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Executive Summary

Since 2000, more than 40% of adult homicides in Utah were domestic violence related (Utah Domestic Violence Coalition). To date there have not been any data collected in the state of Utah regarding public knowledge and attitudes concerning domestic violence. As part of the Utah State University Transforming Communities Initiative, Drs. Jess Lucero, Jennifer Roark, Vonda Jump, and Terry Peak worked with stakeholders to study knowledge, perceptions, and stigma about Domestic Violence in Utah and in their community. The purpose of this study was to understand how the community perceives domestic violence and their knowledge of resources available to the community.

Utah State University Junior social work students throughout Utah, gathered data through community canvassing in the Cache Valley community, online survey distribution with various community and religious organizations, and throughout social media survey recruitment. After data was gathered, STATA software was used to analyze the data received. Students analyzed the data and completed educational outreach presentations to communities around our state, informing community members and leaders across Utah. The following is an overview of the findings for Cache County.

Overview of Findings

- The majority of persons responding to this survey, were white (86.2%), female (68.4%), and born in the United States (91.6%).
- 46.5% of respondents reported to having seen or heard about a domestic violence incident 1-2 times in the past 12 months.
- Respondents agreed that domestic violence is a community problem that must be stopped but did not perceive domestic violence to be a major problem in their neighborhood.
- Domestic violence was listed as the third largest issue community members are worried about, behind air quality and pornography.
- Respondents were most unfamiliar with state and national domestic violence services and the resources they provided.
- 70.7% of respondents reported that they would contact the police if a friend or neighbor needed help regarding domestic violence, whereas only 59.9% reported they would contact the police if they needed help regarding domestic violence.
- Not wanting the police to take away children was listed as the largest barrier to contacting law enforcement in a domestic violence situation.
- Embarrassment over people finding out about a domestic violence situation was identified as the largest barrier to seeking help.
BACKGROUND

Intimate partner violence (IPV) continues to be a pervasive public health problem in the United States with 25% of women and 14% of men reporting they have been the victim of some form of IPV (Breiding, Black, & Ryan, 2008). The occurrence of IPV has deleterious health, social and economic effects (Golding, 1999; Rossman, 2001; Grych, Jouriles, Swank, McDonald, & Norwoord, 2002) and thus has sweeping effects on our communities. While the definition of IPV has expanded to include violence perpetrated by women and same-sex violence, there remains a disproportionate rate of male-to-female violence (Breiding, Black, & Ryan, 2008; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Women have reported nearly three times the prevalence of physical violence as men across their lifetimes (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). In 2005, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), found that 1 in 4 women and 1 in 7 men report having been the victim of some form of IPV (Breiding, Black, & Ryan, 2008). The CDC defines IPV as threatened, attempted, or completed physical or sexual violence, and emotional abuse in the context of physical or sexual violence (Saltzman, Fanslo, McMahon & Shelley, 1999). Studies abound which examine the intra- and interpersonal context of IPV (Swan, Gambone, Fields, Sullivan, & Snow, 2005; Humphreys, & Thiara, 2003; Lindgren, & Renck, 2008); while these are highly useful in designing appropriate individual-level interventions, there is a need for further research that conceptualizes IPV from a community perspective in order to inform community-level interventions. By gaining the general public’s perceptions (knowledge and attitudes) regarding IPV, we can help community-based anti-violence agencies tailor community responses to violence against women. While this sort of work is important at various scales (i.e., national, state, and local), it may be most influential at the local level. To date, there have not been any data collected in the state of Utah regarding public knowledge and attitudes concerning domestic violence. These data are critical in order to inform future educational outreach efforts and community responses aimed at increasing public awareness of domestic violence. To this end, we propose a community-based research (CBR) project that will involve a partnership between numerous anti-violence agencies and Utah State University’s Social Work Program that will focus on students’ collection, analysis, and application of data that assesses public knowledge and attitudes of domestic violence among Utah residents.

