | 911(30.1) | 836(31.6) | 75(25.7) | | 2,181(32.9) | 2,014(33.1) | 167(30.4) | |
| Someone at least 5 years older than respondent touched respondent sexually Once | 60(2.0) | 51(1.9) | 9(3.1) | .003 | 324(4.9) | 281(4.6) | 43(7.9) | .003 |
| More than once | 73(2.5) | 58(2.2) | 15(5.1) | | 404(6.1) | 370(6.1) | 34(6.2) | |
| Someone at least 5 years older than respondent tried to make them touch them | | | | | | | | |
| sexually | | | | .145 | | | | .944 |

| | | Male | | | | Female | | |
|--|---------|---------|--------|------|----------|----------|---------|------|
| Once | 60(2.0) | 51(1.9) | 9(3.1) | | 197(3.0) | 182(3.0) | 15(2.8) | |
| More than once | 51(1.7) | 43(1.6) | 8(2.8) | | 273(4.1) | 251(4.1) | 22(4.0) | |
| Someone at least 5 years older forced respondent to have sex | | | | .012 | | | | .456 |
| Once | 20(0.7) | 15(0.6) | 5(1.7) | 1012 | 120(1.8) | 108(1.8) | 12(2.2) | |
| More than once | 23(0.8) | 18(0.7) | 5(1.7) | | 109(1.6) | 103(1.7) | 6(1.1) | |

13. American Association of Universities Sexual Misconduct Survey (SMS) data

| Gender identity – collapsed | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|------------|------------|-------|------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| , , | | | | Valid | Cumulative | | | | | | |
| | | Frequency | Percent | Percent | Percent | | | | | | |
| Valid | Woman | 15500 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Asian stude | nts and all othe | ers | | | | | | | |
| | | Asian | | All non-As | - | Total | | Pearson Chi-Square Tests (all d | f=1) | | |
| | | Count | Column N % | Count | Column N % | Count | Column N % | | | Asian students | s and all others |
| B1 How problematic is sex | | | | | | | | B1 How problematic is sex | | | |
| misconduct at university | Not at all | 61 | 3.60% | 304 | 2.20% | 365 | 2.40% | misconduct at university | Chi-square | 12.376 | |
| | Any Response | 1643 | 96.40% | 13461 | 97.80% | 15104 | 97.60% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| B2 How likely you will | | | | | | | | B2 How likely you will | | | |
| experience sex misconduct on | | | | | | | | experience sex misconduct on | | | |
| campus | Not at all | 366 | 21.50% | 2586 | 18.80% | 2953 | 19.10% | campus | Chi-square | 7.502 | |
| | Any Response | 1334 | 78.50% | 11196 | 81.20% | 12530 | 80.90% | | Sig. | .006*,b | |
| B3 How likely you will | | | | | | | | B3 How likely you will | | | |
| experience sex misconduct off | | | | | | | | experience sex misconduct off | | | |
| campus events | Not at all | 338 | 20.10% | 2643 | 19.20% | 2982 | 19.30% | campus events | Chi-square | 0.688 | |
| | Any Response | 1346 | 79.90% | 11104 | 80.80% | 12451 | 80.70% | | Sig. | .407b | |
| C1A Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1A Aware of services | | | |
| provided by The Aurora Center | No | 190 | 11.10% | 1417 | 10.30% | 1607 | 10.40% | provided by The Aurora Center | Chi-square | 1.261 | |
| | Yes | 1514 | 88.90% | 12379 | 89.70% | 13893 | 89.60% | | Sig. | .261b | |
| C1B Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1B Aware of services | | | |
| provided by University of | | | | | | | | provided by University of | | | |
| Minnesota Police Department | No | 275 | 16.10% | 2056 | 14.90% | 2331 | 15.00% | Minnesota Police Department | Chi-square | 1.812 | |
| | Yes | 1429 | 83.90% | 11740 | 85.10% | 13169 | 85.00% | | Sig. | .178b | |
| C1C Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1C Aware of services | | | |
| provided by Disability | | | | | | | | provided by Disability | | | |
| Resource Center | No | 960 | 56.40% | 7998 | 58.00% | 8958 | 57.80% | Resource Center | Chi-square | 1.663 | |
| | Yes | 744 | 43.60% | 5798 | 42.00% | 6542 | 42.20% | | Sig. | .197b | |
| C1D Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1D Aware of services | | | |
| provided by GLBTA-PO | No | 1280 | 75.10% | 11147 | 80.80% | 12427 | 80.20% | provided by GLBTA-PO | Chi-square | 30.73 | |
| | Yes | 424 | 24.90% | 2650 | 19.20% | 3073 | 19.80% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| C1E Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1E Aware of services | | | |
| provided by Multicultural | | | | | | | | provided by Multicultural | | | |
| Center for Academic | | | | | | | | Center for Academic | | | |
| Excellence | No | 488 | 28.70% | 8698 | 63.00% | 9187 | 59.30% | Excellence | Chi-square | 742.716 | |
| | Yes | 1215 | 71.30% | 5098 | 37.00% | 6314 | 40.70% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| C1F Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1F Aware of services | | | |
| provided by Office for Student | | | | | | | | provided by Office for Student | | | |
| Conduct and Academic | | | | | | | | Conduct and Academic | | | |
| Integrity | No | 982 | 57.60% | 7926 | 57.40% | 8908 | 57.50% | Integrity | Chi-square | 0.02 | |
| | Yes | 722 | 42.40% | 5870 | 42.60% | 6592 | 42.50% | | Sig. | .889b | |

| C1G Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1G Aware of services | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|------|------------------|--------|------------------|-------|---------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|
| provided by Security Monitor | | | | | | | | provided by Security Monitor | | | |
| Services | No | 987 | 57.90% | 7980 | 57.80% | 8967 | 57.90% | Services | Chi-square | 0.009 | |
| | Yes | 716 | 42.10% | 5817 | 42.20% | 6533 | 42.10% | | Sig. | .926b | |
| C1H Aware of services | | | | | | | | C1H Aware of services | | | |
| provided by Women's Center | No | 988 | 58.00% | 7782 | 56.40% | 8770 | 56.60% | provided by Women's Center | Chi-square | 1.537 | |
