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While literature has more recently begun to examine sexual assault against men, there is a paucity of research that examines the reporting process among gay men of color. Researchers have consistently found that gay men are more likely to be sexually assaulted than their heterosexual counterparts. After an individual is sexually assaulted, they may decide to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Homophobia has been identified as a barrier to reporting sexual assault among male sexual assault survivors, although racism has not yet been examined as a potential barrier. This study draws upon gender performativity and practice theories through an intersectional lens to provide a theoretical framework to explain barriers and facilitators perceived and experienced among gay Latino men. The aims of this study were: 1) what factors influence gay Latino men’s decision making about whether to report being sexually assaulted 2) what barriers and facilitators do gay Latino men experience when they report being sexually assaulted to legal authorities 3) how does the racial/ethnic and sexual identity of gay Latino sexual assault survivors affect how authorities respond to and address their reports of sexual assault. Fourteen men (N=14) participated in the study from six cities in the United States. Participants were recruited through a newspaper, a geosocial networking app, and personal contacts. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted either in English or Spanish. They were audio-recorded, translated and transcribed verbatim. A grounded theory approach was utilized and coding methods consistent with grounded theory methodology were conducted. Three themes emerged from the data; nine factors were identified as barriers to reporting sexual assault, eight factors as negative
repercussions experienced when reporting sexual assault and four factors as facilitators to reporting sexual assault. All men who reported being sexually assaulted experienced racism and/or homophobia by authorities. Findings revealed survivors were re-traumatized during the reporting process and did not receive medical care or social service referrals. Recommendations include training on male sexual assault, the LGBT Latinx community, culturally-cogruent and trauma-informed best practices for medical and mental health care providers, and a need for agencies to implement inclusive and clear sexual assault policies.
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1.0 Background

1.1.1 Introduction

Men, women, trans and non-binary individuals can all be survivors of sexual assault. While indispensable, the prevailing literature has focused on sexual assault against women, resulting in little research examining sexual assault against men (Davies, 2002; Du Mont et al., 2013b). Although extant literature on sexual assault prevalence rates against men has been limited and varied, research has consistently found that gay and bisexual men are more likely to experience sexual assault than their heterosexual peers (Peterson et al., 2011; Rothman et al., 2011). Although sexual assault is underreported across genders, men are less likely to report being sexually assaulted compared to women (Davies, 2002; McLean, 2013; Tewksbury, 2007). Among the litany of factors that serve as barriers for men who report being sexually assaulted, homophobia has been found to negatively influence the sexual assault reporting process (Javaid, 2015, 2017). However, researchers have not yet examined the role of racism on the sexual assault reporting process for male sexual assault survivors of color. Furthermore, no current literature has examined the role of homophobia and racism on reporting practices among gay Latino men.

The vast majority of research on sexual assault has focused on women, leaving the sexual victimization of men largely absent from the literature (Davies, 2002; Du Mont, Macdonald, White, & Turner, 2013b; Hodge & Canter, 1998; Peterson, Voller, Polusny, & Murdoch, 2011; Pino & Meier, 1999; Stermac, del Bove, & Addison, 2004; Stermac, Sheridan, Davidson, & Dunn, 1996; Tewksbury, 2007; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). As legal definitions classifying rape and
sexual assault have historically excluded men, it often has left estimating prevalence rates of male sexual victimization nearly impossible to measure (Peterson et al., 2011).

One of the most ongoing and contentious debates regarding the subject is the varied usage of the terms rape and sexual assault. At times, these terms are used interchangeably and in other instances, they are measuring two distinct violent acts or occurrences. Sexual assault has been defined as *any* sexual contact or behavior that occurs without explicit consent of the victim (RAINN, 2016). However, the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics defines sexual assault as “a wide range of victimizations, separate from rape or attempted rape. These crimes include attacks or attempted attacks generally involving unwanted sexual contact between victim and offender” (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2017; Langton & Truman, 2014). Rape has been defined as “the crime, typically committed by a man, of forcing another person to have sexual intercourse with the offender against their will” (Oxford English Dictionary, n.d.).

The U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics defines rape as “forced sexual intercourse including both psychological coercion as well as physical force. Forced sexual intercourse means penetration by the offender(s). Includes attempted rapes, male as well as female victims, and both heterosexual and same sex rape.” Rape is the highest costing crime in the United States per year costing approximately $127 billion dollars or $151,423 per survivor (National Crime Sexual Violence Resource Center, 2015).

In the United States, the operational definition of rape often varies by state, municipality and by college campus or university (LeMaire, Oswald, & Russell, 2016). Consequently, this has left prevalence rates of sexual victimization difficult to measure. Additionally, such varied usage also makes it difficult to understand the lived experiences of sexual assault survivors, as it may be unclear as to what form of sexual assault they were subjected.
The issue of whether the term sexual assault or rape should be utilized to better describe the experiences of individuals who are sexually victimized remains contested. The terminology of sexual assault is broader in scope, as it includes various forms of sexual violence. For this dissertation, I define sexual assault as encompassing all forms of sexual violence, including rape. I note the areas where the term rape is instead referenced and account for these instances, when applicable.

Although estimates on the sexual assault of men have varied, research has consistently found that gay and bisexual men are more likely to be sexually assaulted than heterosexual men (Davies, 2002; Peterson et al., 2011; Stermac et al., 1996). Estimates of lifetime sexual assault (LSA) for gay and bisexual men range from 11.8% to 54.0% and estimates of adult sexual assault (ASA) prevalence rates range from 10.8% to 44.7% for gay and bisexual men (Rothman et al., 2011). This wide range is largely a result of the inconsistent usage and varying legal definitions of the term sexual assault among the studies.

Men may experience a multitude of deleterious physical and mental health consequences resulting from being sexually assaulted. Men who are sexually assaulted have been found to experience depression, anxiety, hostility, isolation, disassociation, sexual dysfunction, and are more likely to make suicide threats, self-mutilate and engage in other risk-taking behaviors compared to men who have not been sexually assaulted (Du Mont et al., 2013; Elliot et al., 2004; Tewksbury, 2007). These negative mental health consequences may result in negative psychosocial outcomes in their employment, interpersonal relationships, romantic relationships, familial relationships, physical and mental well-being, and educational attainment.

After an individual is sexually assaulted, they may decide to report the incident to the police and/or other reporting authorities. The benefits to disclose being sexually assaulted among female
sexual assault survivors include emotional support and access to resources (Orchowski, Untied, & Gidycz, 2013; Starzynski, Ullman, Filipas, & Townsend, 2005b; S. E. Ullman, 2000; Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). However, female sexual assault survivors often experience negative responses to reporting being sexually assaulted (Ullman, 2010). Further, racism has been identified as affecting the sexual assault reporting process for Black and Latina women (Tillman, Bryant-Davis, Smith, & Marks, 2010; L. E. Walker, 1995). Since researchers have identified racism as a barrier for reporting sexual assault among women of color, it warrants an examination into the role of racism on Latino and Black male sexual survivors’ experiences during the sexual assault reporting process.

All survivors of sexual assault are likely to experience victim-blaming, have their complaints not be taken seriously, contend with unclear reporting procedures, be subject to rape myths, and encounter a litany of barriers when reporting having been sexually assaulted (Davies, 2002; Davies, 2012; DuMont, 2003; McClean, 2013; Ullman, 1995; Ullman, 1999; Ullman & Filipas, 2001; Walker, 1995; Zinzow, 2011). Recent studies have indicated that there is much improvement needed to enhance the reporting process for women and trans* sexual assault survivors (Cantor, et al., 2015; McCaskill, 2014). As there exists a paucity in research examining the experiences of gay Latino sexual assault survivors, further research is needed to examine the issues particularly salient to this population in order to best enhance the reporting process for these men.

While researchers have examined the role of racism on the reporting practices among Latina and Black women, researchers have not adequately addressed male sexual assault survivor reporting practices, particularly among gay men of color. The sparse literature that exists on male sexual assault victimization often focuses on the act of sexual assault itself. Studies have only
examined the role of homophobia on the sexual assault reporting practices among male sexual assault survivors. Men are more likely to report being sexually assaulted to authorities if they are assured they will not encounter homophobic responses, can prove their heterosexuality or conceal their sexual orientation (if they are gay) (Davies, et al., 2006; Hodge and Canter, 1998). Homophobia does influence the sexual assault reporting process, including how seriously male survivors’ complaints will be taken (Davies, 2002; Hodge & Canter, 1998; Javaid, 2015, 2017; Scarce, 1997). However, no known empirical literature exists that has examined whether racism plays a role in sexual assault reporting practices for men of color.

Addressing the needs of gay Latino sexual assault survivors during and after the reporting process will help to develop culturally congruent, trauma-informed, and evidence-based interventions salient to this population. To examine this under researched area, this dissertation focuses on the barriers and facilitators in reporting sexual assault particularly salient for gay Latino sexual assault survivors. A further inclusivity to address the specific needs of this population in sexual assault discourse, policy and practice is needed.

It is not only necessary to identify the perceived and actual barriers encountered by these men, but it is equally important to identify facilitators that may enhance the reporting process for gay Latino men. Understanding both the barriers and facilitators in reporting sexual assault among gay Latino men are necessary to best inform policy and practice. This dissertation further examined whether homophobia and racism affected the reporting process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

This dissertation addresses the following research questions:

1. What factors influence gay Latino men’s decision making about whether to report being sexually assaulted?
2. What barriers and facilitators do gay Latino men experience when they report being sexually assaulted to legal authorities?

3. How does the racial/ethnic and sexual identity of gay Latino sexual assault survivors affect how authorities respond to and address their reports of sexual assault?

Chapter 1 provides a detailed review of the literature on gay Latino sexual assault survivors. The chapter begins by providing the history of sexual assault discourse and sexual assault law and policy in the United States, demonstrating the importance of this topic to the social work profession. Chapter 2 provides a theoretical framework to explain the nuanced ways in which homophobia and racism may influence the sexual assault reporting process for gay Latino men. Further, I review the empirical literature to identify current gaps in the literature and specify where research should be focused. Chapter 3 provides the methodological approach for this dissertation, specifically how the data was collected and analyzed and a rationale for this method. Chapter 4 provides the findings from this study and a detailed discussion of the findings. Chapter 5 provides implications and recommendations for future research in this area. It concludes with an overview of the study and suggests ways of achieving social justice for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.
2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Background and Significance

2.1.1 Research on Sexual Assault of Men

Men have been largely absent from sexual assault literature, research and policy, as sexual assault literature has mainly focused on the sexual assault of women. Historically, sexual assault has been considered an act against women committed by men (Graham, 2006; Peterson et al., 2011; Stermac et al., 2004; Tewksbury, 2007). Several scholars have noted the dearth of literature examining the sexual assault of men (Davies, 2002; Du Mont et al., 2013b; Graham, 2006; Hodge & Canter, 1998; Peterson et al., 2011; Pino & Meier, 1999; Stermac et al., 2004; Stermac et al., 1996; Tewksbury, 2007; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). While discourse on the sexual assault of women is important and necessary, only recently has literature begun to address sexual assault against men (Davies, 2002; Tewksbury, 2007). Despite a growing number of studies on sexual assault against men, much of the prior empirical research has focused on adult sexual assault of men among prison and military populations (Peterson et al., 2011; Stermac et al., 1996). Adult sexual assault of gay men has been found to usually occur in two domains: as a form of intimate partner violence or in the form of a hate crime (Hodge and Canter, 1998; Stermac et al., 1996).
2.1.2 Prevalence Rates of Sexual Assault of Gay Men

Prevalence rates of sexual assault against men have been scarce and varied (Peterson et al., 2011; Pino & Meier, 1999). Considering that there has not been a uniform definition of sexual assault or rape and given the fact that legal definitions of rape have historically excluded men, it has made male sexual victimization prevalence rates nearly impossible to measure (Peterson et al., 2011). However, findings have consistently concluded that gay and bisexual men are more likely to experience sexual assault than their heterosexual counterparts (Rothman et al., 2011). Most recently, however, the 2011 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that men and women had similar prevalence rates of non-consensual sex in the prior year (Stemple & Meyer, 2014).

Although literature has varied on estimates of sexual assault against men, literature has consistently found that gay and bisexual men are more likely to be sexually assaulted than heterosexual men (Davies, 2002; Peterson et al., 2011; Rothman et al., 2011; Stermac et al., 1996). Estimates of lifetime sexual assault (LSA) for gay and bisexual men range from 11.8% to 54.0% and estimates of adult sexual assault (ASA) prevalence rates range from 10.8% to 44.7% for gay and bisexual men (Rothman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011). There are a few reasons as to why the prevalence rates of ASA vary. One reason is that the terminology and measurements used to identify and define sexual assault and rape has been varied, used interchangeably and in other instances, has been quantified differently (Peterson et al., 2011; Stemple & Meyer, 2014). Additionally, federal databases have used different scales to measure sexual assault victimization (Stemple & Meyer, 2014). For example, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) has been inconsistent in their survey questions throughout the years, and used different measurements.
to assess sexual assault, which may account for the difference of reported prevalence rates. Evolving definitions and usage of the terms sexual assault and rape has been inconsistent and differ on state and federal levels. Consequently, the shifting and evolving definition and usage of the terminology of sexual assault and rape on the state level has resulted in a mismatch with the federal government’s definition of female only rape. Some agencies could only report certain types of sexual victimization to the FBI until 2013, when the term of rape was expanded on a federal level to include additional forms of sexual violence (Stemple & Meyer, 2014). This multitude of factors account for the varying prevalence rates of adult sexual assault of men.

2.1.3 Barriers for Men in Reporting Sexual Assault

The majority of individuals who are sexually assaulted do not report being sexually assaulted to the police and/or other authorities (Meier & Nicholson-Crotty, 2006). Sexual assault is underreported in the United States and few sexual assault cases are ever prosecuted (Meier & Nicholson-Crotty, RAINN, n.d.). As is the case with women, sexual assault against men is underreported (Davies, 2002; Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; McLean, 2013; Tewksbury, 2007). However, men are less likely to report being sexually assaulted than women (Davies, 2002; McLean, 2013; Tewksbury, 2007). There are various reasons why people do not report being sexually assaulted. Such factors include: fear of retaliation, not being believed, being blamed, and not knowing what resources are available to them (Amar et al., 2014; Donnelly and Kenyon, 1996; Miller et al., 2011). These fears are justified, as reporting authorities tend to blame sexual assault survivors for being sexually assaulted (Grubb & Harrower, 2008; Strömwall, Alfredsson, & Landström, 2013).
Men are notably different in certain instances in their reasoning to forgo reporting being sexually assaulted to authorities. Often, men do not report being sexually assaulted to authorities due to concerns about perceptions of their masculinity, fear of not being taken seriously, beliefs that men cannot be raped and being blamed for being sexually assaulted (Davies, 2002; Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2006; Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; Javaid, 2016; McLean, 2013; Pino & Meier, 1999). Consistent with men being less likely to report being sexually assaulted, men fear being taken less seriously by authorities than women when reporting having been sexually assaulted (Davies, 2002; McClean, 2013). Additionally, men who are sexually assaulted may also experience difficulty locating other male sexual assault survivors as a source of support (Pino & Meier, 1999; Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006). Locating other sexual assault survivors is one form of emotional support after having been sexually assaulted. Survivors may disclose

While there is a myriad of barriers that men may encounter when reporting being sexually assaulted, research has identified facilitators to reporting sexual assault among male sexual assault survivors. Research has found that men are more likely to report being sexually assaulted if they can be assured they will not encounter homophobic responses and can prove their heterosexuality or conceal their sexual orientation (if they are gay) when reporting being sexually assaulted to authorities (Davies, et al., 2006; Hodge and Canter, 1998). A large determining factor to whether males report being sexually assaulted to authorities is whether they believe that they will be treated fairly by authorities (Javaid, 2017).
2.1.4 Influence of Racism and Homophobia in Reporting Sexual Assault

There is inconclusive evidence regarding whether men of color are more likely to be sexually assaulted than white men. As an appreciable amount of sexual assault literature has focused on women, there has been fewer research examining sexual assault of men and even less research examining sexual assault of men of color. Many studies have not demonstrated adequate sample sizes to compare rates of sexual victimization by an individual’s race/ethnicity, leaving a large gap in empirical literature. However, a consistent finding is that perpetrators of male sexual assault are usually white heterosexual men (Graham, 2006; Groth & Burgess, 1980; Isely & Gehrenbeck-Shim, 1997). Further, men are more likely to be sexually assaulted by multiple assailants in contrast to women (McLean, 2013).