Community-based research is a collaborative research effort in which academic and community partners share in all aspects of the research process (Israel, Schelz, Parker, & Becker, 1998). In social work, CBR promotes social action and data-driven prevention/intervention strategies. CBR projects can facilitate long-lasting university-community partnerships and provide opportunities for students to be actively engaged in meeting the needs of their communities through research (Cooke & Thorme, 2011). The purpose of this research is twofold: (1) To involve undergraduate social work students in a community-based research (CBR) project that will involve a partnership with numerous anti-violence agencies with the intention of providing students a learning opportunity related to data-driven community work; and (2) to assess the public’s attitudes and knowledge concerning domestic violence among Utah residents.

Research Questions

Below we describe our proposed research aimed at both the general public and the Utah Human Service Agencies.
1) What knowledge does the general public have concerning domestic violence (e.g., definitions, perceptions of prevalence, resources for help-seeking, etc.)?

2) What attitudes do the general public hold concerning domestic violence (e.g., level of denial, perceptions of effectiveness of community responses)?
METHODS

Although this report details the results from the Cache County surveys, this project was a smaller portion of a larger project surveying areas throughout Utah. The methods describe the entire state-wide project. For the Cache County findings, we used neighborhood canvassing, social media, and community organization outreach. Sixty percent of the surveys were collected via the neighborhood canvassing efforts, 22% were collected through social media, and 18% were collected through community and religious organizations.

Design

This project includes a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design wherein members of Utah’s general public were asked to provide their survey responses (hard copy or online) to a series of questions aimed at assessing their attitudes and knowledge regarding domestic violence.

Student Training

In collaboration with numerous anti-violence agencies and under the direction of Assistant Professor Jessica Lucero and Clinical Assistant Professor, Jenifer Evers, approximately 75 undergraduate social work students were trained in quantitative survey methods and data analysis. Students were CITI certified by the first week of class in the spring 2016 semester. For every component of the research project, students were trained in how to competently engage in research. In particular, there was one dedicated class period for each stage of the sampling plan wherein students were trained in how to respond to potential challenges that may arise as well as how to competently and respectfully interact with potential survey respondents at their doorstep, over the phone, via email and through social media channels.

Sampling

The general public sample was recruited for survey participation in 3 separate ways: (1) through direct neighborhood canvassing efforts in Logan, Price, Moab, Brigham City and Tooele; (2) through social media survey recruitment efforts in Salt Lake City, Ogden, and Provo; and (3) through online survey distribution efforts with various community and religious organizations in the aforementioned cities. The ultimate goal of this three-pronged sampling plan was to obtain a sample of individuals who were diverse in race, socioeconomic status, and religion. We have students in Logan, Moab, Price, Tooele, and Brigham City, Utah. In these cities, we used a stratified sampling technique wherein we identified neighborhoods (operationalized as block groups according to Census data) based on income and racial/ethnic diversity. Student researchers canvassed in-person to administer surveys in each city from a neighborhood in each strata (i.e., high, middle, low-income; higher proportion White, moderate proportion White; and low proportion White). Cut-off points were determined by calculating geographic area tercile points for the Census indicators in question.

In order to collect data from other cities in the state (i.e., Salt Lake City, Ogden, and Provo), we used social media survey promotion methods aimed specifically at regions of the state in which we do not have students. For this mode of data collection, all students in the class were asked to promote the survey through a variety of social media channels, using standardized language and asking their social media ‘friends’ and ‘followers’ to complete the survey and ‘share’ the survey if they live in the specified regions noted above. We anticipated collecting an additional 200 surveys through this sampling strategy.
Finally, in order to ensure we collected responses from a racially, socioeconomically, and religiously diverse sample, we approached various community and religious organizations in the aforementioned cities to inquire if they would send an online link to the survey to their listservs. We anticipated collecting an additional 100 surveys using this strategy. In each of the three sampling plans, trained student researchers used structured protocols for interaction and distribute letters of information prior to conducting the survey. Additionally, survey respondents were offered an opportunity to be entered into a drawing for three $25 gift cards as a token of thanks for their participation.

**Data Analysis**

Following entry of the hard copy survey data, we used STATA software to conduct basic descriptive and bivariate statistics that summarize the knowledge, attitudes, and experiences related to domestic violence among the general public. In order to test how our various sampling strategies produced demographically disparate samples, we coded surveys according to our 3 sampling strategies. This allowed us to estimate chi-squares, and ANOVA statistics that demonstrate the similarities/differences between sub-samples. Students were involved in every step of the analyses, but especially in the interpretation and dissemination of the results.