| | Yes | 716 | 42.00% | 6015 | 43.60% | 6730 | 43.40% | | Sig. | .215b | |
| C1I Aware of services provided | | | | | | | | C1I Aware of services provided | | | |
| by Boynton Health Services | No | 215 | 12.60% | 902 | 6.50% | 1117 | 7.20% | by Boynton Health Services | Chi-square | 83.839 | |
| | Yes | 1489 | 87.40% | 12895 | 93.50% | 14383 | 92.80% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| C1J Aware of services provided | | | | | | | | C1J Aware of services provided | | , | |
| by University Counseling and | | | | | | | | by University Counseling and | | | |
| Consulting Services | No | 549 | 32.20% | 3543 | 25.70% | 4092 | 26.40% | Consulting Services | Chi-square | 33.376 | |
| | Yes | 1155 | 67.80% | 10254 | 74.30% | 11409 | 73.60% | 5 | Sig. | .000*,b | 1 |
| C1K Aware of services | | _ | | | | | | C1K Aware of services | Ŭ | | 1 |
| provided by University | | | | | | | | provided by University | | | |
| Student Legal Services | No | 709 | 41.60% | 5793 | 42.00% | 6502 | 42.00% | Student Legal Services | Chi-square | 0.08 | |
| | Yes | 994 | 58.40% | 8003 | 58.00% | 8998 | 58.00% | | Sig. | .778b | - |
| C1L Aware of services | 100 | 551 | 5011070 | 0005 | 5010070 | 0550 | 5010070 | C1L Aware of services | 0.8. | | |
| provided by Student Conflict | | | | | | | | provided by Student Conflict | | | |
| Resolution Center | No | 955 | 56.00% | 7661 | 55.50% | 8615 | 55.60% | Resolution Center | Chi-square | 0.162 | |
| | Yes | 749 | 44.00% | 6135 | 44.50% | 6885 | 44.40% | | Sig. | .687b | |
| C1M Aware of services | 100 | 7.15 | 110070 | 0100 | 1115070 | 0000 | | C1M Aware of services | 5.8. | 1007.0 | |
| provided by Equal Opportunity | | | | | | | | provided by Equal Opportunity | | | |
| and Affirmative Action | No | 1293 | 75.90% | 10920 | 79.20% | 12213 | 78.80% | and Affirmative Action | Chi-square | 9.724 | |
| and Ann had ve Action | Yes | 411 | 24.10% | 2876 | 20.80% | 3287 | 21.20% | and / an added / edon | Sig. | .002*,b | |
| C1P CLEANED Aware of | 105 | 411 | 24.10% | 2070 | 20.0070 | 5207 | 21.20% | C1P CLEANED Aware of | 515. | .002 ,0 | - |
| services provided by - 'None of | | | | | | | | services provided by - 'None of | | | |
| the above' category recoded | No | 1704 | 100.00% | 13796 | 100.00% | 15500 | 100.00% | the above' category recoded | Chi-square | | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 137.50 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | | Sig. | .b | |
| C2A How knowledgeable | 103 | 0 | 0.0078 | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | C2A How knowledgeable | Jig. | .0 | - |
| about university sexual | | | | | | | | about university sexual | | | |
| misconduct definition | Not at all | 183 | 10.80% | 1379 | 10.00% | 1562 | 10.10% | misconduct definition | Chi-square | 0.915 | |
| | Any Response | 1520 | 89.20% | 12403 | 90.00% | 13923 | 89.90% | misconduct definition | Sig. | .339b | + |
| C2B How knowledgeable | Any Response | 1520 | 89.2076 | 12403 | 50.00% | 13923 | 89.90% | C2B How knowledgeable | Jig. | .3350 | + |
| about where to get help for | | | | | | | | about where to get help for | | | |
| sex misconduct at university | Not at all | 105 | 6.20% | 602 | 4.40% | 707 | 4.60% | sex misconduct at university | Chi-square | 11.231 | |
| sex misconduct at university | | 105 | 93.80% | 13178 | 4.40% 95.60% | 14776 | 95.40% | sex misconduct at university | Sig. | .001*,b | |
| C2C How knowledgeable | Any Response | 1228 | 93.80% | 131/8 | 95.00% | 14776 | 95.40% | C2C How knowledgeable | ວາ <u>g</u> . | .001',0 | - |
| 5 | | | | | | | | 5 | | | |
| about how to report sex | Not at all | 274 | 16 2000 | 1054 | 14.20% | 2227 | 14 500/ | about how to report sex | Chi aguart | 5 200 | |
| misconduct to university | Not at all | 274 | 16.30% 83.70% | 1954 | 14.20% 85.80% | 2227 | 14.50% | misconduct to university | Chi-square | 5.269 | |
| | Any Response | 1403 | 83.70% | 11759 | 85.80% | 13161 | 85.50% | | Sig. | .022*,b | <u> </u> |

| C2D How knowledgeable | | | | | | | | C2D How knowledgeable | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---------|--|
| about what happens when sex | | | | | | | | about what happens when sex | | | |
| misconduct is reported to | | | | | | | | misconduct is reported to | | | |
| university | Not at all | 608 | 35.70% | 5650 | 41.00% | 6258 | 40.40% | university | Chi-square | 17.944 | |
| | Any Response | 1096 | 64.30% | 8124 | 59.00% | 9220 | 59.60% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D1 Harassment - offensive | | | | | | | | D1 Harassment - offensive | | | |
| sexual remarks jokes stories | Yes | 553 | 32.50% | 6327 | 45.90% | 6880 | 44.50% | sexual remarks jokes stories | Chi-square | 111.668 | |
| | Never | | | | | | | | | | |
| | experienced | 1151 | 67.50% | 7446 | 54.10% | 8596 | 55.50% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D2 Harassment - inappropriate | | | | | | | | D2 Harassment - inappropriate | | | |
| comments about appearance | | | | | | | | comments about appearance | | | |
| or sexual experiences | Yes | 711 | 41.80% | 7363 | 53.40% | 8073 | 52.20% | or sexual experiences | Chi-square | 81.731 | |
| | Never | | | | | | | | | | |
| | experienced | 989 | 58.20% | 6417 | 46.60% | 7407 | 47.80% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D3 Harassment - unwanted | | | | | | | | D3 Harassment - unwanted | | | |
| talk about sexual matters | Yes | 330 | 19.60% | 3555 | 25.90% | 3886 | 25.20% | talk about sexual matters | Chi-square | 31.3 | |
| | Never | | | | | | | | | | |