Given the lack of literature on the role of racism on the reporting process for Latino and Black sexual assault survivors, the experiences of Latina and Black women may be relevant. Racism has been found to be a barrier in disclosing and reporting sexual assault among Latina and Black women who have been sexually assaulted. For Black women, racism has affected the perceived credibility and believability of Black women who report being sexually assaulted as well as a disproportionality in sentencing the perpetrators of sexual assault against Black women (Tillman et al., 2010; L. E. Walker, 1995). Latina sexual assault survivors have also been found to be less likely to disclose being sexually assaulted to mental health providers than White women and are more likely to receive negative responses from informal supports upon disclosing being sexually assaulted compared to White female sexual assault survivors. However, Latina and Black women were found to receive more emotional support from mental health providers and medical care providers than informal support networks (Ahrens, Rios-Mandel, Isas, & del Carmen Lopez,
Given that research has identified racism and different levels of emotional support received by Latina and Black women from service providers, it provides cause for examining the role of racism in sexual assault reporting practices among Latino men.

Researchers have examined whether homophobia affects the reporting process for male sexual assault survivors. It has been found that homophobia does influence whether men are likely to report being sexually assaulted and how seriously their complaints will be taken (Davies, 2002; Hodge & Canter, 1998; Javaid, 2015, 2017; Scarce, 1997). Since the perception of whether a male sexual assault survivor is gay has been found to influence whether men are believed when reporting being sexual assaulted, it may also be likely that a man’s race/ethnicity additionally influences whether they are believed by reporting authorities. Latinos have been legally discriminated against, excluded and marginalized throughout U.S. history (Hernández, 2008; Romero, 2006; Vázquez, 2010). Criminal enforcement measures have more recently been used in the criminal justice system to remove immigrants, which has disproportionately affected Latinos in the United States. Such measures have been argued to extend discrimination, exclusion and marginalization against Latinos in the United States. Specifically, these actions have further the perception of Latinos as criminals and an integral part of social chaos (Vázquez, 2010). These considerations need to be taken into account when understanding how law enforcement and other reporting authorities may have racial attitudes against Latino men.

Despite a beginning examination into the role of homophobia in sexual assault reporting practices among men, there is a paucity of research examining the role of racism in reporting practices among gay Latino and Black men. While literature has begun to address sexual assault against men, it has done little to examine the role of racism and homophobia in the sexual assault
reporting process. Currently, there is not any empirical literature examining the specific barriers that gay Latino sexual assault survivors encounter during the sexual assault reporting process. It is therefore imperative for future research to determine whether racism and homophobia factor into the sexual assault reporting process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

2.1.5 Consequences of Being Sexually Assaulted

There are various deleterious psychosocial outcomes for men that have been sexually assaulted. Adult sexual assault can result in severe and long-lasting effects for male sexual assault survivors. Gay Latino men’s mental and physical health may suffer resulting from being sexually assaulted. Men who are sexually assaulted are more likely to report depression, anxiety, hostility, isolation, make suicide threats and engage in risk taking behaviors compared with men who have not been sexually assaulted (Du Mont et al., 2013; Elliot et al., 2004; Tewksbury, 2007). Research has indicated that post-traumatic stress disorder and substance usage are associated with sexual assault (Gold, Dickstein, Marx, & Lexington, 2009). Additionally, men who are sexually assaulted are likely to have depression, flashbacks, damaged self-image and increased vulnerability (Du Mont et al., 2013b; J. Walker, Archer, & Davies, 2005a). It is evident that adult sexual assault can result in severe and long-lasting negative physical and mental health outcomes for men. Such negative social and psychological outcomes may affect their ability to function in daily society including but not limited to their employment, educational pursuits, familial relationships, and personal relationships.
2.1.6 Benefits to Disclosing Sexual Assault

There is a notable difference between disclosure and reporting sexual assault. Disclosure refers to the act of discussing the experience of being sexually assaulted to another person, regardless of whether it is to an officially recorded to a formal authority. Reporting refers to the act of discussing being sexually assaulted to a formal agency with the intent of having the report officially recorded (Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003; Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012).

There are some significant benefits for sexual assault survivors who disclose and/or report being sexually assaulted to informal and formal networks. Consistent with the other aspects of sexual assault literature, benefits to reporting has mostly been examined among female sexual assault survivors. These benefits include emotional support and access to resources (Orchowski et al., 2013; Starzynski et al., 2005b; S. E. Ullman, 2000; Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). Conversely, women who did not disclose being sexually assaulted to others were more likely to experience posttraumatic stress and higher rates of depression than those who disclosed their experience to someone (Ahrens, Stansell, & Jennings, 2010). Despite the positive benefits to disclosing to others, it has been found that such benefits can be negated for female sexual assault survivors if they receive negative responses from others (Ahrens, Stansell, et al., 2010). Research has revealed that sexual assault survivors often receive negative responses when disclosing their experiences of being sexually assaulted (S. E. Ullman, 2010). Research concerning the benefits of disclosure among male sexual assault survivors, however, has not been addressed in empirical literature. Consistent with social work values, all sexual assault survivors should be supported regardless of their choice in deciding whether to report to authorities or to disclose being sexually assaulted with informal networks.
2.2 History of Sexual Assault

To fully understand the topic of sexual assault against men, the history of sexual assault against women must be discussed. This provides a historical contextualization for the purposes of this dissertation. Sexual assault was originally conceptualized as a phenomenon only occurring against women. It is through understanding antiquated notions of sexual assault and other forms of violence against women, that we can recognize similar nuances and misunderstandings of sexual assault against men. Many of the erroneous conclusions regarding sexual assault are based in patriarchy and sexism, which has allowed for homophobia and gendered stereotypes to contribute to many misunderstandings of sexual assault against men. The history of sexual assault against women provides a contextual framework towards understanding sexual assault against men, including the lack of attention toward gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

Conceptualizations of violence against women the United States originated in the United Kingdom. The concept of “The Rule of Thumb” law was accepted practice in both the United States and the United Kingdom, beginning in the late eighteenth century, although originally coined in 1782 (Lentz, 1999). The “Rule of Thumb” allowed men to legally beat their wives with any object that was not bigger or thicker than their thumb as an accepted means of punishment. It was not until the start of 19th century that women began to publicly advocate against such forms of violence, marking the original movement against domestic violence on a national scale (Lentz, 1999).
2.2.1 The Societal Acceptance of Sexual Assault

Rape laws in the United States were modeled after legal codes in the United Kingdom, which originally conceptualized rape as an act of a man against a woman (King, Coxell, & Mezey, 2000; Mezey & King, 1987). It should be noted that rape was the first way that sexual violence was conceptualized, as other forms of sexual violence were not considered in discourse and were excluded from law. Early rape laws required that a woman's sexual history and the perception of her chastity be considered in determining whether rape had indeed occurred. These rape laws set the tone for victim-blaming, as these laws required women to prove that they were not raped and, additionally, to demonstrate good moral character (Garland, 2005; Reddington & Kreisel, 2005). Victim-blaming was part of the standard law, legally implying that women had somehow contributed to being raped (Hodgson & Kelley, 2002; Reddington & Kreisel, 2005).

Rape within a marriage was not considered possible, as laws considered women to be property of their husbands. As property of their husbands, it was believed that women consented to all activities within the marriage, consequently negating the possibility of rape. This was law in the U.S. until 1977, when Oregon became the first state to repeal the marital rape exemption law (Hanser, 2005). The Oregon law acknowledged that a woman could legally be raped by her husband in accordance with the law. Massachusetts instituted the first rape statute in 1642, where rape was legally defined as being forcible in nature. While groundbreaking, this law limited the scope of what could legally be considered rape. Rape laws varied on a state to state basis, as no federal mandate on rape had been put into place (Frieze, 1983; Hasday, 2000; Ryan, 1995; Siegel, 1995). Such inconsistencies made it difficult to measure the prevalence rates of sexual assault and difficult for sexual assault survivors to understand their legal rights.
2.2.2 Conceptualization of Sexual Assault

During the 1930s, interest in sex crimes began to gain national attention in the United States. The work of Sigmund Freud in the 1920s has also been cited as influencing societal attention to issues concerning human sexuality. Sex crimes became recognized in the public sphere in the 1930s and consequently, the conceptualization of the “sexual psychopath”, which resulted in sending perpetrators to state mental hospitals. Unfortunately, it was also during this time that victim-blaming entered into legal vernacular and was written into legislation (Reddington, 2005). It was not until the 1950s that some states began to reform the need for force to be present in the legality of defining rape, although these standards varied and remained unclear. By the 1960s, this forcible rhetoric in rape law was replaced with an ambiguous “reasonable resistance standard,” which required that survivors reasonably resist rape given the particular circumstances (Reddington, 2005). While this standard remained problematic, a shift in the conceptualization of rape had begun to take place.

As the feminist movement in the 1960s focused on the need for women to have control over their bodies, notable successes towards women’s rights were achieved. The publication of *The Feminist Mystique* in 1963, resulted in additional attention towards women's issues. It was during this time that the movement first began to tackle rape on a national level. Also notable was the establishment of the National Organization for Women (NOW) in 1966, which resulted in advocacy for women on a national scale (Odem & Clay-Warner, 1998).
2.2.3 1970s- Beginnings of the Anti-Rape Movement

The 1970s marked the beginning of the anti-rape movement in the United States, due to the success of feminists on a national level. Rape was still the main act of sexual assault that was focused on during this time period. Rape then began to be understood as an act of power, control and domination (Hodgson & Kelley, 2001; Odem and Clay-Warner, 1998; Reddington, 2005; Scarce, 2007), as opposed to an act of misguided sexuality. Notably, the first rape crisis center was founded in Washington, D.C. in 1972 (Odem & Clay-Warner, 1998).

One major achievement of the anti-rape movement of the 1970s was the reform of antiquated rape laws. Laws allowed that men could be charged with raping their wives (Bernat, 2001; Reddington, 2005). In 1974, Michigan implemented the first comprehensive rape law reform legislation in the country (Reddington, 2005; Scarce, 2007). Additionally, rape shield laws began to be implemented on a national level, which protected sexual assault survivors. Rape shield laws limited victim-blaming questions, including the requirement that a woman’s sexual history be taken into account when determining whether the crime of rape had been committed (Hodgson & Kelley, 2002; Reddington & Kreisel, 2005). Such laws were a result of feminists demonstrating that existing laws placed unfair burden on sexual assault survivors as well as severely limiting the forms of sexual assault that could be recognized under the law (Bernat, 2001).

Rape law reforms continued into the 1980s, with the majority of the efforts focused on eradicating victim blaming from sexual assault discourse and placing the burden of the blame on the perpetrators of sexual assault. By 1985, all except for two states had implemented rape shield laws in the United States (Hodgson & Kelley, 2002). Yet, there was still little to no legal acknowledgement that men could similarly be sexually victimized.
2.2.4 First Discussions of Sexual Assault Against Men

Attention to the sexual assault of men began in the late 1970s, partially due to the feminist movement which had increasingly helped to turn national attention to the subject of sexual assault. One of the first books to acknowledge sexual assault against men was published by Susan Brownmiller in 1975, which consisted of an essay addressing male rape. However, this essay only addressed male rape in prison settings. This was followed by a book in 1979, by psychologist Nicholas Groth, in which male rape was first discussed outside of a prison setting (Scarce, 1997).

While states were left to determine their own sexual assault laws and policies, often these laws were gendered, heterosexist and exclusionary in their legal definitions. Many states not only defined rape as being confined to the act of vaginal violation but simultaneously criminalized consensual sexual intercourse that involved anal penetration (Scarce, 1997). These laws served two purposes: to exclude men from being raped according to the law as well as criminalizing sex between two men. As a result, gay men were criminalized for having sex with one another and gay men failed to be protected if they had been sexually assaulted. Such policies had long-lasting effects on gay men who were sexually assaulted.

2.2.5 Legal Protections for Male Sexual Assault Survivors

There have been other policies that have offered some protections to both gay and Latino men, although these policies do not directly address sexual assault of gay Latino men. The Hate Crime Statistics Act was passed by U.S. Congress and set into law in April of 1990. The Hate Crime Statistics Act required the Attorney General to establish guidelines and collect data on
crimes that were motivated by prejudice based on race, religion, and sexual orientation, all of which were covered under the crime of forcible rape (Nolan, Akiyama, & Berhanu, 2002). This law enabled gay Latino male rape survivors to be legally protected but only if the rape could be proven to have been motivated by prejudice. Rape was still the legal term used during this time, which was limited in scope, as other acts of sexual violence were not criminalized. It should be noted that the FBI’s antiquated rape definition was still in place during this time, which did not allow for men to be raped according to the law. It was not until 2009 that the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act expanded the 1969 federal hate crimes law to cover gender, disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity as protected classes. This act was signed into law by President Obama (Kim, 2010). As with previous policies, this law criminalized sexual assault against gay Latino men but only if the sexual assault was considered to be a hate crime.

**2.2.6 1990s-Present- The Inclusion of Men in Sexual Assault Legislation**

In the 1990s, men began to be included in sexual assault legislation on a national level in the United States. The Violence Against Women’s Act (VAWA) was first implemented in 1994 and was the first comprehensive legislation to address violence against women on a federal level (Hodgson & Kelley, 2002; Reddington & Kreisel, 2005; Runge, 2013). The Violence Against Women Act was then reauthorized as VAWA 2000, as part of the Violence Protection Act of 2000, where $3.33 billion was allocated for the Violence Against Women Act 2000, which was nearly double that of VAWA 1994 (Runge, 2013). This reauthorization expanded certain programs and also created programs to combat stalking, and domestic abuse against women; yet men were still
excluded from these protections. In 2005, the Violence Against Women Act was again reauthorized and included protections for female survivors of sexual assault (Runge, 2013). However, male sexual assault survivors were still not legally protected. It was not until 2013, when Congress reauthorized and passed the Violence Against Women Act of 2013, that gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered individuals were finally protected by federal law. This legislation, however, did not explicitly include protections for their identity as Latino men, as it only covered legal protections for sexual orientation but not ethnicity. Gay Latino sexual assault survivors’ identities are still not fully protected under this law.

As previously mentioned, the FBI definition of rape was limited in its scope and failed to protect male sexual assault survivors and women from other forms of sexual violence. The original FBI definition of rape was “carnal knowledge of a female forcibly against her consent” (Koss et al., 1987). It was not until 2012 that the FBI announced it was revising its nearly 80 year old rape definition to switch to “Penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim,” which went into effect as of January 1, 2013 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2014). This was the first time that men could legally be raped according to the national government. While this definition allowed for men to be raped according the law, it still did not include other forms of sexual victimization.