**Data Dissemination**

In addition to providing a real-world context in which students learn to engage in macro-level research, this project has resulted in useful data that will help improve educational outreach efforts and community responses to domestic violence issues in communities across our state. At the end of the spring 2016 semester, students participated in various community outreach events across the state, informed by what they learned in class and what they learned from the research. Students were able to connect to over 600 community residents through outreach efforts in schools, at health fairs, through newspaper outreach, social media campaign, and at community meetings.
FINDINGS

The survey queried participants on six sections and about their demographics. In total there were 600 surveys either partially or fully completed in Cache County. This report will first describe the participants who took the survey and then detail their responses regarding the definition of domestic violence, the prevalence of domestic violence in Logan, important issues in Logan, community resources, the effectiveness of the community resources, and community information.

Participants’ Demographics

Gender, Age, Income, and Languages Spoken in the Home

The majority of persons responding to this survey, were white (86.2%), female (68.4%), and born in the United States (91.6%). The average age of respondents was approximately 36 years old (SD = 16.3). The oldest participant surveyed was 92 years old and the youngest was 18 years old. Additionally, the average yearly income for participants was approximately $39,000 (SD = $48,475). The least amount of income reported was zero dollars and the greatest amount of income was $500,000. Surprisingly, almost 15% of the respondents indicated that they spoke a language other than English in the home. Some of these languages included Spanish, German, Dutch, ASL, Tongan, Tagalog, and Native American dialects.

The majority of participants had at least a high school diploma or GED. Less than 1% had not graduated high school or received their GED.

---

1 It is common in survey research for participants not to complete the whole survey; thus, results are presented based on responses, not on completed surveys.
2 Participants were required to be 18 or older to complete the survey.
Relationship Status

The majority of respondents reporting being in a relationship with almost two-thirds of the participants were married and another 7% indicating they were not married, but living with their significant other. A small percentage reported an “other” relationship status (for example, engaged, in a serious relationship, or domestic partnership).

Race/Ethnicity

In spite of the overwhelmingly majority of the respondents were white (86%), the survey respondents were racially diverse when compared to the Cache County census information. The Census reports that Cache County comprises of 93% white persons and 10% reporting Hispanic or Latino origins. In this study, 2.4% of the respondents reported they were an “other” race, with the majority of those identifying as bi-racial.
Political Affiliation
Among the respondents, there was much diversity among their political affiliation. Republican affiliation was the highest among the respondents (41.3%), followed by Democrat (21.6%), Independent (20.5%), and Libertarian (4.9%). Almost 12% of the respondent reported identifying with an “other” political affiliations were constitutionalist, conservative, democratic socialist, and unaffiliated.

Religious Affiliation
The majority of respondents identified as LDS (59%), with the second largest category people identified with was “other” (for example, Agnostic, Native American religious traditions, Buddhist, Hindu, and Unitarian Universalist).
Domestic Violence Definitions
To understand how the community understands domestic violence, we asked them about what actions they believed constituted domestic violence, who they thought a domestic violence victim was, and what they thought about domestic violence.

Domestic Violence Action Definitions
For this sub-section, we asked participants how much they agreed or disagreed with fifteen statements about what domestic violence abusers often do in relationships. Specifically, we asked, “How much do you agree or disagree that the following behaviors against a person’s intimate partner (for example: spouse, live-in boyfriend/girlfriend, boyfriend/girlfriend, etc.) are considered domestic violence?” Their responses were coded on a four-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Agree; 4=Strongly Agree). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreement with the statement.

![Domestic Violence Behaviors Chart]

Domestic Violence Victims
Next, participants were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with statements about who a domestic violence victim is. Specifically, we asked, “How much do you agree with the following statements about domestic...
A victim of domestic violence is usually female. Domestic violence victims are more likely to be poor. They are less likely to have a college degree. They are less likely to be white. They are less likely to be in a same-sex relationship. They are less likely to be in a traditional marriage. They are less likely to attend religious services. They are more likely to have a mental health problem. They are less likely to be in a same-sex relationship. They are less likely to be in a traditional marriage.