| | experienced | 1354 | 80.40% | 10189 | 74.10% | 11543 | 74.80% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D4 Harassment - unwanted | | | | | | | | D4 Harassment - unwanted | | | |
| sexual electronic | | | | | | | | sexual electronic | | | |
| communications | Yes | 229 | 13.50% | 2082 | 15.20% | 2312 | 15.00% | communications | Chi-square | 3.21 | |
| | Never | | | | | | | | | | |
| | experienced | 1466 | 86.50% | 11655 | 84.80% | 13121 | 85.00% | | Sig. | .073b | |
| D5 Harassment - unwanted | | | | | | | | D5 Harassment - unwanted | | | |
| continuous requests for dates | | | | | | | | continuous requests for dates | | | |
| or sex | Yes | 243 | 14.30% | 3077 | 22.30% | 3319 | 21.50% | or sex | Chi-square | 57.079 | |
| | Never | | | | | | | | | | |
| | experienced | 1450 | 85.70% | 10695 | 77.70% | 12145 | 78.50% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D10A Student contacted | | | | | | | | D10A Student contacted | | | |
| University of Minnesota Police | | | | | | | | University of Minnesota Police | | | |
| Department about | | | | | | | | Department about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 844 | 99.60% | 9013 | 98.80% | 9857 | 98.90% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 4.596 | |
| | Yes | 3 | 0.40% | 105 | 1.20% | 109 | 1.10% | | Sig. | .032*,b | |
| D10B Student contacted | | | | | | | | D10B Student contacted | | | |
| Minneapolis Police | | | | | | | | Minneapolis Police | | | |
| Department about | | 0.7- | 00.005 | 00.45 | 00.000/ | | 00.005/ | Department about | <u>.</u> | | |
| experience(s) | No | 837 | 98.90% | 9046 | 99.20% | 9884 | 99.20% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 1.452 | |
| | Yes | 10 | 1.10% | 72 | 0.80% | 82 | 0.80% | | Sig. | .228b | |
| D10C Student contacted St. | | | | | | | | D10C Student contacted St. | | | |
| Paul Police Department about | | a | | . | | | | Paul Police Department about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 847 | 100.00% | 9107 | 99.90% | 9954 | 99.90% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 1.116 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 12 | 0.10% | 12 | 0.10% | | Sig. | .291b,c | |

| D10D Student contacted | | | | | | | | D10D Student contacted | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|------|---------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|------------|---------|--|
| Office of Student Conduct and | | | | | | | | Office of Student Conduct and | | | |
| Academic Integrity about | | | | | | | | Academic Integrity about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 847 | 100.00% | 9038 | 99.10% | 9885 | 99.20% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 7.492 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 80 | 0.90% | 80 | 0.80% | | Sig. | .006*,b | |
| D10E Student contacted The | | | | | | | | D10E Student contacted The | Ű | | |
| Aurora Center about | | | | | | | | Aurora Center about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 815 | 96.20% | 8804 | 96.60% | 9619 | 96.50% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 0.258 | |
| | Yes | 32 | 3.80% | 314 | 3.40% | 346 | 3.50% | | Sig. | .611b | |
| D10F Student contacted Office | | | | | | | | D10F Student contacted Office | | | |
| of Equity and Diversity about | | | | | | | | of Equity and Diversity about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 847 | 100.00% | 9089 | 99.70% | 9936 | 99.70% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 2.795 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 30 | 0.30% | 30 | 0.30% | | Sig. | .095b,c | |
| D10G Student contacted | | | | | | | | D10G Student contacted | | | |
| University Counseling and | | | | | | | | University Counseling and | | | |
| Consulting Services about | | | | | | | | Consulting Services about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 810 | 95.60% | 8794 | 96.40% | 9604 | 96.40% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 1.433 | |
| | Yes | 37 | 4.40% | 325 | 3.60% | 362 | 3.60% | | Sig. | .231b | |
| D10H Student contacted | | | | | | | | D10H Student contacted | | | |
| Boynton Health Services about | | | | | | | | Boynton Health Services about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 795 | 93.90% | 8791 | 96.40% | 9586 | 96.20% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 13.807 | |
| | Yes | 52 | 6.10% | 327 | 3.60% | 379 | 3.80% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D10K Student contacted None | | | | | | | | D10K Student contacted None | | | |
| of the above about | | | | | | | | of the above about | | | |
| experience(s) | No | 100 | 11.80% | 936 | 10.30% | 1037 | 10.40% | experience(s) | Chi-square | 1.976 | |
| | Yes | 747 | 88.20% | 8182 | 89.70% | 8929 | 89.60% | | Sig. | .160b | |
| D10K_CLEANED Student | | | | | | | | D10K_CLEANED Student | | | |
| contacted - 'None of the | | | | | | | | contacted - 'None of the | | | |
| above' category recoded | No | 1704 | 100.00% | 13773 | 99.80% | 15477 | 99.80% | above' category recoded | Chi-square | 2.969 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 24 | 0.20% | 24 | 0.20% | | Sig. | .085b,c | |
| D13_DIDNOTKNOW | | | | | | | | D13_DIDNOTKNOW | | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Didn't | | | | | | | | contacting services - Didn't | | | |
| know who or where to go | No | 650 | 87.10% | 7750 | 92.80% | 8400 | 92.40% | know who or where to go | Chi-square | 32.928 | |
| | Yes | 97 | 12.90% | 598 | 7.20% | 695 | 7.60% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D13_EMBARRASSED | | | | | | | | D13_EMBARRASSED | | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - | | | | | | | | contacting services - | | | |