2.2.7 History of Sexual Assault Response on Campuses

More recently, attention has focused on addressing sexual assault on college campuses and universities in the United States (Amar, Strout, Simpson, Cardiello, & Beckford, 2014; DeMatteo,
Galloway, Arnold, & Patel, 2015). One of the most noteworthy policies is the Clery Act, which arose from the murder and rape of Jeanne Clery at Lehigh University in 1986. The rape and murder of Jeanne Clery brought into question whether colleges and universities should be held responsible for taking preventative measures to combat violence on their campuses. As a result, colleges and universities began to legally be held liable for foreseeable criminal acts against students and laws began to be implemented to address these issues (Fisher & Sloan, 2013). In 1990, the Student Right To Know and the Campus Security Act was enacted by Congress and signed into law by former President George Bush (Fisher & Sloan, 2007). This Act required colleges and universities to publish annual campus crime statistics and security policies. In 1998, this policy was renamed the Clery Act. Additionally, the Clery Act required colleges and universities to provide more specific information, such as the location of the crime and providing daily crime logs. The Buckley Amendment Clarification of 1992 mandates that records kept by campus police and those kept for security purposes are not considered educational records and therefore are allowed for public consumption (Fisher & Sloan, 2007). The United States Department of Education established Security on Campus, Inc., which provides free assistance to students who believe that their college or university has violated their rights under the Clery Act. This organization assists survivors of sexual assault with an advocate, should their university fail to protect them. The organization’s name later switched to The Clery Center For Security On Campus (Fisher & Sloan, 2007; Fisher & Sloan, 2013).

Research investigating sexual assault on college campuses began in the 1970s and continued into the 1980s, yet men were widely excluded from this research. Research conducted by college safety advocacy groups, such as Safety On Campus, Inc., investigated and published findings revealing that colleges and universities failed to address, report and respond to sexual
assault on their campuses in order to protect their institutions’ reputations (Fisher & Sloan, 2013; Fisher & Sloan, 2007). Since the 1970s, research has continued to investigate sexual assault on college campuses and more recent data has become available (Amar et al., 2014; Fisher et al., 2003; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009; Z. J. Pérez & Hussey, 2014). Most recently, the National Climate Campus Survey by the American Association of Universities published in 2015, gave statistics concerning sexual assault on 27 campuses nationwide (Cantor et al., 2015). Recent research has indicated that colleges and universities continue to underreport sexual assault on their campuses (McCaskill, 2014; Yung, 2015).

A recent study found that many institutions in higher education failed to address sexual assault complaints in various contexts (DeMetteo et al., 2015; McCaskill, 2014). This study found that colleges and universities often had campus policies that discouraged reporting sexual assault, a lack of trained law enforcement, a lack of knowledge about sexual assault, a lack of coordinated oversight with Title IX, and a lack of best practices and procedures being followed correctly and a high number of uninvestigated cases of sexual assault complaints (DeMatteo et al., 2015; McCaskill, 2014). This study found that only 41% of colleges and universities investigated at least one complaint of sexual assault on their campus (McCaskill, 2014). Coupled with the findings that LGBT students are more at risk of experiencing unwanted sexual contact on campuses than their heterosexual counterparts (Cantor et al., 2015), it is likely that gay Latino students have reported being sexually assaulted to campus law enforcement without a formal investigation taking place. However, it has been found that many colleges and universities are ill equipped to adequately investigate or respond to sexual assault of college students (McCaskill, 2014). Campus authorities may be even more poorly equipped to address the sexual assault of gay Latino men, due to a lack of cultural competence or outright bias. Similar to the general statistics on sexual assault
victimization, the prevalence figures on sexual assault taking place on campuses varies due to a lack of consistent methodology with data collection (Yung, 2015).

2.3 Theoretical Frameworks

Lens of Intersectionality I approach the subject of sexual assault of gay Latino men and the barriers in their reporting of being sexually assaulted from an intersectional lens. In order to fully understand the plight of gay Latino sexual assault survivors, we must always take into account their ethnicity and sexual orientation. Gay Latino men may be subject to racism and homophobia throughout the entire sexual assault reporting process.

It is impossible to view gay Latino men in two distinct categories: neither their ethnicity nor sexual orientation can be isolated without considering the other, which is why we must address this phenomenon through an intersectional lens. Research on gay Black and Latino men has highlighted the need to recognize the oppression of gay men of color’s multiple identities (Malebranche, 2003; Ramirez-Valles, Kuhns, Campbell, & Diaz, 2010). Gay Latino men may experience additional stressors due to their racial/ethnic identity coupled with their identity as a gay man (R. M. Diaz, Ayala, & Bein, 2004; R. M. Diaz, Ayala, Bein, Henne, & Marin, 2001; Díaz, Bein, & Ayala, 2006; Kertzner, Meyer, Frost, & Stirratt, 2009; Sandfort, Melendez, & Diaz, 2007).

Intersectionality is a lens that can be used to capture dynamics of power (Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013). Intersectionality was originally conceptualized by Crenshaw (1991) to help explain the complex ways in which racism and patriarchy shape rape conceptualizations. Intersectionality was originally written in the legal realm and was later applied to the social
sciences and other humanities. Intersectionality addresses the complexity of identities in the ways in which they construct intertwined inequalities (Choo & Ferree, 2010). This is certainly true for gay Latino men. Since gay Latino sexual assault survivors have two marginalized identities, this lens allows a way of recognizing how both of their identities shape how the understanding of their sexual assault is conceptualized and how these men will be addressed by reporting authorities. Crenshaw (1991) originally utilized intersectionality to address rape specifically and other forms of violence against women of color, with an emphasis on Black women. While Crenshaw’s (1991) original use of intersectionality was used in the legal domain to address problems concerning Black women, it has since expanded to address other marginalized complex identities.

Rape itself is also gendered in its conceptualization as theorized by MacKinnon (1982). MacKinnon (1982) states that rape is a form of gendered violence, which is essential in understanding how gay Latino men’s oppressed identities may leave them at particular risk of being further marginalized in the sexual assault reporting process. It can be argued that MacKinnon’s (1982) conceptualization of rape may also apply to other forms of sexual assault. While Mackinnon’s original conceptualization of rape is heterosexist and limited, it does account for how rape can lead to victim blaming and how it is impossible to remove gender from the discussion. One key concept from Mackinnon (1982) is that rape is a form of violence, as opposed to a form of sexuality. This conceptualization can be applied to other forms of sexual assault as well.

One vector of intersectionality is that some bodies are valued over other bodies, particularly due to the race or ethnicity of the individual. Crenshaw (1991) argues that women of color’s bodies are less valued than those of white women, which results in their rape being taken less seriously than the rape of white women. According to this framework, gay Latino male bodies will be less
valued than white heterosexual male bodies. It can be argued that there is a similar devaluation of black and brown bodies, which would include bodies of Latino men. Crenshaw’s (1991) lens allows for a similar application to theorize how the rape of gay Latino men will similarly be dismissed. The lens of intersectionality lends explanatory power as to why gay men of color may be denied justice due to their race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. Consistent with the aims of this dissertation, this study specifically seeks to understand how racism and homophobia may influence decision making process and the sexual assault reporting process for gay Latino men.

2.3.1 Gender Performativity

Gender performativity can be useful in explaining how gay Latino men may be dismissed or blamed when they attempt to report being sexually assaulted. Gender performativity was originally proposed by Butler (1988). Butler (1988) posits that gender is socially constructed through a series of performative acts. As such, an individual’s gender is not permanent and can be performed differently at different times. Butler’s (1988) gender performativity is similar to the notion that gender can be viewed as an achievement, originally conceptualized by West and Zimmerman (1987). In many ways, Butler’s (1988) gender performativity expands and builds upon the original conceptualization of gender posed by West and Zimmerman (1987). West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that gender is constructed and achieved in its interactions with others, at risk of sanctions for non-conformity. Thus, whether one has properly achieved their gender is dependent upon the rejection or acceptance by others. This element is crucial in understanding that a gay Latino man’s gender performativity may be rejected or accepted by reporting authorities and therefore affect whether reporting authorities take their reporting of being sexually assaulted.
seriously. If reporting authorities fail to accept Latino gay men’s gender performativity, then it may be likely that their reports of being sexually assaulted will be dismissed. Consequently, these men may continue to be sexually assaulted and they may suffer additional negative mental and physical health outcomes. Consistent with prior literature, such negative outcomes include depression, anxiety and low self-esteem.

A gay Latino man’s sexual orientation also plays a crucial role in determining whether his gender performativity is accepted or rejected by reporting authorities. Butler (1988) contends that gender performativity can promote heterosexuality. Therefore, individuals who are not heterosexual or cannot perform their gender in a heterosexual context may be subject to rejection and/or punishment by others. Gay effeminate men may be more likely to be dismissed compared to masculine gay men, on account of their gender performativity. Previous studies have found that effeminate gay and bisexual Latino men were more likely to have been abused and raped by a relative and/or boyfriend/spouse than non-effeminate men (Sandfort et al., 2007). One possible way that reporting authorities may punish gay Latino men for reporting being sexually assaulted is to dismiss them and their claims as well as blaming them for being sexually assaulted in the first place. Gay Latino men be justifiably concerned that they will not be believed since they are not heterosexual men. This possibility is consistent with the literature that has indicated that men are most likely to report being sexually assaulted when they are able to prove they are heterosexual or able to hide the fact that they are gay (Davies, 2002; Hodge & Cantor, 1998).

Butler’s (1988) theory of gender performativity also lends explanatory power as to why reporting authorities may victim-blame gay Latino male sexual assault survivors for being sexually assaulted. Since one’s gender performativity can be subject to punishment, it can be argued that reporting authorities view sexual assault as an appropriate punishment for gay men that perform
their gender incorrectly. As such, reporting authorities may view sexual assault as simply a consequence of being a gay man. These reporting authorities may not believe that it is worth investigating sexual assault of gay men if they believe that these men are responsible for being sexually assaulted. Additionally, reporting authorities may not believe that gay men are worth their time and resources.

**Masculinities.** Masculinity studies is a crucial branch of gender performativity, as masculinities shape the way in which a man’s gender is perceived by reporting authorities. By understanding how masculinities are socially constructed in society and their respective power, we can better understand how these masculinities are used to perform gender. To better understand how gay Latino men are perceived when reporting being sexually assaulted, the role of masculinities and how they may influence the sexual assault reporting process must first be examined.

Masculinity is a social construct as opposed to an innate or biological production (Reeser, 2010). Literature has shown masculinities to be varied and not one single concept of masculinity can adequately encapsulate the various forms of masculinity (Pascoe and Bridges, 2016, Reeser, 2010). Reeser (2010) acknowledges that since there is no origin to masculinity, there are only free-floating copies of masculinities that can be obtained. That is, there is no sole or single origin of masculinity that exists. Masculinities can be adapted dependent upon the individual that wishes to adapt a copy of masculinities for themselves. Therefore, masculinity is something that can be possessed and lost (Pascoe & Bridge, 2016; Reeser, 2010). This concept aligns with literature that indicates that men often feel a loss of masculinity when being sexually assaulted and during the reporting process.
**Performance and Power.** Reeser (2010) contends that masculinities may also be performed, which is in accordance with masculinities falling under the theory of gender performativity posited by (Butler, 1988). Consistent with Butler (1988), a man’s masculinity through gender performativity can promote heterosexuality. “In other words, the ‘unity’ of gender is the effect of a regulatory practice that seeks to render identity uniform through a compulsory heterosexuality” (p. 31). Reeser (2010) contends that masculinity is an act of separating heterosexuality and homosexuality, which in turn creates a binary. This binary allows for a power differentiation between gay and heterosexual men. Therefore, it would appear evident that heterosexual men are afforded power by distancing themselves from gay men though their masculinity. Heterosexual men are therefore able to perform their gender by asserting their heterosexual masculinity over a gay man’s masculinity. It may be possible that heterosexual men are able to perform their gender performativity through masculinities by refusing to believe gay Latino men when they report being sexually assaulted.

**Hierarchy of Masculinities.** The hierarchical nature of masculinities is crucial in understanding the barriers gay Latino men encounter when reporting being sexually assaulted to authorities. This notion allows us to understand how masculinities are performed, as part of gender performativity in its acquisition and maintenance of power, since it is based on the relation of masculinities to one another. Pascoe and Bridges (2016) conceptualize masculinities by understanding how they function in relation to one another. “Thinking of gender in terms of relations, rather than roles, that are found in particular gender orders, as well as more specific regimes, allows us to more clearly understand complicated gendered practices, identities and representations” (Pascoe & Bridges, 2016, p.16). If we are to view masculinities in a power relational construct, then we are to recognize that inequality exists among different masculinities.
As such, a hierarchical structure among masculinities does exist, which allows for differing degrees of power afforded to each. At the top of the hierarchical structure of masculinities is hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is the exalted and culturally accepted form of masculinity that justifies dominance and inequality (Pascoe & Bridges, 2016). Hegemonic masculinity can result in the subordination of gay men. At the bottom of the hierarchical structure, exists subordinated masculinity. “Subordinated masculinity refers to configurations of masculinity with least cultural status, power, and influence” (Pascoe & Bridges, 2016, p. 18). Gay men have been used to exemplify subordinated masculinity, since they are viewed and treated as inferior to heterosexual men. This concept of subordinated masculinities can lend explanatory power towards understanding why gay Latino sexual assault survivors may not be believed by reporting authorities. Since gay men have less power than heterosexual men, they may not be believed when reporting being sexually assaulted, because of their subordinated masculinity. In addition, white heterosexual male reporting authorities may be able to assert their gender performativity through their masculinity by refusing to investigate a sexual assault claim, dismissing a sexual assault claim, and/or by blaming gay Latino men for being sexually assaulted.

**LatinoMasculinity.** A Latino’s race/ethnicity may also play a role in determining how reporting authorities respond when investigating the sexual assault of these men. While Latino masculinity is not its own theory or framework, it is important to note cultural differences in the framing of masculinities. In addition, it is important to note that Latino masculinities are lower in the hierarchy than white heterosexual masculinities. Racial and ethnic biases may affect a reporting authority’s decision to investigate a case. Latinos may be viewed as a threat to U.S. society, a concept originally posited by Chavez (2013). Chavez (2013) proposes Latino Threat Narrative. Latino Threat Narrative is a perspective based in racist and misguided beliefs that views Latinos
as posing a threat to U.S. culture. Reporting authorities may hold racist beliefs and solely view Latino men as perpetrators of violence as opposed to victims of violence, due to the history of marginalization and racism against Latinos in the United States. In addition, the ways in which Latino masculinities are performed may more subtly play a role into sexual assault reporting practices and responses.

Machismo is an important concept in understanding Latino masculinity. Latino masculinity is notably different than white masculinity. Almaguer (1993) notes that gay Latino men’s masculinity, particularly Chicano men’s masculinity, is conceptualized and scrutinized differently than the masculinity of gay men in the United States. Gay Chicanos’ sexuality is viewed as a passive/active role dichotomy as compared with the Anglo heterosexual/gay dichotomy. As with masculinities, there is no one singular concept of machismo. Certain aspects and misunderstandings of machismo may result in reporting authorities failing to believe Latino men when they report being sexually assaulted. Literature concerning the conceptualization of machismo has been varied and inconsistent (Abreu, Goodyear, Campos & Newcomb, 2000; Torres, Solberg, & Carlstrom, 2002). The initial literature on Latino masculinity, centers on the concept of “machismo”, which is the social process in which in which a boy becomes the image of his father (Abreu, Goodyear, Campos & Newcomb, 2000; Diaz, 1966). Yet, other literature has focused the discussion of “machismo” by exemplifying its exaggerated roles of hyper masculinity. Such qualities often associated with machismo are heavy drinking, toughness, promiscuity, male dominance, fearlessness, aggressiveness, stoicism, honor, respect, virility and bravado (Abreu, Goodyear, Campos & Newcomb, 2000; Torres, Solberg, & Carlstrom, 2002). However, there are also positive qualities associated with machismo – being romantic, commitment, self-assertiveness, loyalty, autonomy, respect and honor (Torres, Solberg, & Carlstrom, 2002). All the
varying conceptualizations of machismo are significant in that they may influence how Latino men cope with being sexually assaulted and their decision-making process when deciding whether to report that they have been sexually assaulted.