Their responses were coded on a four-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Agree; 4=Strongly Agree). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreeance with the statement.
**Attitudes toward Domestic Violence**

Finally, in this section, we asked the community about nine statements about domestic violence. In contrast to the previous sub-sections, this section focused on general statements about domestic violence as a social problem. Specifically, we asked, “How much do you agree with the following statements?” Their responses were coded on a five-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreeance with the statement.

![Domestic Violence Behaviors Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes separating partners in a domestic violence situation is enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are arrested for domestic violence are less likely to do it again.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If one partner hits another partner it is probably because they were provoked.</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If convicted of domestic violence, the person should not be allowed to own a gun.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who abuses their partner often abuses their pets.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence cases are not worthwhile to intervene because the victim will return anyway.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A domestic violence victim does not have a good support network.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A domestic violence victim that chooses to stay in the abusive relationship is partially to blame.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevalence of Domestic Violence in Cache County

To understand how prevalent the community believed domestic violence to be we asked them, “In the past 12 months, how many times have you seen or heard about a domestic violence incident in Logan? This could be through friends, family, church, newspaper, radio, and so forth.”

In addition, we asked community members about domestic violence in their neighborhoods. Specifically, we asked, “How much do you agree with the following statements?” Their responses were coded on a five-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreeance with the statement.

Perceived Prevalence in Community and Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence occurs less often in my community than in other communities.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence occurs more frequently in lower income neighborhoods in my community.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my neighborhood, domestic violence is a problem.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a serious problem among teenagers.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within my religious community, domestic violence is a serious problem.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within my own racial group, domestic violence is a serious problem.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a community problem that must be stopped.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My community has resources readily available to domestic violence victims.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My community has resources available that address cultural diversity for domestic violence victims.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Issues
In an effort to understand what concerns community members, we asked community members what issues they were most worried about. We presented them with ten options and also gave them an opportunity to write in their concerns. Their responses were coded on a four-point scale (1=Not Worried; 2=Somewhat Worried; 3=Worried; 4=Very Worried). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreement with the statement.

Logan community members were the most concerned about issues that were not listed. Some issues community members were worried about were religious oppression (lack of religious tolerance and dominant religious influence into politics), GLBT issues (youth and adult services), gun violence, climate change, racism, job availability and school issues (bullying and curriculum).
Domestic Violence Community Resources

Awareness of Community Agencies

One of the main foci of this survey was to gauge how much community members were aware of community agencies that address domestic violence. Respondents were present with a list of community agencies and asked whether they knew of the agency and what domestic violence services the agency provided. Ultimately, respondents were asked to choose one option: “I am aware of this agency and know what domestic violence services they offer,” “I am aware of this agency, but do not know what domestic violence services they offer,” or “I am unaware of this agency.”

### Awareness of Community Agencies and Domestic Violence Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Aware &amp; Know of DV Services</th>
<th>Aware &amp; Don’t Know of DV Services</th>
<th>Unaware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPSA</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Family Place</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro de la Familia de Utah</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Institute of Northern Utah (FINU)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault and Anti-Violence Information (SAAVI)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Workforce Services</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Family Services</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Legal Services</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Protect Services</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cach County Victim Services</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Child and Family Services</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National DV Information Line</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organizations</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help-Seeking Behaviors

To understand who people would contact in the event of a domestic violence situation, we asked community members two questions. First, we asked, “If you needed help for your friend or neighbor regarding domestic violence who would you contact?” and then we asked, “If you needed help for yourself regarding domestic violence who would you contact?” For both questions, participants were asked to indicate either yes, no, or maybe for each person presented. We present the help-seeking findings for friends or neighbor first, and then we present the findings for help-seeking for self.

### Help-seeking for a Friend or Neighbor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone at your job/school</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Personnel</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Agency (CAPSA, SAVI, etc.)</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn't contact anyone</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Percentages do no equal 100 as respondents were given the choice of “Doesn’t Apply.”
We also asked participants what would prevent them from contacting the police, if they were in an abusive relationship. Their responses were coded on a five-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreement with the statement.