| Embarrassed Ashamed | | | | | | | | Embarrassed Ashamed | | | |
| Emotionally Difficult | No | 696 | 93.20% | 7826 | 93.70% | 8522 | 93.70% | Emotionally Difficult | Chi-square | 0.383 | |
| | Yes | 51 | 6.80% | 522 | 6.30% | 573 | 6.30% | | Sig. | .536b | |
| D13_NOTBELIEVE Harassment: | | | | | | | | D13_NOTBELIEVE Harassment: | | | |
| Reason for not contacting | No | 731 | 97.80% | 8044 | 96.40% | 8775 | 96.50% | Reason for not contacting | Chi-square | 4.543 | |

| D13 NOTBELIEVE Harassment: | | | | | | | | D13 NOTBELIEVE Harassment: | | | 1 |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|--------|------|--------|------|--------|-------------------------------|------------|---------|---|
| Reason for not contacting | | | | | | | | Reason for not contacting | | | |
| services - Would not be | | | | | | | | services - Would not be | | | |
| believed | No | 731 | 97.80% | 8044 | 96.40% | 8775 | 96.50% | believed | Chi-square | 4.543 | |
| | Yes | 16 | 2.20% | 304 | 3.60% | 321 | 3.50% | | Sig. | .033*,b | |
| D13 NOTSERIOUS | | | | | | | | D13 NOTSERIOUS | 0 | , | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Nothing | | | | | | | | contacting services - Nothing | | | |
| would be done | No | 171 | 22.90% | 1368 | 16.40% | 1539 | 16.90% | would be done | Chi-square | 20.634 | |
| | Yes | 576 | 77.10% | 6980 | 83.60% | 7556 | 83.10% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D13 NOTROUBLE | | | | | | | | D13 NOTROUBLE | | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Did not | | | | | | | | contacting services - Did not | | | |
| want to get perp in trouble | No | 686 | 91.90% | 7540 | 90.30% | 8225 | 90.40% | want to get perp in trouble | Chi-square | 1.841 | |
| | Yes | 61 | 8.10% | 809 | 9.70% | 870 | 9.60% | | Sig. | .175b | |
| D13_CONSEQUENCES | | | | | | | | D13_CONSEQUENCES | - | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Feared | | | | | | | | contacting services - Feared | | | |
| social consequences | No | 713 | 95.40% | 7562 | 90.60% | 8274 | 91.00% | social consequences | Chi-square | 19.843 | |
| | Yes | 34 | 4.60% | 787 | 9.40% | 821 | 9.00% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D13 NOTHINGDONE | | | | | | | | D13 NOTHINGDONE | | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Nothing | | | | | | | | contacting services - Nothing | | | |
| would be done | No | 534 | 71.50% | 6515 | 78.00% | 7049 | 77.50% | would be done | Chi-square | 16.854 | |
| | Yes | 213 | 28.50% | 1834 | 22.00% | 2046 | 22.50% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D13 NOTCONFIDENTIAL | | | | | | | | D13 NOTCONFIDENTIAL | | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Would | | | | | | | | contacting services - Would | | | |
| not be confidential | No | 702 | 93.90% | 7913 | 94.80% | 8614 | 94.70% | not be confidential | Chi-square | 0.88 | |
| | Yes | 45 | 6.10% | 436 | 5.20% | 481 | 5.30% | | Sig. | .348b | |
| D13_OFFCAMPUS | | | | | | | | D13_OFFCAMPUS | | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Did not | | | | | | | | contacting services - Did not | | | |
| occur on campus | No | 636 | 85.20% | 7069 | 84.70% | 7705 | 84.70% | occur on campus | Chi-square | 0.118 | |
| i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | Yes | 111 | 14.80% | 1280 | 15.30% | 1390 | 15.30% | | Sig. | .731b | |
| D13_NOTOCCURSCHOOL | | | | | | | | D13_NOTOCCURSCHOOL | | | |
| Harassment: Reason for not | | | | | | | | Harassment: Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Did not | 1 | | | | | | | contacting services - Did not | | | |
| occur while in school | No | 690 | 92.40% | 7950 | 95.20% | 8640 | 95.00% | occur while in school | Chi-square | 11.825 | |
| | Yes | 57 | 7.60% | 398 | 4.80% | 455 | 5.00% | | Sig. | .001*,b | |
| D13_OTHER Harassment: | | | | | | | | D13_OTHER Harassment: | | | |
| Reason for not contacting | | | | | | | | Reason for not contacting | | | |
| services - Other | No | 647 | 86.70% | 7314 | 87.60% | 7961 | 87.50% | services - Other | Chi-square | 0.491 | |
| | Yes | 99 | 13.30% | 1034 | 12.40% | 1134 | 12.50% | | Sig. | .483b | |

| D14 FRIEND Harassment: | | | | | | | | D14 FRIEND Harassment: | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------------------------------|------------|---------|--|
| Who else told - Friend | No | 179 | 21.10% | 2499 | 27.40% | 2678 | 26.90% | Who else told - Friend | Chi-square | 15.523 | |
| | Yes | 668 | 78.90% | 6619 | 72.60% | 7287 | 73.10% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| D14 FAMILYMEM | | | | | | | | D14 FAMILYMEM | - 0 | | |
| Harassment: Who else told - | | | | | | | | Harassment: Who else told - | | | |
| Family | No | 705 | 83.20% | 7465 | 81.90% | 8170 | 82.00% | Family | Chi-square | 0.976 | |
| | Yes | 142 | 16.80% | 1653 | 18.10% | 1795 | 18.00% | | Sig. | .323b | |
| D14_FACULTY Harassment: | | | | | | | | D14_FACULTY Harassment: | | | |
| Who else told - Faculty | No | 834 | 98.50% | 8829 | 96.80% | 9664 | 97.00% | Who else told - Faculty | Chi-square | 7.047 | |
| | Yes | 13 | 1.50% | 289 | 3.20% | 302 | 3.00% | | Sig. | .008*,b | |
| D14_SOMEONEELSE | | | | | | | | D14_SOMEONEELSE | | | |
| Harassment: Who else told - | | | | | | | | Harassment: Who else told - | | | |
| Someone else | No | 778 | 91.90% | 8374 | 91.80% | 9152 | 91.80% | Someone else | Chi-square | 0.001 | |
| | Yes | 69 | 8.10% | 745 | 8.20% | 813 | 8.20% | | Sig. | .981b | |
| D14_DIDNTTELL Harassment: | | | | | | | | D14_DIDNTTELL Harassment: | | | |
| Who else told - Didn't tell | No | 687 | 81.10% | 6803 | 74.60% | 7490 | 75.20% | Who else told - Didn't tell | Chi-square | 17.576 | |