The exaggerated role of machismo may result in some Latino men, particularly gay Latino men, being hesitant when deciding to report being sexually assaulted – as it would take away from their masculinity and honor. As previously mentioned, studies have found that effeminate gay and bisexual Latino men were more likely to have been abused and raped by a relative and/or boyfriend/spouse than non-effeminate men (Sandfort et al., 2007). Consistent with Almaguer (1993), gay Latinos may be hesitant to report being sexually assaulted, as it would further the Latino cultural stigmatization of being passive, further taking away from their subordinated masculinity.

This concept also demonstrates how Latino masculinity, along with other masculinities, is part of gender performativity (Butler, 1988; West & Zimmerman, 1987). As machismo requires Latino men to be fearless, stoic and to demonstrate bravado (Abreu, Goodyear, Campos & Newcomb, 2000; Torres, Solberg, & Carlstrom, 2002), Latinos may be embarrassed to disclose that they have been sexually assaulted or to demonstrate vulnerability after being sexually assaulted, especially to a stranger. Latinos may also feel uncomfortable disclosing such a personal experience to a white reporting officer, as race may also factor into their level of comfortability and willingness to disclose being sexually assaulted. These conceptualizations of machismo may also unconsciously or consciously influence the reporting officer. A reporting authority may not believe that a Latino is capable of being sexually assaulted. Reporting authorities may believe that Latino men should be strong and be able to protect themselves, consistent with some conceptualizations of machismo. Even if reporting authorities believe that a Latino man has been
sexually assaulted, they may believe that he should be able to handle being sexually assaulted without needing outside interventions or resources. This attitude may influence what resources, counseling or other support are provided to gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

The other aspects of machismo should also be taken into consideration. As literature has indicated that sexual assault of gay men can be a form of intimate partner violence, it may be that gay Latinos are hesitant to report being sexually assaulted by their boyfriend or spouse because it would be considered disloyalty to the family. Since machismo is connected to honor and loyalty of the family, stepping outside to report being sexually assaulted by their spouse may be considered to violation of this value. This value may be associated with *familismo*, another central concept to Latinx culture. *Familismo* is a cultural value that includes loyalty to family, and maintaining a strong family unity (Dillon, De La Rosa, Sastre, & Ibañez, 2013; Piña-Watson, Ojeda, Castellon, & Dornhecker, 2013). As such, reporting being sexually assaulted may be in contrast with the value of *familismo*. This may vary by culture, as Latinos are not a monolithic group. Therefore, the particular family and its culture may vary and therefore have a different influence on Latino men on how to cope with being sexually assaulted as well as whether or not to report being sexually assaulted.

Thus, it is evident that sexual orientation affects one’s gender performativity in determining how receptive reporting authorities will be to them. Consequently, gay Latinos may be more likely to experience homophobic attitudes if they are perceived as being effeminate or gay by the reporting officer. Gay Latino men may be subject to victim-blaming jargon by authorities when reporting that they have been sexually assaulted. Reporting authorities may fail to take their claims seriously due to antiquated stereotypes that gay men are promiscuous, flamboyant, effeminate, and overly dramatic. Police, lawyers, campus safety officers, campus police and other university
administrators may not accept a gay man’s gender performativity and reject it by failing to validate his concerns or failing to conduct a fair investigation. It is likely that gay Latino men may feel vulnerable, helpless and perhaps feel even more powerless after being dismissed by reporting authorities when attempting to report being sexually assaulted.

2.3.2 Practice Theories

Another theoretical framework that is useful to explain the complex process of reporting sexual assault and the reactions by reporting authorities is through practice theories. Practice theories are particularly useful to explain how individuals may have different and unique experiences compared to one another as well as during different points of the reporting process. Practice theories can provide a framework towards understanding the barriers and facilitators experienced by gay Latino sexual assault survivors throughout the entirety of the reporting process. More specifically, practice theories account for how their experience may shift at different points during the reporting process and be reacted to differently by different individuals even within the same agency. Additionally, practice theories also address the power imbalance between the two agents (the survivors and reporting authority) and how the power imbalance may affect the survivor’s experience when reporting being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Last, practice theories address the influence of the structure of the reporting agency.

Practice-oriented frameworks originated in the 1970s and have been used to explain phenomena in varied topics such as language, policy-making and culture. There is not a singular practice theory or singular approach to theorizing practice; various theorists have approached to
explain practice differently, each emphasizing a different aspect or nuanced way of making sense of the daily interactions in the world. Although there are notable differences among theorists in their approaches towards explaining practices, there are a few dominant among practice theories. Practice theories highlight the importance of activity, performances and creation on all aspects of social life (Nicolini, 2012). Practice theories depart themselves from other disciplines in that they attempt to solve problems of the social world, often by addressing the inherent inequalities and power dynamics in dualisms. Theorists such as Ortner (1984), address power imbalances within dualisms. Ortner (1984) acknowledges that all actions can have intentional or unintentional consequences within the social system. Practice theories heavily focus on the power imbalances within the social world (Nicolini, 2012).

Additionally, practice theories focus on daily activities that allow for the function of social order. Practice theories heavily account for the dualisms and the interactions between them (Nicolini, 2012). Practice theory views much of the social world in terms of structure and agency. Furthermore, organizations and institutions are considered to only be created into existence by a series of repetitive actions and performances. As practice theories are centered on activities and view social order as inherently relational, organizations and structures are primarily viewed by actions among dualisms. Practice theory posits social organizations and structures can only exist through the actions of dualisms (Nicolini, 2012; Ortner, 1984).

While much focus is placed on dualisms, practice theories also provide for individual agency and performance. Practice theories acknowledge the agency that individual actors have within their social structures and thus the resulting outcome within their respective dualisms (Nicolini, 2012). One important concept to the sexual assault reporting process is the individual agency that players have within their social structures. This concept acknowledges that sexual
assault survivors can choose to report being sexually assaulted and reporting authorities can choose
the ways in which they respond to sexual assault survivors.

One applicable practice theory-oriented approach towards understanding the reporting
process among gay Latino sexual assault survivors, is the approach set forth by Bourdieu (1977). Bourdieu (1977) set forth a praxis to contend between the notions of subjectivism and objectivism through a practice-oriented approach. This allowed for an explanation of recurring practices of everyday life and the actions that constituted them without having to address them in dichotomous
terms. As such, Bourdieu (1977) posited his notion of habitus, a theoretical model which can
account for the regularity, coherence and order in human conduct (Nicolini, 2012, p. 55). Habitus allows for a placement of agents and their interactions within the social environment. Thus, reporting authorities (agents) are subject to the structures in which they belong (social environments). Bourdieu (1977) postulates that practice can only be created through three elements: habitus, capital and field. Capital is broadly defined as material and non-material sources that have value and afford a power differential (Nicolini, 2012). Bourdieu (1977) contends that capital occurs in social formations. Fields are defined as semi-autonomous and structured spaces which are shaped by social capital, allowing for the distribution of power and legitimacy. Practice is only achieved through the interactions among these three elements.

The notion of power imbalances and the distribution of power through repetitive actions is
crucial towards explaining the negative reactions to gay Latino sexual assault survivors by reporting authorities. After sexual assault survivors report to authorities (action) they are thus unintentionally affording power to the reporting authority, which is consistent with Ortner (1984). Thus, a power imbalance is created by this action. The reporting authority through their agency can afford value or power to survivors and/or their reports of sexual assault. Conversely, reporting
authorities can also chose through their agency to deny them power. Specifically, reporting authorities can also use their power to take action or by refusing to take any action to assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors. These actions function within the dualism of the interactions between the reporting authority and the survivor. These interactions allow for power to be afforded or denied throughout the sexual assault reporting process, which can be intentional or unintentional in nature (Ortner, 1984). This power imbalance can be further heightened by homophobia and racism within the habitus (Bourdieu, 1977).

The sexual assault reporting process among gay Latino men can also be explained by the approach set forth by Bourdieu (1977). Practice theory specifically explains how men may have different and varied experiences among one another. It also provides an explanatory framework to how one’s experience in reporting may shift due to one individual action by a particular agent. This is accounted for by Bourdieu’s (1977) habitus. Each individual actor may have a different experience since each agent can choose how they act and react to the other agent. Reporting authorities may choose to support or to react negatively to gay Latino sexual assault survivors in various forms. A reporting authority may have a homophobic or racist reaction to a gay Latino sexual assault survivor who reports being sexually assaulted and choose to act through physical or verbal abuse or perhaps choose to ignore them. One agent (reporting authority) may also react differently at different points during the reporting process, in accordance with practice theory. The survivor then can choose on how they react to the reporting authorities’ reactions and this is also subject to shift during the reporting process, in accordance with Bourdieu (1977).

The reporting authority’s reaction may influence the survivors’ reactions during the reporting process. The performance by both actors explain how the reporting process is continual and subject to variation. Each agent has individual agency in how they act within the given social
structure. This is explained through practice theory’s postulation of dualisms. As the reporting procedure can be complex and often constitutes multiple processes, the interactions between the reporting authorities and survivors are constantly produced through their individual agency continuously throughout the reporting process.

The structure in which the actors are placed are another key element of practice theory. The structures must also be understood within dualisms – both within the dualism between the actors themselves and the actors and their structures. These dualisms must be considered when assessing the agency that the actors choose between each other and the relationship between the agency and the structure. Certain structures may now allow for individual agency to be expressed or place limitations on the agency that the actor feels they can exhibit. Secondly, one must also consider the tension between the actor and the structure. Certain structures may have historic and contemporary contention with one another – one account of the agent’s individual characteristics. Specifically, law enforcement agencies may have a contentious relationship with Latino men due to a history of racism between police and racial/ethnic persons. Medical care providers may have a tension between their agencies and gay men, on account of a history of stigmatization and medical mistreatment of gay men in the United States. The tension between agency and structure cannot be overlooked; as such tension may subconsciously influence the decisions of the agents involved throughout the process. The structure may also have certain rules or polices imbedded in racism and homophobia, which may influence the environment of the given structure as well as the agency that even well-intended actors may have within their agency.

Bourdieu (1977) contends that practice only occurs through the habitus, capital and field. This applies to the sexual assault reporting process among gay Latino men. Gay Latino sexual assault survivors must negotiate their capital (social capital) and access to capital (resources)
within the field (the agency’s structure). The structure, consistent with practice theories, is only allowed through the actions of other players. These approaches explain how structural inequalities are reproduced through the actions based on one’s individual agency within a given social sphere. As such, while the individual agent (the sexual assault survivor), and the individual agency which they act upon (reporting) (habitus) is given value and can be reacted to by homophobia and/or racism (power), within the given field (the agency) thus create the final outcome (practice). The sexual reporting process is accomplished through a series of actions determined by individual agency within a given social sphere.

**Discrimination Against Latinos**

Latinos are also subject to being discriminated against in the United States, on account of their ethnicity. There has not been extensive literature conducted to examine prevalence rates of discrimination against Latinos in the United States (Perez, Fortuna, & Alegria, 2008). It has been found that Blacks are more likely to report higher rates of discrimination than Whites (Mickelson & Williams, 1999). Discrimination against Latinos may vary by subgroups, level of acculturation, level of exposure to U.S. culture, ethnic identity and cultural factors (Perez, Fortuna & Alegria, 2008). Previous studies have found that socioeconomic, cultural factors, ethnic subgroups, English language proficiency, and ethnic identity are associated with perceived discrimination for Latinos (Mickelson & Williams, 1999; Finch & Kolody, 2000; Watson, Scarinci & Slaawson, & Beech, 2002; Williams & Collins, 1995).

Most studies regarding discrimination in the United States have focused on discrimination against Blacks (Almeida, Biello, Pedraza, Wintner & Viruell-Fuentes, 2016; Williams & Mohammed, 2009; Williams, Neighbors & Jackson, 2003). While Latinos account for 17% of the United States’ population as of 2012, there still remains a large gap in empirical literature
examining discrimination against Latinos in the United States (Almeida et al., 2016). However, there has been evidence that discrimination is an aspect of life for Latinos in the United States (Almeida et al., 2016; Flores et al. 2008; Lopez, Morin & Taylor, 2010). This is important to note for gay Latino sexual assault survivors, as they may encounter discrimination by reporting authorities merely for their ethnicity alone. Latino immigrants or even Latinos who are perceived to be immigrants may be subject to additional discrimination.

Policies that support or stigmatize immigrants affect the social context of reception (Hacker, Kasper & Morris, 2011). In more recent years, various anti-immigrant policies have led to a hostile environment for racial/ethnic minorities in the United States (Almeida et al., 2016; Gee & Ford, 2011, Viruell-Fuentes et al., 2012). Latinos experience this hostile environment. In fact, specific anti-immigrant policies have targeted Latinos in recent years. For example, Arizona’s SB 1070, a bill which was similarly followed in many other states, was constructed under the pretense of protecting communities from undocumented immigrants (Almeida et al. 2016; Morse, 2011). This law led to the legalization of racial profiling against Latinos. Some research has highlighted that anti-immigrant policies against undocumented immigrants lead to race, ethnicity and immigrant status becoming conflated and consequently leading to the presumption that all Latinos are undocumented (Viruell-Fuentes et al., 2012). Anti-immigrant policies and anti-Latino rhetoric has become heightened since the election of Donald Trump in 2017. Trump has made comments stating that Latinos and Blacks are uneducated, not believing that the Central Park 5 (Black and Latino men) were innocent despite being cleared by DNA testing and stating that Mexicans are rapists and that Hondurans are coming in caravans to the United States and bringing along crime (Desmond-Harris, 2016; Reilly, 2016; Sarlin, 2016; Vazquez, 2018). The Trump administration has supported anti-immigrant legislation that has widely been criticized. Since the Trump
administration, Latinos have been targeted and scapegoated on a national level which may trickle down to local levels. Additionally, Latinos may be less likely to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities if they do not feel protected, respected valued by the United States government and/or society. Latinos may feel that reporting authorities hold prejudicial beliefs against them for being Latino, believe they may be undocumented and/or will not be viewed as trustworthy.

2.4 Empirical Literature

While empirical studies have been conducted to examine prevalence rates of sexual assault as well as barriers to reporting sexual assault for men in more recent years, no studies currently exist that specifically examine gay Latino men’s practices of reporting sexual assault in the United States. The lack of extant literature addressing multiple marginalized identities demonstrates a need for research to examine this phenomenon. Although studies have not solely focused on sexual assault reporting practices among men, they provide a basis for what is currently known about barriers to reporting sexual assault and the experiences of reporting sexual assault among men, which was used to inform the methodology and research design for this dissertation.