**Barriers to Police Intervention**

**Help-seeking for Self**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone at your job/school</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Personnel</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Agency (CAPSA, SAVI, etc.)</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t contact anyone</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why Community Member Would not Contact Police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have had a previous bad experience with the police.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can handle this by myself.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family would disapprove.</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police may not arrest my partner/ex-partner, which might make the situation worse.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t want the police to take my children from me.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t want my partner/ex-partner to get in trouble with the law.</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t want my children to see their mom/dad getting arrested.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Barriers to Help-Seeking**

Similar to the questions about what would prevent participants from contacting the police, we asked them, generally, “If you were in an abusive relationship what would prevent you from seeking help?” Their responses were coded on a five-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreeance with the statement.

![Why Community Member Would Seek Help](chart)

**Intervening in Domestic Violence Cases**

To understand in which situations community members would intervene in domestic violence cases, we asked how much the participants agreed with three domestic violence situations. Their responses were coded on a five-point scale (1=Very Unlikely; 2=Unlikely; 3=Neither Likely or Unlikely; 4=Likely; 5=Very Likely). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger likelihood to intervene.

![How Likely are Community Members to Intervene in Domestic Violence Situations](chart)
**Neighborhood Intervention**

We also asked community members about how effective they believe their neighborhood is addressing domestic violence. Specifically, participants were asked ten items regarding how cohesive they believe their neighborhood is and well they believe their neighborhood is in dealing with domestic violence. Their responses were coded on a five-point scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree). The average of the responses is presented below with the higher the number indicating a stronger agreement with the statement.

![Graph showing neighborhood perceptions of domestic violence](Image)
Effectiveness of Domestic Violence Agencies

The last section we asked community members was in regards to their opinions about the effectiveness of domestic violence services provided by community agencies. For each social service agency, we asked participants to rate the agency’s level of effectiveness (1=Very Effective; 2=Effective; 3=Neither Effective nor Ineffective; 4=Ineffective; 5=Very Ineffective; 6=Haven’t Heard of the Agency). We collapsed the categories into Effective, Neither, Ineffective, and Haven’t Heard of the Agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Unaware of the Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens against Physical and Sexual Abuse (CAPSA)</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Family Place (formerly Child and Family Support Center)</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro de la Familia de Utah</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Institute of Northern Utah (FINU)</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Legal Services</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault and Anti-Violence Information (SAAVI)</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Workforce Services</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Family Services</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Protective Services</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache County Victim Services</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.9% 7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Child and Family Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Domestic Violence Information Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

Based on the results, the majority of respondents perceived domestic violence to be a significant issue and were largely unaware of or unsure about the services offered by domestic violence agencies. Significant barriers to help seeking were also identified. This data can be used by social service agencies to justify need for further educational outreach about resources and inform policymakers, local city government, and community members on domestic violence, resources available, and where there are gaps in the community.

Recommendations

Various recommendations were made by the TCI Stakeholders Board during a meeting. One of the main needs identified was to ensure faith leaders, particularly those in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS) were prepared to compassionately and competently respond to the members of their church experiencing domestic violence. This study identified that nine out of ten LDS respondents reported that if experiencing domestic violence they would be most likely to seek help from a faith leader. It was proposed that more information was needed about the training LDS leaders receive about responding to domestic violence in their congregation and a work group should be formed.

These data provide a useful starting point for state officials and policy-makers who have an investment in combating domestic violence in Utah. In particular, by providing greater understanding of what the public knows and thinks about domestic violence, these results will help improve educational outreach efforts at the state level. Students analyzed the data and completed educational outreach presentations to communities around our state, reaching over 600 community members and leaders across Utah. Further outreach efforts can be conducted employing tested community toolkits.

Recommended Toolkits

- Virtual toolkit on integrating IPV education into health centers (Futures Without Violence)
- Preventing Intimate Partner Violence Across the Lifespan: A Technical Package of Programs, Policies, and Practices (CDC)
- Closing the Gap: Integrating Services for Survivors of Domestic Violence Experiencing Homelessness (National Center on Family Homelessness)

Additional resources and information about domestic violence can be found on the SAMHSA-HRSA Center for Integrated Health Solutions Intimate Partner Violence page.
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