| | Yes | 160 | 18.90% | 2316 | 25.40% | 2476 | 24.80% | | Sig. | .000*,b | |
| E1 Stalking - Unwanted calls | | | | | | | | E1 Stalking - Unwanted calls | | | |
| emails texts or social media | Yes | 99 | 5.80% | 877 | 6.40% | 976 | 6.30% | emails texts or social media | Chi-square | 0.703 | |
| | No | 1597 | 94.20% | 12909 | 93.60% | 14506 | 93.70% | | Sig. | .402a | |
| E2 Stalking - Unwanted | | | | | | | | E2 Stalking - Unwanted | | | |
| waiting for or following | Yes | 229 | 13.50% | 1296 | 9.40% | 1525 | 9.90% | waiting for or following | Chi-square | 28.591 | |
| | No | 1466 | 86.50% | 12480 | 90.60% | 13947 | 90.10% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E3 Stalking - Spying in person | | | | | | | | E3 Stalking - Spying in person | | | |
| or using devices | Yes | 115 | 6.90% | 831 | 6.10% | 946 | 6.10% | or using devices | Chi-square | 1.634 | |
| | No | 1563 | 93.10% | 12883 | 93.90% | 14445 | 93.90% | | Sig. | .201a | |
| E11_DIDNOTKNOW Reason | | | | | | | | E11_DIDNOTKNOW Reason | | | |
| for not contacting services - | | | | | | | | for not contacting services - | | | |
| Didn't know who or where to | | | | | | | | Didn't know who or where to | | | |
| go | No | 48 | 52.00% | 573 | 79.80% | 620 | 76.70% | go | Chi-square | 34.805 | |
| | Yes | 44 | 48.00% | 145 | 20.20% | 189 | 23.30% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E11_EMBARRASSED Reason | | | | | | | | E11_EMBARRASSED Reason | | | |
| for not contacting services - | | | | | | | | for not contacting services - | | | |
| Embarrassed Ashamed | | | | | | | | Embarrassed Ashamed | | | |
| Emotionally Difficult | No | 62 | 68.00% | 617 | 86.00% | 680 | 84.00% | Emotionally Difficult | Chi-square | 19.331 | |
| | Yes | 29 | 32.00% | 100 | 14.00% | 130 | 16.00% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E11_NOTBELIEVE Reason for | | | | | | | | E11_NOTBELIEVE Reason for | | | |
| not contacting services - | | | | | | | | not contacting services - | | | |
| Would not be believed | No | 69 | 75.00% | 647 | 90.10% | 716 | 88.40% | Would not be believed | Chi-square | 18.154 | |
| | Yes | 23 | 25.00% | 71 | 9.90% | 94 | 11.60% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E11_NOTSERIOUS Reason for | | | | | | | | E11_NOTSERIOUS Reason for | | | |
| not contacting services - Not | | | | | | | | not contacting services - Not | | | |
| serious enough to report | No | 24 | 25.90% | 262 | 36.50% | 285 | 35.30% | serious enough to report | Chi-square | 3.864 | |

| E11 NOTROUBLE Reason for | | | | | | | | E11 NOTROUBLE Reason for | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|--------|-----|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|
| not contacting services - Did | | | | | | | | not contacting services - Did | | | |
| not want to get perp in | | | | | | | | not want to get perp in | | | |
| trouble | No | 62 | 68.00% | 604 | 84.10% | 666 | 82.30% | trouble | Chi-square | 14.192 | |
| | Yes | 29 | 32.00% | 114 | 15.90% | 143 | 17.70% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E11 CONSEQUENCES Reason | | | | | | | | E11 CONSEQUENCES Reason | 0 | | |
| for not contacting services - | | | | | | | | for not contacting services - | | | |
| Feared social consequences | No | 69 | 75.00% | 568 | 79.10% | 637 | 78.70% | Feared social consequences | Chi-square | 0.82 | |
| | Yes | 23 | 25.00% | 150 | 20.90% | 173 | 21.30% | | Sig. | .365a | |
| E11_NOTHINGDONE Reason | | | | | | | | E11_NOTHINGDONE Reason | | | |
| for not contacting services - | | | | | | | | for not contacting services - | | | |
| Nothing would be done | No | 17 | 18.90% | 456 | 63.60% | 474 | 58.50% | Nothing would be done | Chi-square | 67.126 | |
| | Yes | 74 | 81.10% | 261 | 36.40% | 336 | 41.50% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E11_NOTCONFIDENTIAL | | | | | | | | E11_NOTCONFIDENTIAL | | | |
| Reason for not contacting | | | | | | | | Reason for not contacting | | | |
| services - Would not be | | | | | | | | services - Would not be | | | |
| confidential | No | 69 | 75.00% | 652 | 90.90% | 721 | 89.10% | confidential | Chi-square | 21.356 | |
| | Yes | 23 | 25.00% | 65 | 9.10% | 88 | 10.90% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E11_OFFCAMPUS Reason for | | | | | | | | E11_OFFCAMPUS Reason for | | | |
| not contacting services - Did | | | | | | | | not contacting services - Did | | | |
| not occur on campus | No | 77 | 84.00% | 556 | 77.50% | 633 | 78.20% | not occur on campus | Chi-square | 1.87 | |
| | Yes | 15 | 16.00% | 162 | 22.50% | 176 | 21.80% | | Sig. | .171a | |
| E11_NOTOCCURSCHOOL | | | | | | | | E11_NOTOCCURSCHOOL | | | |
| Reason for not contacting | | | | | | | | Reason for not contacting | | | |
| services - Did not occur while | | | | | | | | services - Did not occur while | | | |
| in school | No | 92 | 100.00% | 679 | 94.60% | 771 | 95.20% | in school | Chi-square | 5.25 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 39 | 5.40% | 39 | 4.80% | | Sig. | .022a,*,c | |
| E11_OTHER Reason for not | | | | | | | | E11_OTHER Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Other | No | 60 | 65.10% | 608 | 84.70% | 668 | 82.50% | contacting services - Other | Chi-square | 21.366 | |
| | Yes | 32 | 34.90% | 110 | 15.30% | 142 | 17.50% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E12_FRIEND Who else told - | | | | | | | | E12_FRIEND Who else told - | | | |
| Friend | No | 0 | 0.00% | 87 | 9.20% | 87 | 8.30% | Friend | Chi-square | 10.739 | |
| | Yes | 107 | 100.00% | 858 | 90.80% | 965 | 91.70% | | Sig. | .001a,* | |