Previous literature has examined sexual assault of men (Bergen & Bukovec, 2006; Doherty & Anderson, 2004; Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; Du Mont, Macdonald, White, & Turner, 2013a; Gold & Marx, 2007; Hensley, Koscheski, & Tewksbury, 2005; Isely, 1998a, 1998b; Jamel, Bull, & Sheridan, 2008; King & Woollett, 1997; Neville, Heppner, Oh, Spanierman, & Clark, 2004; Rentoul & Appleboom, 1997; Robertson, 2003; Rumney, 2008, 2009; Scarce, 1997;
Struckman-Johnson, 1988; Tewksbury, 2007; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001; Vearnals & Campbell, 2001; J. Walker et al., 2005a; J. Walker, Archer, & Davies, 2005b; Weiss, 2010) yet these studies did not focus on the sexual assault reporting practices to reporting authorities. Other studies have investigated college student likelihood of reporting sexual assault and/or the actual sexual assault reporting practices on college campuses to campus authorities (Banyard et al., 2007; Fisher et al., 2003; Moore, 2016; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Sable et al., 2006; Stotzer & MacCartney, 2016; Tuel, 2000; Walsh & Bruce, 2014; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2011). Additional studies have examined the barriers that women encounter when reporting having been sexually assaulted to police (Du Mont, Miller, & Myhr, 2003; Fisher et al., 2003; Sleath & Bull, 2012). Researchers have investigated if sexual assault claims would be taken seriously when reported, examining actual outcomes of reporting, hypothetical reporting scenarios and the influence of victim-blaming (Sleath & Bull, 2010; Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013; Venema, 2016). One study specifically focused on LGBT individuals reporting being sexually assaulted to police, comparing cis-gendered men to trans*men (Langenderfer-Magrunder, Walls, Kattari, Whitfield, & Ramos, 2016). Preliminary work investigating the role of homophobia on male sexual assault reporting practices has been undertaken in the United Kingdom. These studies investigated how homophobia and the social construction of masculinities influence men in deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted and the possible reactions by police and other reporting authorities (Hammond, Ioannou, & Fewster, 2017; Jamel, 2010; Jamel et al., 2008; Javaid, 2015, 2017; Pino & Meier, 1999; Sable et al., 2006).


2.4.1 Quantitative and Mixed Methods Studies

**Federally Collected Data on Male Sexual Victimization.** Quantitative and mixed-methods studies have investigated sexual assault in the United States through the use of large data sets. One of the first studies to examine sexual victimization prevalence rates on a national level was conducted through surveying students in higher education (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). This study used the term sexual victimization rates in their reports, which includes the act of rape. Koss and colleagues (1987) surveyed a national sample of women and men from 32 institutions of higher learning utilizing a self-report questionnaire and compared women’s reported victimization rates and men’s reported perpetration rates and compared the results to the Bureau of Justice Statistic’s National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) from 1984, which is the nation’s lead source of information on crime statistics. The study found that women reported sexual victimization 10 to 15 times higher than the NCVS data, which indicated that sexual victimization occurred at higher rates than national data suggested. While this study was groundbreaking in exposing that sexual victimization is often underreported, it failed to examine the sexual victimization of men. Similarly, Pino and Meier (1999) also utilized the NCVS data. This study was notably different from the one conducted by Koss and colleagues (1987), in that it compared male and female rape reporting behavior from the NCVS data form 1979-1987. At the time of this study, rape was still the term utilized in the data instruments. It is difficult to discern how rape was defined and whether some of the acts included other forms of sexual assault. Of the 897 rape survivors, 81 were men, mostly white and unmarried. The study found that men were more likely to be raped by white assailants (66% ) and by multiple assailants, when compared to women (Pino & Meier, 1999). This study is notable in the fact that it examined male rape
victimization utilizing national data. Most recently, Stemple and Meyer (2014) investigated prevalence rates of male sexual assault in the United States from federal data, including the NVCS. Stemple and Meyer (2014) assessed five federal data and survey sets (National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, National Crime Victimization Survey, Uniform Crime Report, Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates Intimate Survey, Sexual Victimization in Juvenile Facilities Reported by Youth; National Survey of Youth in Custody) to examine the prevalence rates of male sexual assault. They found that some forms of sexual assault against men were almost the same in prevalence rates to those experienced by women. These forms included rape made to penetrate as well as sexual coercion and unwanted sexual contact (Stemple & Meyer, 2014). It should be noted that these studies did not examine the reporting practices of sexual assault survivors.

These studies suggest that sexual assault victimization rates are often underreported and that the experiences of men’s sexual assault may be different than the experiences of women. Additionally, these studies indicate a growing literature examining the sexual assault of men in the United States. However, these studies highlight that there is much unknown regarding the sexual assault of men.

**Sexual Assault Reporting Practices.** While studies utilizing federal data sets have primarily focused on prevalence rates of sexual assault, they have not been able to fully capture sexual assault reporting practices. Some quantitative studies have used secondary data sets from schools of higher education and from sexual assault care centers, as opposed to federally collected data to examine sexual assault reporting practices of women and men. These studies help identify preliminary factors that may influence an individual’s likelihood of reporting being sexually
assaulted and factors that may serve as barriers to reporting sexual assault for sexual assault survivors.

One study examined female sexual assault reporting practices to police, by using data from those who attended a sexual assault care center in Ontario, Canada (Du Mont et al., 2003). As the sexual assault care center did provide services for men, the data collected regarding men were excluded from the data. This study was notable in that 30.8% of the sexual assault survivors were women of color, which is significantly larger than many other studies whose data has consisted primarily of white individuals. The study found that 50% of all women reported being sexually assaulted to the police. Women who were physically injured and physically coerced were more likely to report being sexually assaulted to police compared with those who were not physically injured or coerced. No differences in reporting between whites and women of color were found (Du Mont et al., 2003).

A ground-breaking study conducted by Fisher and colleagues (2003) was one of the first studies to analyze data of sexual assault on colleges and universities on a national scale. This study focused on reporting practices among a random sample of 4,446 female students in 233 postsecondary institutions, as part of the larger National College Women Sexual Victimization Study. Fisher and colleagues’ (2003) measurement strategy was patterned after the survey used on the NCVS, consisting of behavioral specific questions to measure sexual victimization. This study examined the characteristics of the incidents, offenders, victims, and other contextual characteristics. Only 2.1% of women who were sexually assaulted reported being sexually assaulted to police and 4.0% of those sexually assaulted reported being sexually assaulted to campus authorities. However, 70% of those sexually assaulted disclosed being sexually assaulted to people other than reporting authorities (87.9% of survivors told a friend), and all students who
disclosed being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities also disclosed to other sources. Reasons given for not reporting being sexually assaulted were that students felt the incidents were not severe enough to report, not wanting family members and others to know they were sexually assaulted, not having proof, and fear of reprisals. Black students were more likely to report being sexually assaulted than whites, consistent with previous studies (Bachman, 1998). Notably, this study did break down students by their race/ethnicity, which has not always been examined in other studies examining prevalence rates of sexual assault.

Another study examined how institutional factors of a college or university may contribute to sexual assault reporting practices by students. In this study, 524 colleges and universities were examined, based on data collected from National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which includes information on schools sent to the federal government, including campus safety statistics from each college and university. This study examined various factors including the percentage of women in the student body, the region and selectivity of the school, and the percent of men involved in fraternities, using additional data form U.S. News and World Report, the Princeton Review, Carnegie School Classifications and the FBI (Stotzer & MacCartney, 2016). Campuses with higher levels of students living on campus, campuses with a higher number of athletic teams on campus, and campuses allowing students of legal age to possess alcohol were associated with increased numbers of reports of sexual assault (Stotzer & MacCartney, 2016). While this study did not address individual barriers towards sexual assault reporting on college campuses, it is one of the few recent studies that examines factors related to sexual assault reporting on college and university campuses.

The literature does offer contradictory findings to whether survivors of color are more likely to report being sexually assaulted compared to White survivors. Notably, the literature does
indicate that the majority of survivors who report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities have previously disclosed being sexually assaulted to others in a non-official capacity.

**Barriers for Women in Reporting Sexual Victimization.** Although little research examining barriers for men in reporting sexual assault has been conducted, there exists a larger body of research examining the barriers for women in reporting sexual assault. These studies provide a basis for what is currently known in the sexual assault literature on barriers to reporting sexual assault among survivors. Starzynski and colleagues (2005) conducted a survey to examine sexual assault reporting practices of 1,084 women in Chicago and the surrounding area. Notably, most of the participants were Black (46.2%), 7% were multi-racial and 9.7% identified as Latina. Twenty-two percent of the sample identified as gay, bisexual or unsure. It was found that most women disclosed being sexually assaulted to a source of informal support (97.6%), while some women did disclose to sources of formal support (60.7%). The study was significant in that most of the participants were people of color (Starzynski, Ullman, Filipas, & Townsend, 2005a).

Increasing research has focused on examining barriers for women in reporting physical and sexual assault on college and university campuses. Thompson and colleagues (2007) conducted a study of 492 women at a southeastern university to understand the factors associated with reporting sexual assault. Only two of the 141 women who were sexually assaulted reported the sexual assault to police. The location of the incident, the severity of the incident and the individuals’ race predicted reasons for not reporting physical and sexual assault. Women of color were more likely to report being assaulted compared to white women. Reasons women cited for not reporting the sexual assault to police were that they believed that the incident would be viewed as being their fault and that the police would not do anything (Thompson, Sitterle, Clay, & Kingree, 2007). A similar study examining barriers for women in reporting sexual assault on campus was conducted
a few years later (Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). Seven-hundred and nineteen undergraduate women were surveyed, and 127 women reported being sexually assaulted. Eighty-five percent of the women stated they did not report the assault to police. Eighty-one percent of the respondents were White, 16% were Black and 3% were categorized as “Other”. The study also utilized the Sexual Experience Survey and other scales utilized were adapted from the National Violence Against Women Survey (2000). Women cited various reasons for not reporting to authorities, including: that they were able to handle it themselves (70%), that they did not believe it was serious enough to be a crime (68%) and that they did not want anyone to know about the sexual assault (45%). A similar yet larger study was conducted to investigate sexual assault reporting practices of women on college and university campuses (Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2011). Two-thousand women were interviewed by computer assisted telephone interviewing using close-ended questions. This study sought to examine whether these women reported being sexually assaulted to police, as well as focusing on their relationship to the perpetrator. Only 11.5 % of those victimized reported being sexually assaulted to law enforcement officials and 17.8 % of those victimized sought advice from an agency that provide assistance to victims of crime. Contrary to Fisher and colleagues’ (2003) study, White survivors were more likely to report being sexually assaulted to authorities compared to racial/ethnic minorities.

Collectively, these studies highlight that the vast amount of sexual assault survivors do not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These studies reveal also that there are a multitude of factors that influence female sexual assault survivors to not report to official reporting authorities. Moreover, this research demonstrates there are a variety of factors that are considered to reporting being sexually assaulted to police and other reporting authorities. While these studies
only include women, they do provide important knowledge into the factors that influence sexual assault reporting practices.

**Perceptions of Barriers in Reporting Sexual Assault for Men and Women.** Scholars have begun to focus on students’ perceptions of possible barriers in reporting sexual assault to reporting authorities. A few notable studies have been conducted that have addressed the perceived barriers that survivors will encounter should they report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. While these studies are hypothetical in context, they do provide preliminary data on factors that contribute to men’s willingness to report sexual assault to reporting authorities.

Sable (2006) investigated the perceived barriers in reporting sexual assault at one university. Two-hundred and fifteen students completed a self-report survey, consisting of questions, scenarios, and statements in order to gauge perceptions and attitudes about sexual assault as well as perceived barriers in reporting sexual assault. Forty-five percent of the respondents were male. Importance of perceived barriers to reporting were found to be different for men than for women. Males rated “shame, guilt, embarrassment” as much more important than did females. “Fear of not being believed” was significantly higher for males than for females. “Fear of being judged for being gay” were cited to be important barriers for males, which were reported at a much higher rate than for women. However, “confidentiality issues” were found to be equal barriers for both men and women (Sable et al., 2006).

Moore (2016) investigated students’ likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to reporting authorities. Three-hundred and thirty-six students completed an in-person survey, consisting of 62 questions. The students were provided with scenarios and were asked questions regarding the importance of various factors when deciding to report being sexually assaulted. This study consisted of graduate students, 48% who identified as white, and 63% who identified as
female. Students reported that they were more likely to report being sexually assaulted to a police person than to a university official. A desire for justice was an important factor in deciding to report to police in all four scenarios and to a university official in three of four scenarios. Students were more likely to report being sexually assaulted if they were assaulted by a stranger than by someone they knew and their level of trust in police and university officials was positively associated with their likelihood to report to the police and university officials. It was also found that Whites were significantly less likely to report to authorities than were racial/ethnic minorities (Moore, 2016).

Another notable study examined male and female sexual assault survivors in a university setting and noted the survivors’ race/ethnicity (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007). This study was particularly notable in that it consisted of a relative large sample size of 1,375 men. Students who disclosed that they were sexually assaulted were able to respond to modules related to sexual assault victimization. Male participants were given sexual assault modules that were gender appropriate. Most of the questions were close-ended. The majority of the males who took the survey were White (84.3%), 7.8% were Black, and 1.8% were Hispanic. Most of the males identified as heterosexual (94.5%) and only 2.6% identified as being gay. Results indicated that 6.1% of all males reported being sexually assaulted. However, due to low number of males reporting being sexually assaulted, the researchers were unable to report descriptive data on the sexual assault of these men. Therefore, it is unknown whether there are any racial/ethnic and sexual orientation disparities in sexual assault victimization for males in this study. For women, it was found that Hispanics were more likely to have physical force present when sexually assaulted compared to whites. It remains unknown whether the same is for Hispanic/Latino men in the
sample set, which leaves a need for further research to be conducted to examine the sexual assault of Latino men.

One study in the United Kingdom examined perceptions of barriers to reporting sexual assault with a sample of police officers. Venema (2016) surveyed 174 police officers from one police department, 82.4 % of which were male, 85.9 % white and 3.6% Hispanic. Police officers were provided with vignettes to judge their perceptions of rape, rape myth acceptance and the attribution of blame. It was found that levels of rape myth acceptance influenced how much blame was attributed to the victim and that other officers’ opinions influenced their perceptions of the rape case (Venema, 2016). The study utilized and examined perceptions of rape as opposed to sexual assault, as the influence of rape myth acceptance was a focal point of the study. Another recent study examined individuals’ attitudes of male rape and reporting barriers for men reporting rape in the United Kingdom (Hammond et al., 2017). Hammond and colleagues (2017) conducted an online survey to determine barriers in reporting incidents of male sexual assault, levels of male-rape acceptance and perceptions of police authorities in addressing male sexual assault. Ninety-eight male participants completed the survey; 95% were White, 3% were Black, and 2 % identified as “Other”. Eighty-three percent of the respondents were heterosexual and 8% of the respondents identified as gay. The study found that participants believed that police were less likely to take male sexual assault as seriously as they do with women. Men also reported that the main reason for not reporting sexual assault to police was that they felt the police would not take their complaint seriously, and that they would not take any action with regards to their allegation.

These studies provide important insights into potential barriers that men and women believe they may encounter should they decide to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These findings provide possible factors that men may consider when deciding whether
to report to reporting authorities. As prior literature has indicated, most sexual assault survivors do not report being sexually assaulted to official reporting authorities. Identifying potential and perceived barriers is necessary to further our understanding of the decision-making process to report sexual assault among gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

**Barriers for Men in Reporting Sexual Assault** While the majority of studies have examined sexual assault reporting barriers for women and overall student perceptions of barriers in reporting sexual assault, few studies have examined reporting barriers for male sexual assault survivors. Banyard and colleagues (2007) surveyed 225 men and 408 women regarding sexual assault perceptions, attitudes and experiences with unwanted sexual contact; race/ethnicity was not asked due to possible identification of participants. The survey found that 8.2% of the men reported that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact. Men were less likely to report an unwanted sexual experience to authorities than women (15% to 33%) and were less likely to know where to receive support after being sexually assaulted (Banyard et al., 2007). Walsh and Bruce (2014) also conducted a survey of undergraduate students from a university to determine their sexual assault reporting practices. In total, 834 students were surveyed in a self-report questionnaire. From this survey, 19.9% were men and 17% identified as Black, and 9% identified as Hispanic/Latino. Widely used and validated measures were utilized. Only 14% of students reported unwanted sexual experiences to the police and 80% of those who reported being sexually assaulted felt the need to attend therapy or counseling after being sexually assaulted. Due to the low number of men in the study, a statistical comparison of men and women in their reporting behavior was not able to be conducted (Walsh & Bruce, 2014).