| E12_FAMILYMEM Who else | | | | | | | | E12_FAMILYMEM Who else | | | |
| told - Family | No | 37 | 34.10% | 524 | 55.50% | 561 | 53.30% | told - Family | Chi-square | 17.581 | |
| | Yes | 71 | 65.90% | 420 | 44.50% | 491 | 46.70% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E12_FACULTY Who else told - | | | | | | | | E12_FACULTY Who else told - | | | |
| Faculty | No | 107 | 100.00% | 824 | 87.20% | 931 | 88.50% | Faculty | Chi-square | 15.481 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 121 | 12.80% | 121 | 11.50% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| E12_SOMEONEELSE Who else | | | | | | | | E12_SOMEONEELSE Who else | | | |
| told - Someone else | No | 93 | 86.30% | 782 | 82.80% | 875 | 83.10% | told - Someone else | Chi-square | 0.779 | |
| | Yes | 15 | 13.70% | 163 | 17.20% | 177 | 16.90% | | Sig. | .377a | |

| E12_DIDNTTELL Who else told | | | | | | | | E12_DIDNTTELL Who else told | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|----------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|
| - Didn't tell | No | 107 | 100.00% | 866 | 91.70% | 973 | 92.50% | - Didn't tell | Chi-square | 9.671 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 79 | 8.30% | 79 | 7.50% | | Sig. | .002a,* | |
| F1 IPV - Partner controlled or | | | | | | | | F1 IPV - Partner controlled or | | | |
| tried to control you | Yes | 75 | 6.80% | 936 | 8.60% | 1011 | 8.40% | tried to control you | Chi-square | 4.595 | |
| | No | 1041 | 93.20% | 9959 | 91.40% | 11000 | 91.60% | | Sig. | .032a,*,c | |
| F2 IPV - Partner threatened to | | | | | | | | F2 IPV - Partner threatened to | | | |
| harm you someone else or | | | | | | | | harm you someone else or | | | |
| themselves | Yes | 30 | 2.70% | 664 | 6.10% | 695 | 5.80% | themselves | Chi-square | 21.675 | |
| | No | 1086 | 97.30% | 10212 | 93.90% | 11298 | 94.20% | | Sig. | .000a,*,c | |
| F3 IPV - Partner used physical | | | | | | | | F3 IPV - Partner used physical | | | |
| force against you | Yes | 45 | 4.00% | 424 | 3.90% | 469 | 3.90% | force against you | Chi-square | 0.049 | |
| | No | 1071 | 96.00% | 10456 | 96.10% | 11527 | 96.10% | | Sig. | .824a,c | |
| F6 Seek medical attention | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 24 | 12.40% | 24 | 11.90% | F6 Seek medical attention | Chi-square | 1.248 | |
| | No | 9 | 100.00% | 172 | 87.60% | 181 | 88.10% | | Sig. | .264a,c | |
| F11 DIDNOTKNOW Reason for | | | | | | | | F11 DIDNOTKNOW Reason for | | | |
| not contacting services - Didn't | | | | | | | | not contacting services - Didn't | | | |
| know who or where to go | No | 71 | 67.90% | 986 | 89.20% | 1057 | 87.40% | know who or where to go | Chi-square | 40.546 | |
| | Yes | 34 | 32.10% | 119 | 10.80% | 153 | 12.60% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| F11 EMBARRASSED Reason | | | | | | | | F11 EMBARRASSED Reason | | | |
| for not contacting services - | | | | | | | | for not contacting services - | | | |
| Embarrassed Ashamed | | | | | | | | Embarrassed Ashamed | | | |
| Emotionally Difficult | No | 66 | 63.40% | 834 | 75.50% | 900 | 74.40% | Emotionally Difficult | Chi-square | 7.211 | |
| , | Yes | 38 | 36.60% | 271 | 24.50% | 309 | 25.60% | , | Sig. | .007a,* | |
| F11 NOTBELIEVE Reason for | | | | | | | | F11 NOTBELIEVE Reason for | Ű | , | |
| not contacting services - | | | | | | | | not contacting services - | | | |
| Would not be believed | No | 90 | 86.00% | 980 | 88.80% | 1070 | 88.50% | Would not be believed | Chi-square | 0.879 | |
| | Yes | 15 | 14.00% | 124 | 11.20% | 139 | 11.50% | | Sig. | .349a | |
| F11 NOTSERIOUS Reason for | - | | | | | | | F11 NOTSERIOUS Reason for | | | |
| not contacting services - Not | | | | | | | | not contacting services - Not | | | |
| serious enough to report | No | 16 | 15.40% | 422 | 38.20% | 438 | 36.20% | serious enough to report | Chi-square | 21.872 | |
| | Yes | 89 | 84.60% | 683 | 61.80% | 772 | 63.80% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| F11 NOTROUBLE Reason for | | | 2 | | | | | F11 NOTROUBLE Reason for | - 0 | | |
| not contacting services - Did | | | | | | | | not contacting services - Did | | | |
| not want to get perp in | | | | | | | | not want to get perp in | | | |
| trouble | No | 90 | 86.00% | 795 | 72.00% | 885 | 73.20% | trouble | Chi-square | 9.253 | |
| | Yes | 15 | 14.00% | 310 | 28.00% | 324 | 26.80% | | Sig. | .002a,* | |
| F11 CONSEQUENCES Reason | | 10 | 1 | 510 | 20.0075 | 327 | 20.0075 | F11 CONSEQUENCES Reason | - 0 | | |
| for not contacting services - | | | | | | | | for not contacting services - | | | |
| Feared social consequences | No | 71 | 67.90% | 913 | 82.70% | 985 | 81.40% | Feared social consequences | Chi-square | 14.395 | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Yes | 34 | 32.10% | 191 | 17.30% | 225 | 18.60% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |

| F11 NOTHINGDONE Reason | | | | | | | | F11 NOTHINGDONE Reason | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|---------|------|--------|------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|
| for not contacting services - | | | | | | | | for not contacting services - | | | |
| Nothing would be done | No | 62 | 59.10% | 816 | 73.90% | 878 | 72.60% | Nothing would be done | Chi-square | 10.657 | |
| Nothing would be done | Yes | 43 | 40.90% | 288 | 26.10% | 331 | 27.40% | | Sig. | .001a,* | |
| F11 NOTCONFIDENTIAL | 103 | 45 | 40.5070 | 200 | 20.10% | 551 | 27.4070 | F11 NOTCONFIDENTIAL | Jig. | .0010, | |
| Reason for not contacting | | | | | | | | Reason for not contacting | | | |
| services - Would not be | | | | | | | | services - Would not be | | | |
| confidential | No | 81 | 77.20% | 973 | 88.10% | 1054 | 87.20% | confidential | Chi-square | 10.363 | |
| connactitia | Yes | 24 | 22.80% | 131 | 11.90% | 155 | 12.80% | | Sig. | .001a,* | |
| F11 OFFCAMPUS Reason for | | | | | | | | F11 OFFCAMPUS Reason for | 8- | | |
| not contacting services - Did | | | | | | | | not contacting services - Did | | | |
| not occur on campus | No | 75 | 71.40% | 700 | 63.40% | 775 | 64.10% | not occur on campus | Chi-square | 2.682 | |
| • | Yes | 30 | 28.60% | 404 | 36.60% | 434 | 35.90% | | Sig. | .101a | |
| F11 NOTOCCURSCHOOL | | | | | | | | F11 NOTOCCURSCHOOL | Ŭ | | |
| Reason for not contacting | | | | | | | | Reason for not contacting | | | |
| services - Did not occur while | | | | | | | | services - Did not occur while | | | |
| in school | No | 105 | 100.00% | 1040 | 94.10% | 1144 | 94.60% | in school | Chi-square | 6.527 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 65 | 5.90% | 65 | 5.40% | | Sig. | .011a,* | |
| F11 OTHER Reason for not | | | | | | | | F11 OTHER Reason for not | | | |
| contacting services - Other | No | 105 | 100.00% | 907 | 82.20% | 1012 | 83.70% | contacting services - Other | Chi-square | 22.384 | |
| | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 197 | 17.80% | 197 | 16.30% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| F12 FRIEND Who else told - | | | | | | | | F12 FRIEND Who else told - | | | |
| Friend | No | 16 | 12.40% | 329 | 24.90% | 344 | 23.80% | Friend | Chi-square | 9.416 | |
| | Yes | 110 | 87.60% | 993 | 75.10% | 1104 | 76.20% | | Sig. | .002a,* | |
| F12 FAMILYMEM Who else | | | | | | | | F12 FAMILYMEM Who else | | | |
| told - Family | No | 91 | 72.00% | 863 | 65.30% | 954 | 65.90% | told - Family | Chi-square | 2.467 | |
| | Yes | 35 | 28.00% | 459 | 34.70% | 494 | 34.10% | | Sig. | .116a | |
| F12_FACULTY Who else told - | | | | | | | | F12_FACULTY Who else told - | | | |
| Faculty | No | 121 | 96.50% | 1264 | 95.60% | 1385 | 95.70% | Faculty | Chi-square | 0.393 | |
| | Yes | 4 | 3.50% | 58 | 4.40% | 63 | 4.30% | | Sig. | .531a | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Results are |
| | | | | | | | | | | | based on |
| | | | | | | | | | | | nonempty rows |
| | | | | | | | | | | | and columns in |
| F12_SOMEONEELSE Who else | | | | | | | | F12_SOMEONEELSE Who else | | | each innermost |
| told - Someone else | No | 115 | 91.30% | 1176 | 89.00% | 1291 | 89.20% | told - Someone else | Chi-square | 0.637 | sub table. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | *The Chi- |
| | | | | | | | | | | | square statistic |
| | | | | | | | | | | | is significant at |
| | Yes | 11 | 8.70% | 146 | 11.00% | 156 | 10.80% | | Sig. | .425a | the .05 level. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | a. Some cell |
| | | | | | | | | | | | counts in this |
| F12_DIDNTTELL Who else told | | | | | | | | F12_DIDNTTELL Who else told | | | sub table are |
| - Didn't tell | No | 110 | 87.60% | 1061 | 80.20% | 1171 | 80.90% | - Didn't tell | Chi-square | 3.69 | not integers. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | c. More than |
|-------------------------------|--------------|------|---------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|------------|---------|------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 20% of cells in |
| | | | | | | | | | | | this sub table |
| | | | | | | | | | | | have expected |
| | | | | | | | | | | | cell counts less |
| | | | | | | | | | | | than 5. Chi- |
| | | | | | | | | | | | square results |
| | Yes | 16 | 12.40% | 261 | 19.80% | 277 | 19.10% | | Sig. | .055a | may be invalid. |
| G1 Forced Rape | Yes | 95 | 5.60% | 705 | 5.10% | 800 | 5.20% | G1 Forced Rape | Chi-square | 0.677 | , |
| | No | 1604 | 94.40% | 13057 | 94.90% | 14661 | 94.80% | | Sig. | .411a | |
| G2 Attempted Rape | Yes | 96 | 5.70% | 580 | 4.20% | 676 | 4.40% | G2 Attempted Rape | Chi-square | 7.542 | |
| · · · · | No | 1598 | 94.30% | 13164 | 95.80% | 14763 | 95.60% | | Sig. | .006a,* | |
| G3 Forced Sexual Battery | Yes | 219 | 12.80% | 2222 | 16.20% | 2441 | 15.90% | G3 Forced Sexual Battery | Chi-square | 13.032 | |
| | No | 1485 | 87.20% | 11460 | 83.80% | 12945 | 84.10% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| G4 Rape by Incapacitation | Yes | 106 | 6.30% | 1181 | 8.70% | 1287 | 8.40% | G4 Rape by Incapacitation | Chi-square | 11.362 | |
| | No | 1585 | 93.70% | 12423 | 91.30% | 14008 | 91.60% | | Sig. | .001a,* | |
| G5 Sexual Battery by | | | | | | | | G5 Sexual Battery by | | | |
| Incapacitation | Yes | 114 | 6.80% | 1716 | 12.70% | 1830 | 12.00% | Incapacitation | Chi-square | 47.818 | |
| | No | 1555 | 93.20% | 11833 | 87.30% | 13388 | 88.00% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| G6 Penetration or oral sex by | | | | | | | | G6 Penetration or oral sex by | | | |
| Coercion | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 103 | 0.80% | 103 | 0.70% | Coercion | Chi-square | 12.916 | |
| | No | 1686 | 100.00% | 13434 | 99.20% | 15120 | 99.30% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| G7 Sexual Touching by | | | | | | | | G7 Sexual Touching by | | | |
| Coercion | Yes | 0 | 0.00% | 54 | 0.40% | 54 | 0.40% | Coercion | Chi-square | 6.761 | |
| | No | 1679 | 100.00% | 13404 | 99.60% | 15083 | 99.60% | | Sig. | .009a,* | |
| G8 Penetration or oral sex | | | | | | | | G8 Penetration or oral sex | | | |
| without Affirmative Consent | Yes | 87 | 5.20% | 1540 | 11.50% | 1626 | 10.80% | without Affirmative Consent | Chi-square | 61.185 | |