One notable study examined the provision of services to male rape survivors by the London Metropolitan Police (Jamel et al., 2008). This study focused on male rape cases and did not
operationalize the definition of rape versus sexual assault. Therefore, the term rape will be utilized as it is unclear whether the data accurately reflects acts of sexual assault other than rape. This study was a survey given to Sexual Offences Investigative Technique Offices of the London Metropolitan Police force with assistance from a local organization. Nineteen surveys were completed and returned. Most the officers were White (95%) and the remaining were Asian (5%). Similarly, most of the male rape survivors they worked with were White (95%). This survey indicated that 40% of the rape survivors identified as being heterosexual, 45% identified as being gay, and 15% identified as bisexual or confused. Very few officers reported experience with male rape cases and most officers stated that male rape cases never reach trial stage. Only 53% of police offers dealt with 3 or less male rape cases during their career span (average 17 year career span), and 11% stated they never dealt with a male rape case. Police officers reported that male rape survivors often indicated that there was a poor level of communication regarding the progress of their case and that the option to have a gay SOIT officer was not always provided to them. Police officers stated that male rape survivors raised concerns about being “outed”, a lack of faith in police to do anything. Police officers also reported that rape survivors expressed strong wishes for retribution, and that some male rape survivors who reported being sexually assaulted, simply wanted the recognition that rape was against the law. However, the study did find that rape myth acceptance was still displayed by police officers and that their one-hour training on male rape was not sufficient for officers to adequately work with male rape survivors.

Another study investigated two police forces in the United Kingdom, regarding rape myth acceptance, victim and perpetrator blaming and the effect of gender roles (Sleath & Bull, 2012). A total of 25 female and 36 male officers participated in the questionnaire. Fourteen of the police officers had received special training to work with sexual assault survivors. Hypothetical scenarios
were given, and they used the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (1999) to measure rape myth acceptance. There were no differences in rape myth acceptance among officers who received special training and those who were not specially trained officers. Officers who had higher levels of rape myth acceptance also had higher levels of victim-blaming but no difference with regards to levels of perpetrator blaming.

One study focused on the experiences in reporting rape to authorities by male rape survivors in the United Kingdom. (Javaid, 2017). This study also used the term male rape throughout the study and is unclear whether male rape cases also included other forms of sexual assault. Seventy individuals consisting of police officers, male rape counselors, therapists, and voluntary agency caseworkers were interviewed. Thirty-three men and thirty-seven women participated in the survey. The participants were mostly white, highly educated and middle-class. There was an overall poor response from police, as police often cited they believed there were claims of false allegations of rape. Officers stated that male rape survivors often conveyed that they felt they would get a poor response from police when reporting being sexually assaulted.

A recent study in the United States conducted by Donne and colleagues (2018), sought to understand and identify barriers and facilitators to seeking help services among male sexual assault survivors, as well as the ways in which they understood and conceptualized their experiences of being victimized by sexual violence. Some participated in individual in-depth interviews (N=19), while others participated in one of two focus groups (N=13). The sample included, 11 White participants (33%), 9 Black participants, (28%) 6 Latino participants (19%), and 3 Asian participants (1%). Four identified as heterosexual (13%) and 25 identified as gay (78%) men. Barriers to seeking help included: gender roles and norms, shame, stigma, issues around identity, as well as high costs to pay for mental health and medical providers, insurance coverage, and
finding suitable therapists and gay-friendly services providers for support services. The two men who did seek sexual assault focused support groups and/or therapy did not describe positive experiences. The researchers suggested that service providers should be able to recognize and attend to the needs of gay men who have been sexually assaulted, particularly in addressing issues around masculinity.

Sadler, Cheney, and Mengeling (2018), focused on the barriers to reporting sexual assault of men and the perception of sexual assault during military service. This study consisted of 34 men, 20 in the Reserve/National Guard and 14 in Active Component, who participated in focus groups. For the Active Component participants, barriers identified were the location of deployment, and the sex of the survivor and perpetrator. The National/Reserve Guard cited barriers such as perceptions of stigma due to citizen-soldier status, ethos of conformity and a lack of trust in leadership and the reporting process. All men cited barriers to reporting as a tendency to blame and minimalize male sexual assault survivors and a lack of awareness about male sexual assault.

Collectively, these studies lay out the various challenges that men encounter when deciding to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities and the perceptions that men have regarding the reporting process. Overall, the findings from these studies indicate that men do not believe that male sexual assault will be taken seriously, that male survivors will be victim-blamed, and that reporting authorities are generally ill-equipped and not knowledgeable on male sexual assault. These studies highlight the needs for additional research to be conducted on sexual assault against men and for additional supports to be provided to male sexual assault survivors.

These studies are not without limitations. The majority of the participants (both reporting authorities and survivors) studies consisted primarily of white individuals or the studies did not report or focus on an individual’s race/ethnicity (Banyard et al., 2007; Hammond et al., 2017;
Jamel et al., 2008; Javaid, 2017; Krebs et al., 2007; Sable et al., 2006; Thompson et al., 2007; Venema, 2016; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2011) and racial and ethnic minorities were often collapsed together in a single category (Du Mont et al., 2003; Pino & Meier, 1999). Another major limitation of the studies was that while the methodologies addressed sexual assault survivors, many excluded men in certain statistical analyses or excluded them from the study altogether (Krebs et al., 2007; Starzynski et al., 2005a; Thompson et al., 2007; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2011; Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). Additionally, sexual orientation was not examined in some of the studies (Du Mont et al., 2003; Fisher, 2003; Pino and Meier, 1999; Stemple and Meyer, 2014; Stotzer & MacCartney, 2016). These limitations leave a large gap in understanding the sexual assault of gay Latino men. Additionally, some studies consisted of limited sample sizes (Du Mont et al., 2003; Pino & Meier, 1999), which may affect the generalizability of the studies. While quantitative studies allow for preliminary data to be gathered on sexual assault rates, they often do not capture the complexity and intricacies of an issue, such as the case with sexual assault. As noted by Pino and Meier (1999), qualitative studies may best in providing further insight into understanding the complexity of sexual assault and especially of experiences in reporting or deciding whether to report.

The studies that did focus on male sexual assault survivors took place in the United Kingdom, and it is possible that cultural influences as well as laws and policies surrounding sexual assault may not be applicable to male sexual assault survivors in the United States (Jamel et al., 2008; Javaid, 2017; Sleath & Bull, 2012). Another notable limitation for some of the studies were their small sample sizes (Hammond et al., 2017; Jamel et al., 2008; Javaid, 2017; Sleath & Bull, 2012; Thompson et al., 2007). While these studies addressed and identified barriers to reporting sexual assault, they did not focus identifying areas that worked particularly well for gay male
sexual assault survivors. In social work, it is important to address issues from a strengths-based perspective. As such, it is equally important to identify what strategies or techniques are effective and culturally congruent or applicable gay Latino male survivors during the reporting process. It would be difficult to adequately work to reform policies or procedures if only identifying barriers to reporting. Lastly, as with previous studies, there is an inconsistency in the terminology and operationalization of the term rape and sexual assault (Jamel et al., 2008; Javaid, 2017).

Due to the small number of empirical studies addressing male sexual assault survivors and the non-existent empirical studies on gay Latino sexual assault survivors, these studies provide the closest and best methodology that can inform future research on gay Latino male sexual assault survivors, although they are primarily quantitative in design. While the vast majority of literature has still focused exclusively on the sexual assault of women, a growing body of literature has begun to examine barriers for men who are sexually assaulted. While these studies provide insight on prevalence rates, perceived and actual barriers to reporting sexual assault, and methodologies used to recruit sexual assault survivors, they are not qualitative by design. Since reporting facilitators and barriers for gay Latino sexual assault survivors is a phenomenon that has not yet been explored, it is beneficial to conduct a qualitative study to understand the lived experiences of these sexual assault survivors. While empirical literature has begun to focus on sexual assault against men, it has not adequately addressed the role of racism or the individuals’ race/ethnicity, leaving a large gap in the literature. Additionally, the role of homophobia in the reporting process for male sexual assault survivors has not fully been examined in the United States. As such, my dissertation addresses these issues that are absent from the existing empirical literature.
2.5 Relevance to Social Work

The need to address the phenomenon of sexual assault against gay Latino men and to advocate for gay Latino adult sexual assault survivors is important to the field of social work. Social work values center around dignity, and the respect and worth of a person, consistent with the field’s focus on social justice and equality. These core foundational qualities of social work make it unequivocally essential for the profession to actively advocate for gay Latino male sexual assault survivors. Gay Latino sexual assault survivors are a highly vulnerable and marginalized group, who encounter various challenges due to their multiple marginalized identities. Social workers have the moral obligation and need the skill-sets and clinical training to provide assistance and enhance the well-being of these men.

The National Association of Social Workers’ (NASW) Code of Ethics outlines core values of the social work profession. The “Ethical Principles” section outlines broad ethical principles that are based on social work’s core values (NASW, 2008). The seven ethical principles of social work are: service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity and competence. All of the aforementioned ethical principles allow for various opportunities in which social workers can advocate for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

The first principle is that of service, which is aimed to help people in need and to address social problems. The social issue of sexual assault continues to be at the forefront of public discourse in the United States. While increased attention towards sexual assault has resulted in a growing commitment to combating sexual violence, little attention has been focused on gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Social workers are provided with an opportunity to expand the discourse
on sexual assault by increasing awareness towards the sexual assault of gay Latino and other men of color.

Following being sexually assaulted, gay Latino sexual assault survivors are often in need of mental and physical health services. Gay Latino men are often unsure of what resources are available to them and lack social supports and resources that are responsive to their needs as male sexual assault survivors of color. Social workers can actively work to provide mental health services to gay Latino sexual assault survivors in a culturally competent fashion by utilizing trauma-informed and evidence-based practices in clinical practice. Additionally, social workers can assist in locating culturally-congruent medical care professionals to provide medical care to gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

The second NASW principle is social justice. Social workers should strive to work on behalf of vulnerable and oppressed groups of people. Gay Latino men are a vulnerable and oppressed population due to the intersectionality of their identities - ethnicity, race(s), sexual orientation and the status of being a sexual assault survivor. Gay Latino men may not have easily accessible culturally competent resources or medical and/or mental health care providers available to them. Prior literature has indicated that sexual assault survivors often receive negative responses from reporting authorities and cite a myriad of barriers to reporting to authorities. The complexity of gay Latino men’s identities may further complicate the reporting process and racism and homophobia may hinder them from achieving social justice. By addressing the unique needs of gay Latino sexual assault survivors, social workers can strive towards assisting these men in achieving social justice. By understanding the unique needs of gay Latino sexual assault survivors, social workers can help to advocate for gay Latino men with agencies, medical providers and organizations that may be able to provide services to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Social
workers can work to advocate for more inclusive polices and equitable treatment of gay Latino sexual assault survivors in social service organizations. Additionally, social workers can help to empower gay Latino sexual assault to make their choice in deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. If a survivor chooses to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities, social works can support gay Latino sexual assault survivors through the process by ensuring they are treated fairly by reporting authorities, medical care providers and mental health care providers. Social workers can advocate to ensure that policies and procedures are being followed and advocate for equitable treatment of gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

The third principle is the dignity and worth of the person. Social workers can validate the experiences of gay Latino sexual assault survivors, especially if they encounter negative responses from reporting authorities and/or informal networks. Such negatives responses may be rooted in homophobia, racism, and/or gendered stereotypes and may result in gay Latino sexual assault survivors’ experiences and sense of self being invalidated. Many sexual assault survivors often feel that their dignity has been taken away through the sexual assault itself as well as through the reporting and/or judicial process (Campbell et al., 2001). This may be exacerbated due to racism and homophobia for gay Latino men. Social workers should strive to validate experiences of homophobia and racism that gay Latino men encounter regardless of the context. Social workers can also abide by this principle in providing training and education to other professionals in how to engage in an ethical and competent manner with gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

The fourth ethical principle is the importance of human relationships. Social workers can help strengthen relationships between gay Latino sexual assault survivors and those to whom they disclose being sexually assaulted. This principle is crucial when advocating and promoting social justice for gay Latino men who attempt to report being sexually assaulted. Law enforcement,
lawyers, medical providers, mental health counselors, campus police, and university administration and staff may be hesitant and/or ill-equipped to work with gay Latino men and gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Professionals may also have implicit biases towards gay Latino men which may cause them to dismiss their claims, requests, and needs as sexual assault survivors. Social workers can stress the importance of providing culturally-congruent services, resources and support to gay Latino sexual assault survivors to professionals working with gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Social workers can advocate for the need to develop better and effective communication and skill-sets when working to assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

Another social work ethical principle is integrity. Social workers must be honest and responsible when working with their clients. It is important for social workers to advise gay Latino sexual assault survivors of their legal rights as sexual assault survivors and of the resources available to them. Social workers must also support sexual assault survivors in their choice of whether or not to report being sexually assaulted to authorities. As clinicians, social workers cannot impose their own values or wishes onto the client, even if they are not in agreement with their client’s choice in whether they decide to report being sexually assaulted. Social workers can also abide by the principle of integrity by intervening on their clients’ behalf should these men be denied care due to their race, ethnicity or sexual orientation. Social workers should abide by integrity as well when engaging in their own practice.

The last ethical principle is that of competence. As such, social workers should strive to increase their professional knowledge about the Latinx community, the LGBT community and male sexual assault survivors. By understanding issues salient to gay Latino sexual assault survivors, social workers will be better equipped with the knowledge, clinical skill-sets and resources to provide effective services to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Failing to do so,
may re-traumatize gay Latino sexual assault survivors or neutralize any benefits they may achieve through therapy or seeking social services. Social workers should be competent in familiarizing themselves with appropriate LGBT and Latinx terminology to better work with gay Latino clients. Additionally, social workers should be aware of what resources are available for male sexual assault survivors and the feelings of exclusion male sexual assault survivors may experience when trying to locate available resources. Social workers should strive to increase their knowledge regarding sexual assault against gay men, specifically in how it disproportionately victimizes gay men. By increasing their knowledge and competence on issues specific to gay Latino men, social work professionals will be better able to provide gay Latino sexual assault survivors with the support that they need in an ethical and professional manner.

The social work profession addresses issues from a holistic approach. This holistic approach should be used when addressing the sexual assault of gay Latino men. Social workers should strive to enhance the overall well-being of these men in a culturally congruent manner. Sexual assault of gay Latino men is a public health concern and a general concern for social work. Clinical social workers and researchers can collaboratively work to address and minimize adverse health outcomes for these men. Social workers can address these issues by advocating for gay Latino male sexual assault survivors in clinical practice, policy, and research. Social workers are equipped with the tools to reduce barriers and enhance facilitators that gay Latino sexual assault survivors encounter during the reporting process.

Social workers can intervene to assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors by using appropriate clinical interventions in direct practice, validating their experiences, intervening with other agencies when appropriate, advocating for them during the reporting process and working to strengthen existing sexual assault policies and procedures. Social workers in hospital, community,
academic and research settings, can advocate on behalf of gay Latino sexual assault survivors in various capacities and settings. Social workers can provide culturally competent mental health services, advocacy, education, training and recommendations for policies and practices that will enhance the overall well-being of gay Latino sexual assault survivors.
3.0 Methods

Chapter 3 describes the methodology for this dissertation which includes guiding research questions, research design, participant inclusion criteria, recruitment, data collection, data analysis, positionality statement and conclusion. The demographic questionnaire, recruitment flyers and interview guides are provided in accompanying appendices. A rationale for the participant inclusion and data collection and analysis sections are thoroughly discussed to clearly explain the reasons for choosing the methodology of this dissertation. In addition, the process and details of the recruitment process and data collection and analysis are also provided to clearly provide a justification and rationale for these processes.

Qualitative methods were utilized for this study, as this study seeks to understand the lived experiences of gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Qualitative methods are best for exploring phenomena about which little is known (Maxwell, 2013). Additionally, qualitative methodology emphasizes discovery about a relatively unknown phenomenon, where the objectives are focused on extracting and interpreting the meaning of the experience (Bogdan & Bilken, 1997; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Zea, Reisen and Diaz (2003) note that gay Latino participants who took part in a previous quantitative study expressed that they felt confined by having to select from multiple choice items and would have preferred to talk about their experiences. Zea and colleagues (2003) acknowledge that qualitative methodologies may be best for capturing subjective experiences of gay Latino men. Specifically, this dissertation uses a Grounded Theory methodology as it seeks to understand an under researched and vulnerable population with the goal of relying upon findings.
to develop and test the effectiveness of clinical and practice interventions to better assist gay male sexual assault survivors of color.

3.1 Grounded Theory Methodology

As per the goals of the research study, this dissertation seeks to identify and understand the barriers and facilitators experienced by gay Latino sexual assault survivors. As grounded theory seeks to develop a theory based on the lived experience of participants, this approach is most suitable for this research study. Grounded theory originates from symbolic interactionism, which contends that meaning is negotiated and understood through interactions with others through social processes (Blumer, 1986; Starks & Brown Trinidad, 2007). Grounded theory seeks to develop a theoretical framework of social processes in the environments in which they occur (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This study ultimately aims to lead to the development of a theory that accounts for the decision-making processes among gay Latino sexual assault survivors to guide culturally-competent interventions for clinical practitioners and medical providers who may work with these men.

3.1.1 Research Questions

This dissertation specifically examined the unique barriers and facilitators that gay Latino men experience when they reported or consider reporting being sexually assaulted. This
dissertation further examined the extent to which homophobia and/or racism affected the reporting process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

The questions guiding this study were:

1. What factors influence gay Latino men’s decision-making process about whether to report being sexually assaulted?

2. What barriers and facilitators do gay Latino men experience when they report being sexually assaulted to legal authorities?

3. How does the racial/ethnic and sexual identity of gay Latino sexual assault survivors affect how authorities respond to and address their reports of sexual assault?

### 3.2 Research Design

The research design consisted of two main parts: 1) an in-depth interview (Appendix A or B) and 2) a demographic background questionnaire (Appendix C). The interview guides varied based on whether the interview was conducted with a sexual assault survivor who did not report being sexually assaulted or a sexual assault survivor who did report being sexually assaulted. The first part of the research design (the interview) allowed for rich data to be collected on the participants’ lived experiences of a phenomenon that is not well understood or researched (sexual assault reporting process). The second part of this research design allowed me to gather detailed participant demographic background information.

University of Pittsburgh IRB approved all parts of the research study, such that all procedures and protocols are in adherence to ethical conduct of research with human subjects.
Interview Guide

The interview guide was designed in accordance with the research aims for the study. There were two separate interview guides (Appendix A and Appendix B), designed for men who did not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities (Appendix A) and for men who reported to an official reporting authority or authorities (Appendix B). Some of the questions in both guides were the same but other questions were different, depending on whether they reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities or not.

Appendix A: Appendix A and Appendix B both began with Section 1: Identity Questions. These questions focused on their racial/ethnic identity and the significance that their identity has for them. These questions were also designed to build rapport building between myself and the participant. Section 2: Intentions To Report was focused on their decision-making process in deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These questions focused on the factors they considered when deciding to report to authorities. Section 3: Process Of Not Deciding To Report focused on the various considerations they made when deciding to not report to authorities and what led them to their decision to not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These questions also asked whether their race/ethnicity and/or sexual orientation was a factor in deciding not to authorities. Section 4: Other Disclosure: Non-Official Reporting focused on whether they had disclosed being sexually assaulted to any non-formal networks, such as family and/or friends. This section was designed after the first couple of interviews where the occurrence of disclosing to family and friends was brought up in conversation during the interviews. Section 5: Reflection Questions focused on focused on how they now feel about their decision to not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Section 6: Recommendations and Suggestions focused on what recommendations they have for other gay
Latino sexual assault survivors who are debating whether to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These questions additionally focused on what would help improve the reporting process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

**Appendix B**: Appendix A and Appendix B both began with Section 1: Identity Questions. These questions focused on their racial/ethnic identity and the significance that their identity has for them. These questions were also designed to build rapport building between myself and the participant. Section 2: Intentions To Report was focused on their decision-making process in deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These questions focused on the factors they considered when deciding to report to authorities. Section 3: Process of Deciding To Report focused on the various considerations they made when deciding to report to authorities. These questions also asked whether their race/ethnicity and/or sexual orientation was a factor in deciding not to authorities. Section 4: Reporting Sexual Assault focused on their experience when reporting having been sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These questions specifically asked the extent to which, if any, their race/ethnicity had a role in how they were responded to by reporting authorities. These questions asked specifically what barriers and facilitators they experienced when reporting having been sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Section 5: Other Disclosure: Non-Official Reporting focused on whether they had disclosed being sexually assaulted to any non-formal networks, such as family and/or friends. This section was designed after the first couple of interviews where the occurrence of disclosing to family and friends was brought up in conversation during the interviews. Literature also indicated that those who disclose to reporting authorities often have disclosed to a non-official source. Section 6: Reflection Questions focused on how they now feel about their decision, after their experience of reporting to authorities. Section 7: Recommendations and Suggestions
focused on what recommendations they have for other gay Latino sexual assault survivors who are debating whether to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. These questions additionally focused on what would help improve the reporting process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

3.3 Participant Inclusion Criteria

All participants met certain criteria to participate in the study. Inclusion criteria for this study are as follows: Participants must 1) self-identify as gay Latino men 2) be over the age of 18 3) be fluent in English or Spanish (may know Portuguese) 4) have experienced sexual assault victimization over the age of 18 and 5) have reported being sexually assaulted or considered to report being sexually assaulted to a reporting authority.

3.4 Recruitment

I initially attempted to recruit participants through various non-profit advocacy-oriented agencies that work to enhance the well-being of survivors of sexual assault, particularly for the LGBTQ and Latinx communities. It was imperative to find an agency that had access to this population (gay Latino sexual assault survivors), as this population is a highly marginalized and vulnerable population and as such, they might not be easy to locate for recruitment purposes. Since gay Latino sexual assault survivors have most likely endured various forms of bias, they may be
reluctant to speak about their experiences, even given the fact that the interviews are not focused on the act of sexual assault itself.

Agencies serve as the gate-keepers to the community. Gate-keepers to the community are essential to qualitative researchers, as they often offer a level of trust and support to a given population (Maxwell, 2012). Gatekeepers are often used when interviewers attempt to make contact with potential participants that they do not know (Seidman, 2013). Since Pittsburgh has an extremely small Latinx population and does not offer many resources to Latinos, recruitment for this population was not possible in Pittsburgh. I also acknowledged my role as somewhat of an outsider when I attempted to recruit men for their participation in this study. Thus, gatekeepers were to provide initial contact with these men, as Latinx and LGBT organizations had established working relationships with these men.

The recruitment process through non-profit agencies was extremely difficult and challenging. I sent contact letters to potential collaborative agencies (and later professional contacts who had relationships with other professional agencies (please see Appendix E). The contact letter provided information about myself, my educational background, my doctoral studies, the purpose of the study, and the possibility of mutual collaboration. Four non-profit agencies and one professional contact were sent these letters. I contacted a total of 16 non-profit agencies that work with LGBT. Latinx populations, and/or sexual assault survivors to assist with recruitment. Two Latino LGBT agencies posted my recruitment flyer wording on social media. One was in English and one was posted in Spanish (an agency in Puerto Rico). Two of the agencies were extremely helpful in connecting with personal contacts and other agencies who would be able to assist in recruitment and commended and supported the study.
I communicated with the designated point-person for the given organization/agency to recruit men for the study. I provided these agencies with IRB approved flyers/notices and also an electronic version of the flyers to the designated member of the agency. In order to recruit all possible gay Latino men, I posted advertisements in both English and Spanish, as some potential participants may read better in Spanish or are more comfortable speaking in Spanish as opposed to English. I did not want to exclude men from the study due to their primary language or language preference, as this could also be a potential barrier for them in reporting sexual assault. The recruitment flyers and social media postings provided: 1) a brief description of the study 2) participant inclusion criteria and 3) contact information for the principal investigator.

As there was a great deal of difficulty in recruiting men from various Latinx and/or LGBT organizations from around the country, I then decided it was best to expand my method of recruitment. I conferred with Dean Jackson and Dr. García regarding the possibility of expanding my recruitment methods and I expanded my recruitment methods to include personal and professional contacts, as well as advertising my study in newspapers, and geosocial media sites, such as Grinder, Jack’d and Scruff. I explained the rationale to my Chair and received approval from my Chair to submit the revisions to IRB. The revised methodology was approved by IRB.

I contacted six LGBT newspapers as potential papers to advertise my study. One newspaper in Miami Dade County was the most responsive and helpful. I posted in this newspaper and recruited one participant through this newspaper. Notably, two newspapers in New York City and Philadelphia never responded to my numerous attempts to advertise in their newspapers to conduct a study on gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Other papers were helpful but after cost considerations, I decided it was best to use professional contacts and geosocial networking applications.
I contacted 45 professional contacts to assist with recruitment for the study. I sent all contacts a brief description and purpose of the study and asked them to distribute the IRB approved flyers to anyone they knew who might wish to participate in the study. A few Latino and Black professors in universities were able to send the recruitment flyer to their professional contacts. A total of 2 men were recruited and participated in the study through this method.

The majority of the participants (n=10) were recruited from Grindr. Grindr is a geosocial networking application geared towards gay, bisexual and transgender (trans*) men. It should be noted that one participant was recruited by utilizing snowball sampling methods after conducting an interview with one participant from Grindr. (Please see Data Analysis for discussion of the use of snowball sampling methods). Grindr allows for advertising studies on their application, where the researcher is able to target specific cities in which to advertise. The researcher must also create a landing site for their study, where participants can gain additional information on the study, should they click that they are interested from the application. The landing site page must also be approved by Grindr before the study can be advertised.

I created a website for my study on Wix.com, which is a free and user-friendly website creator/building site. The URL for my study’s website is: https://daj578.wixsite.com/website. On Wix.com, I advertised my study, and designed the settings to allow potential participants to contact me through the Wix internal messaging as well as through designated professional e-mail accounts/addresses and a professional Google Voice number, to be used solely for the purposes of this study. I allowed for three options to contact me to increase the likelihood of participation. Both the advertisement on Grindr and the advertisement for the study on Wix website used IRB approved wording (please see Appendix G). My Wix website page and my advertisement on Grindr was approved by Grindr.
Participants were first screened using an IRB approved script to determine whether they met the eligibility requirements via telephone or Skype communication before participating in the study. During the screening interview, participants asked any questions they had regarding the study or myself. Many of the participants had questions about the duration of the study, the questions that would be asked, how their anonymity would be secured, what would happen with the interviews, and if they had to provide details about the assault. Many participants were worried and expressed relief that they did not have to provide details about being raped or sexually assaulted. Some of the participants thanked me for not asking details about the assault itself. A few participants asked about why I was interested in this topic and wanted to know about identity, sexual orientation, and experiences, if any, with being a sexual assault survivor. I informed all participants that I am a gay Latino man and my reasoning for conducting a study on gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Specifically, I told them that I felt that gay Latino sexual assault survivors are ignored by many and that these stories need to be told. I also answered other questions they had regarding the study.

The 14 participants who met the necessary inclusion criteria, were provided with details regarding the study, including: a brief description of the study, the purpose of the study, average duration of the interview and the process of data collection. It should be noted that 2 participants answered the demographic questions during the interview, as opposed to e-mail. All participants were also provided with the consent and confidentiality agreement, the demographic form for them to fill out (Appendix B), and a list of resources for Latino sexual assault survivors. Only one participant stated he did not wish to receive the resource the list. Many of the participants stated it would be very helpful to them.

**Sampling**
As my demographic population for this dissertation was gay Latino men, I selected cities in the United States that had sizeable Latino populations on Grindr. I recruited men from Miami, New York City, Orlando, Houston, Dallas, and Los Angeles. I also wanted to ensure that I recruited men from different regions of the United States, as one’s experiences may vary based on location in the United States.

In qualitative research, there has been some contention over the sample sizes needed to conduct rigorous and thorough research. Theoretical saturation has often been cited as the gold standard when purposive sampling has been used in qualitative inquiry, yet no specific guidelines have been determined throughout the literature (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). Saturation is accomplished when no new information is gained from additional interviews. Researchers have outlined guidelines for probabilistic sampling but vary in desired sample sizes in qualitative inquiry, ranging from five to thirty-six, also dependent upon the qualitative approach (Bernard, 1995; Bertaux, 1981; Guest et al., 2006; Kuzel, 1992; Janice M Morse, 1994; J. M. Morse, 2000). Determining the validity and adequacy of sample sizes mathematically has been difficult and nearly impossible, specifically for hard to reach populations (Bernard, 1995; Guest et al., 2006; Trotter, 1998). Guest, Bunce and Johnson (2006) posit that twelve interviews are sufficient for research that aims to understand common experiences among a group of relatively homogenous participants and thus achieve theoretical data saturation. It was found that 92% of codes were determined after twelve interviews and any new codes later generated were not substantively novel but rather variations of former codes (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006).

Purposive sampling was utilized in this dissertation. Purposive sampling allows for an in-depth understanding and insight into a phenomenon that is under investigation that cannot be obtained from random sampling (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2012). Qualitative research
often consists of purposive sampling (Patton, 1990). Convenience sampling was utilized to the extent that men were recruited from personal contacts, a newspaper and a social media app. Convenience sampling is used to locate participants who are readily available for the purposes of the given study (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). Last, snowball sampling was also used during the research process. Snowball sampling is often utilized with populations that are hard to reach (Engel & Schutt, 2012). At the conclusion of the interview, I asked the men if they would be willing to share my flyer and contact information with other men they know who may be interested in the study. Since this group can be considered a hidden population, these men were difficult to locate to recruit, for justifiable reasons. One participant was recruited through this method. (Please see Findings for a more detailed discussion.)

Participants

Forty men expressed interest in the study; of the 40 men, 14 participants were interviewed. A few men decided they did not want to talk about the topic and declined to participate (n=3). Other men were ineligible for the study, because they were sexually assaulted as minors (n=4). A larger number of men (n=19) expressed initial interest in the study yet later did not follow-up for an interview (n=19). Some of these men had responded after their initial communication to me and then expressed hesitancy and later did not respond to a screening interview. Two of the interviews were conducted in Spanish. Fourteen of the men provided their demographic information and completed the interview. All of the men answered the majority of the questions and all of the men read the confidentiality agreement. I consulted with the IRB regarding how best to ensure the participants’ anonymity. Considering that the participants constituted a high-risk population, it was jointly decided that the participants’ signature was not advisable for the study, in order to best ensure their anonymity.
Fourteen men participated in the study. Three of the men were Black, one man was White, four identified as Mestizo, four identified as Mixed, one as Other and one did not respond to this category. Three men who identified as Black – also identified as “Mixed Race”. Two of the Black men identified as Puerto Rican and Black and one as Dominican and Black. The White participant identified as being Mexican and Portuguese. Those who identified as Mestizo were Chicano/Tejano, Dominican, and two identified as Mexican. Among those who identified as Mixed, they were Latino/Chinese, two as Mexican, and one as El Salvadorian. Those who identified as Other identified as Peruvian.