| | No | 1585 | 94.80% | 11850 | 88.50% | 13435 | 89.20% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| G9 Sexual Touching without | | | | | | | | G9 Sexual Touching without | | | |
| Affirmative Consent | Yes | 197 | 11.80% | 2434 | 18.20% | 2631 | 17.50% | Affirmative Consent | Chi-square | 42.628 | |
| | No | 1476 | 88.20% | 10934 | 81.80% | 12409 | 82.50% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| I1 How likely other students | | | | | | | | I1 How likely other students | | | |
| support student reporting sex | | | | | | | | support student reporting sex | | | |
| misconduct | Not at all | 25 | 1.50% | 141 | 1.10% | 166 | 1.10% | misconduct | Chi-square | 2.581 | |
| | Any Response | 1607 | 98.50% | 12855 | 98.90% | 14462 | 98.90% | | Sig. | .108a | |

| I2 How likely offender | | | | | | | | I2 How likely offender | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|
| retaliate against student | Net et ell | | 7 200/ | 606 | F 400/ | 010 | 5.00/ | retaliate against student | Chianna | 0.202 | |
| reporting sex misconduct | Not at all | 114 | 7.20% 92.80% | 696 12144 | 5.40% 94.60% | 810 13618 | 5.60% 94.40% | reporting sex misconduct | Chi-square | 8.282 .004a,* | |
| | Any Response | 1473 | 92.80% | 12144 | 94.60% | 13618 | 94.40% | 12 Have likely as many affinish | Sig. | .004a,* | |
| 13 How likely campus officials | | | | | | | | 13 How likely campus officials | | | |
| support student reporting sex | | | 5 2004 | | 2.000/ | | 2 2001 | support student reporting sex | <u>.</u> | 22.027 | |
| misconduct | Not at all | 82 | 5.20% | 375 | 2.90% | 457 | 3.20% | misconduct | Chi-square | 23.037 | |
| | Any Response | 1505 | 94.80% | 12434 | 97.10% | 13939 | 96.80% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| 14 How likely campus officials | | | | | | | | 14 How likely campus officials | | | |
| protect the safety of student | | | | | | | | protect the safety of student | | | |
| reporting sex misconduct | Not at all | 89 | 5.60% | 404 | 3.20% | 494 | 3.40% | reporting sex misconduct | Chi-square | 25.542 | |
| | Any Response | 1498 | 94.40% | 12381 | 96.80% | 13879 | 96.60% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| 15 How likely campus officials | | | | | | | | 15 How likely campus officials | | | |
| conduct fair investigation | Not at all | 84 | 5.40% | 461 | 3.60% | 545 | 3.80% | conduct fair investigation | Chi-square | 11.769 | |
| | Any Response | 1480 | 94.60% | 12300 | 96.40% | 13780 | 96.20% | | Sig. | .001a,* | |
| 16 How likely campus official | | | | | | | | 16 How likely campus official | | | |
| take action against offender | Not at all | 118 | 7.60% | 847 | 6.70% | 965 | 6.80% | take action against offender | Chi-square | 1.748 | |
| | Any Response | 1442 | 92.40% | 11846 | 93.30% | 13288 | 93.20% | | Sig. | .186a | |
| 17 How likely campus officials | | | | | | | | 17 How likely campus officials | | | |
| address factors leading to sex | | | | | | | | address factors leading to sex | | | |
| misconduct | Not at all | 75 | 4.80% | 1093 | 8.70% | 1167 | 8.30% | misconduct | Chi-square | 27.321 | |
| | Any Response | 1482 | 95.20% | 11497 | 91.30% | 12979 | 91.70% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
| Saw or heard Sexual violence | | | | | | | | Saw or heard Sexual violence | Ŭ | , | |
| What did you do | Nothing | 171 | 50.60% | 1877 | 53.70% | 2048 | 53.40% | What did you do | Chi-square | 1.177 | |
| | Took Action | 167 | 49.40% | 1620 | 46.30% | 1786 | 46.60% | ,, | Sig. | .278a | |
| | rookritetion | 107 | 1311070 | 1020 | 1010070 | 1,00 | 1010070 | | 0.8. | 12700 | Results are |
| | | | | | | | | | | | based on |
| | | | | | | | | | | | nonempty rows |
| | | | | | | | | | | | and columns in |
| Saw a drunken encounter | | | | | | | | Saw a drunken encounter | | | each innermost |
| What did you do? | Nothing | 237 | 61.30% | 3999 | 67.90% | 4236 | 67.50% | What did you do? | Chi-square | 7.355 | sub table. |
| | | 207 | 01100/0 | 5555 | 0715070 | .250 | 0710070 | | om oquare | 7.000 | *The Chi- |
| | | | | | | | | | | | square statistic |
| | | | | | | | | | | | is significant at |
| | Took Action | 150 | 38.70% | 1890 | 32.10% | 2039 | 32.50% | | Sig. | .007a,* | the .05 level. |
| | TOOK ACTION | 130 | 30.70% | 1050 | 32.10% | 2039 | 32.30% | | Jig. | .007a, | a. Some cell |
| | | | | | | | | | | | counts in this |
| | | | | | | | | | | | sub table are |
| | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | not integers. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | They were |
| Guenested accoult What did | | | | | | | | Cuspected second: M/bct -11-1 | | | rounded to the |
| Suspected assault What did | No the imp | 110 | 22.000 | 704 | 22.0001 | 000 | 24.000 | Suspected assault What did | Chi anna | 10 445 | nearest integer |
| you do? | Nothing | 118 | 32.60% | 791 | 23.00% | 909 | 24.00% | you do? | Chi-square | 16.415 | before the |

| | Took Action | 244 | 67.40% | 2642 | 77.00% | 2886 | 76.00% | | Sig. | .000a,* | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|--------|------|--------|----------------------------|------------|---------|------------------|
| you do? | Nothing | 118 | 32.60% | 791 | 23.00% | 909 | 24.00% | you do? | Chi-square | 16.415 | Chi-square test. |
| Suspected assault What did | | | | | | | | Suspected assault What did | | | computation of |
| | | | | | | | | | | | before the |
| | | | | | | | | | | | nearest integer |
| | | | | | | | | | | | rounded to the |
| | | | | | | | | | | | They were |
| | | | | | | | | | | | not integers. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | sub table are |
| | | | | | | | | | | | counts in this |
| | | | | | | | | | | | a. Some cell |