Ten of the men did not report to an official reporting authority and four men reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Ten of the men had disclosed to at least one other person and four men had never disclosed being sexually assaulted to anyone else prior to the interview. Nine of the men sustained physical injuries from being sexually assaulted and five did not. Four of the men sought medical care and nine of the men did not seek medical care. Ten of the men are single, three have boyfriends and one is married.

3.5 Data Collection

All participants were provided with an IRB approved consent form which included 1) overview of the study 2) purpose of the study 3) time commitment 4) potential benefits for participating in the study 5) potential risks for participating in the study and how they will be handled 5) contact information for principal investigator 6) contact information for IRB 7) acknowledgement that study is completely voluntary 8) right to refuse or end their participation in
the study at any given time 9) incentives for participation 10) referral information if needed. All
participants were given the consent form and had at least 24 hours to review the
confidentiality/consent form before the interview, to ensure that they had sufficient time to decide
that they wished to participate in the study. Participants verbally consented to the study but were
not asked to sign any the confidentiality form, to protect their anonymity. I also answered any and
all questions they had regarding the study.

Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted. As previously mentioned, as little is
known about this phenomenon, qualitative methodology is the best to utilize in order to illuminate
the lived experiences and meaning of these experiences for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.
“At the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest at understanding the lived experience of other
people and the meaning they make of that experience” (Seidman, 2013, p. 9). Interviews are an
instrumental tool in qualitative research (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Seidman, 2013). This allowed
me to further understand how the culture of these Latino men influence their decision on whether
to report being sexually assaulted, as cultures vary among Latinos. As the interviews were semi-
structured, it allowed for me to revise the interview guide as additional topics were consistently
stated by the participants. One major advantage to collecting data through in-depth interviews is
that they capture an individual’s perspective of an event or experience (Creswell, 2013; Denzin &
participants to speak openly about their experiences of the decision making and/or reporting
process one-on-one. I was fully aware of the sensitive nature of the research topic, ensured the
participants’ confidentiality and conducted the interview in a thoughtful manner to optimize their
level of comfort. Since participants were talking about reporting a traumatic experience, I did not
want the participants to discuss their experiences in a focus group or to be limited to an open-ended
survey. I believe that in-depth interviews were the best way to ask men about their experiences and to minimize feelings of comfortability and vulnerability. This proved true, as some of the men had never disclosed being sexually assaulted to anyone except to me. A few of the men became upset during the process of talking about their experience and I drew upon my clinical skills during these times (please see Discussion for more details on this occurrence). While I did not provide them counseling, I did provide them with a list of resources should they wish to seek outside counseling or other mental health or social support services. At the end of the interview, I again shared with some participants that I have a counseling background during our debriefing. I also used this as a way to discuss the resource sheet with men, many of whom discussed not knowing what resources were available to them.

Once participants met the required participant inclusion criteria and wished to participate in the study, we agreed on a mutual time to have the interview. All participants were advised that they would be audio-recorded and that the interviews would be transcribed. I also sent them a demographic questionnaire (Appendix B) to fill out before we spoke. Interviews lasted between 35-165 minutes. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish or a mix of the aforementioned languages, if necessary. Due to the sensitive nature of the topic, I let the participants decide which language they wished to have the interview conducted in. I conducted two of the interviews in Spanish, although both participants spoke English. I believe this spoke to their culture and comfort level. All interviews were audio-recoded with two recording devices (laptop and an audio recorder). Interviews were transcribed and translated (two of them) into English, for purposes of not losing any of the nuances in the data. All the themes from the data were coded in both languages and reported in English, regardless of the original language in which they were obtained.
After the interview had concluded, I asked participants if they would be willing to speak or meet with me should I have any follow-up questions or to clarify their statements while generating themes during the data analysis process. I followed up with some of the participants to verify if the data reported was accurate as well as allowing them to receive their transcript, if they wanted. Some members only wished to view the transcript, others only wished to see the final product and others wished to verify the transcript, analysis and the final product. As this process is currently being completed, all participants will have the opportunity to member-check before any publications result from this study. This was especially important for interviews conducted in Spanish, as each country can differ on the meanings of certain words in Spanish. I wanted to ensure the accuracy of the data reported. This allowed for member-checking, which is an important method in qualitative analysis (Maxwell, 2012). This did occur with one interview in Spanish, where one term has two different meanings, dependent on the country. I wanted to verify the word, in order to accurately capture their experience. This is important for the validity of the study. Demographic information was collected, if it was not completed before the interview (please refer to Appendix C). This demographic information is displayed in Appendix H.

3.6 Data Analysis

After the interviews had been conducted and transcribed, the data analysis process took place. All the interviews were transcribed verbatim from their audio recordings. The two interviews that were conducted in Spanish were translated into English for the purposes of coding the data. Transcripts in Spanish were also kept in their original language and coded in Spanish as
well. The data analysis process was inductive. Qualitative data analysis is a reflexive and iterative process (Engel & Schutt, 2012). Inductive research occurs when a researcher identifies patterns from the data and develops a generalization about a social process arising from the data (Engel & Schutt, 2012). NVivo 11 was used as a digital tool to organize and conduct the data analysis.

**Coding**

Coding is the process of naming segments with a label that summarizes and accounts for each piece of data (Charmaz, 2014). In qualitative research, coding is the first process towards making analytic statements from the data (Charmaz, 2014). According to Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014), “codes are labels that assign symbolic meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study” (p.73). Coding is a task that allows the researcher to gather the most meaningful data, assemble chunks of data, and condense the data into analyzable units (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). The resulting codes allow for the researcher to begin to make meaning from the data, which is essential toward understanding the lived experiences, perceptions, and beliefs of the participants. Codes are often short phrases or labels that are assigned to segments of data (Charmaz, 2014). Charmaz (2014) notes that the coding process in grounded theory allows for codes to arise from the data and should shape the analytic frame to build the analysis. Coding is the pivotal link that connects the data to the emerging theory in grounded research (Charmaz, 2014).

Following Strauss and Corbin (1990), I followed three steps for analyzing qualitative data. I read the transcripts in order to familiarize myself with the data and conducted open coding. I read through the transcripts line by line and jotted down words and/or phrases that would best encapsulate the emerging phenomena from the data. The words and phrases during the open coding process were clear and concise (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). I then re-read the transcripts and began
to generate preliminary codes. During this part of the coding process, I engaged in first cycle coding, in accordance with Saldaña (2015). (Please see Themes for more detail). This allowed for a thorough and rigorous analysis to be conducted, ensuring that I did not miss any meaningful data from the transcripts.

The first step of coding in grounded theory is open coding or what is also referred to as initial coding. Initial coding allows the researcher to remain open to whatever theoretical possibilities may arise from the data. As this coding process is inductive, it allows the researcher to ultimately develop larger categories from what emerges from the initial coding (Charmaz, 2014). During this stage, the researcher reads the text and assigns initial codes to the data (Creswell & Poth, 2017). Initial coding sets the stage for larger categories to be developed, once similar or overlapping codes can be assigned to larger categories (Charmaz, 2014). This process allows for initial codes to be generated that later form larger categories or themes.

Focused coding is the second stage of coding in grounded theory. Focused codes are more selective and conceptual than initial codes (Charmaz, 2014; Glaser & Strauss, 2017). After the initial codes are determined, focused coding allows for synthesizing and later are used to explain larger sets of data (Charmaz, 2014). These larger sets of data more inclusively and adequately capture the essence that is first captured through initial codes. During this process, the codes become fewer and more condensed.

The final stage of coding the data is referred to as axial coding. Axial coding is a third stage that refines and synthesizes data into a coherent whole (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Axial coding relates categories to subcategories by specifying the dimensions of a category and reassembles the data to give coherence the emerging analysis (Charmaz, 2014). Axial coding allows for researchers to describe the given experience more fully by linking the relationships between categories.
(Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In sum, axial coding links subcategories to larger categories and explains their relationship to one another.

**Themes**

Strauss and Corbin (1990) state that themes are the classifications of discrete concepts. Strauss and Corbin (1990) refer to themes as categories and state that “this clarification is discovered when concepts are compared one against another ad appear to pertain to a similar phenomenon. Thus, the concepts are grouped together under a higher order, more abstract concept called a category” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 61). Strauss and Corbin (1990) refer to categories or themes as more discrete concepts than codes (Bernard, Wutich, & Ryan, 2016).

For this dissertation, I also followed Saldaña’s (2013) methods of coding. Saldaña (2013) breaks coding into two main cycles: first cycle and second cycle coding. First circle codes are the codes initially applied to the data segments (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2014). The first cycle coding was conducted in order to generate initial codes from the data. I conducted first and second cycle coding, consistent with qualitative methodology, in order to best analyze the emerging phenomena from the data (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2014; Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

I first engaged in first cycle coding, in order to generate initial codes from the data (Saldaña, 2013). While there are various approaches to first cycle coding, each approach to coding has a unique purpose and function (Hubert, Miles, & Saldaña, 2014). For the purposes of this dissertation, I used four main approaches for the first cycle coding: in vivo coding, descriptive coding, emotion coding and versus coding.

I utilized in vivo coding, as it uses the exact words and/or phrases from the participants. In vivo coding uses the participant’s own language as codes and is one of the most well-known coding methods (Hubert, Miles, & Saldaña, 2014; Saldaña, 2015). It should be noted that this form of in
vivo coding is different than that Charmaz’s (2014) approach of in vivo coding. I used in vivo coding, as it captured the exact words of the participants, which was extremely imperative to record for many of the complex meanings that they gave to their experiences.

I used descriptive coding for my first cycle coding, also for my open coding (grounded theory), a foundation approach to coding qualitative data, regardless of the type of qualitative study. Descriptive coding assigns short labels in a word or a phrase to capture the essence of the data segment. This was particularly useful for the second cycle or axial coding stage of coding, when condensing the codes into themes.

Third, I used emotion coding. Due to the nature of the study, which focuses on the experiences of the decision-making process and/or the experience in reporting being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities, I felt it was best to use an approach that would capture the emotions of the participants’ lived experiences. Emotion coding is best used for studies that explore intrapersonal and interpersonal participant experiences and provides insight into their perspectives (Hubert, Miles, & Saldaña, 2014). This was particularly relevant for understanding the perceived potential barriers for men who did not report being sexually assaulted. Following Saldaña’s (2015) approach, when a participant labeled their own emotion, I placed the labeled emotion in quotation marks.

Versus coding is used in qualitative studies that wish to identify in binary terms that individuals, groups, and/or social systems experience in conflict with one another. Versus coding is used when there is often a power dynamic imbalance between two groups (Saldaña, 2015). Since this study seeks to understand the influence of gay Latino men’s identities on reporting sexual assault, versus coding allowed for the analysis to identify differences perceived between two identities (gay versus straight, white versus black, white versus Latino). This is particularly
relevant when seeking to understand the differences experienced or perceived to be an issue by gay Latino sexual assault survivors compared with their white and/or heterosexual counterparts.

As coding is an iterative process, I kept an audit trail to provide a detailed description of my decision-making process of how I analyzed my data. Since qualitative research is iterative by nature, it is important to report how I managed the raw data by categorizing the data into meaningful themes and later assigning them codes. I wrote analytical memos to jot my initial thoughts on the interviews, particularly what stood out to me from the data as well as my accounting for bracketing, for each of the interviews. An audit trail describes the decision-making process during the data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2015) and is often considered good methodological practice. I wanted to ensure that my data analysis was as rigorous as possible and that the coding process was transparent and detailed. In order to rigorously analyze my data, I followed the systematic approach outlined by Miles and Huberman (1994). While this technique is primarily used in phenomenological studies, I found it useful to engage in for the purposes of keeping a detailed record of my coding schema and other aspects of the analysis process. After each interview, I wrote memos in order to write down my initial reflections and impressions from each interview. I wrote memos for each of the interviews, which later helped to generate codes from the data. Also following Miles and Huberman (1994), I drafted a summary sheet from the field notes (in this case transcripts and memos), that summarized the important aspects for each participant, that later would assist with preliminary codes. Such examples were the barriers and facilitators experienced by each participant which were summarized in memos. Memos are short phrases, ideas or key concepts that occur to the reader (Creswell & Poth, 2017).

Analytic memos were also utilized in order to further understand the emerging themes of the data and to process the data. While analytics memos are primarily used in phenomenological
research, analytic memos served as an audit trail to detail my coding processes. Analytics memos help the researcher to process the data in a brief or extended narrative. These memos are often used to condense and synthesize the data and serve as a basis for final report. They often help to gather the data into more generalizable concepts (Huberman, Miles, & Saldaña, 2014).

3.7 Positionality

It is imperative for me to be cognizant of my own positionality in order to recognize preconceived notions I may hold about conducting this research, how my personal and professional experience shape my ideas regarding my topic, how my professional and life experiences may result in assumptions I have regarding the participants, my power relation to the participants, and how participants may perceive me and which would thus influence their responses.

I have always been passionate about the life experiences of gay Latino and Black men both on personal and a professional level. As a gay man of color, I am committed to understanding these experiences and the effects their intersectionality of marginalized identities has on gay men of color. As Black and Latino gay men are subject to both racism and homophobia, much of my professional and personal interests have focused on addressing the needs of these men. I have personally been subject to many instances of racism and homophobia during my formative years and continue to experience varying forms of both racism and homophobia as an adult.

I am Latino, gay, adopted and originally from Honduras, which has given me a unique perspective on life. I was born in Honduras and was fortunate enough to be adopted and consequently was afforded the opportunities available to me in the United States. I was raised by
an inter-faith white couple, which adds to the complexity of my own identity and my life experiences. While I have always been proud of being Latino, I grew up in a predominantly white community and was not accepted for either my ethnicity or my sexual orientation or the fact that my Dad is Jewish. I have experienced bias, racism, homophobia, bullying and harassment during my teenage years. I was often told to “go back to my country” and was called derogatory comments such as “spic” as well as homophobic terms when I was growing up. I was severely bullied during the entirety of my high school experience, and I choose not to speak publicly about these experiences anymore. During this time period, I had reported being bullied, harassed, and being threatened to numerous school authorities and they either did not believe me or minimized what I was experiencing. I was told that “boys will be boys” and to “thicken your skin.” Even when I told the principal that there was a threat to physically attack me, she told me and another student that she did not believe either of us. Two days later, I was attacked – choked, strangled, thrown against a wall, hit and had a chair thrown at me and was almost put in the hospital. I do not like writing or talking about this unless necessary. These early traumatic experiences shaped my own belief in reporting traumatic experiences to authorities. I personally know the pain of not being believed and how racism and homophobia allow for these occurrences to happen.

These experiences caused me to understand racism, xenophobia, and discrimination on a personal level. Although I was unable to fully conceptualize or understand these experiences from an academic perspective, I certainly understood the hurt resulting from these experiences. In turn, I knew that I was different for not being White and heterosexual and would most likely not be believed when I attempted to report being victimized. I used these painful experiences to begin to become involved in groups during college and graduate school to fight racism and homophobia in an attempt to protect other students from experiencing the same.
As an adult, I began to be comfortable with who I was as a person and accept myself and find others who accepted me. This process was far from easy or painless – yet I was able to grow stronger as a person and empathize with others who were made to feel different. During my undergraduate years, I became close with other Latino and Black students who helped me gain a strong sense of pride and common lived experiences that helped me to finally feel validation and self-worth. It was during this time, when I also began to become active in Latino and Black student groups in order to advocate for other students of color.

My current interest in sexual assault against gay Latino men is a result of my previous work experience, clinical experiences in conducting therapy, as well as being shaped by my own personal identity. During my previous experience as a Criminal Investigator with the Office of the Public Defender for the State of New Jersey, I often was assigned to cases involving domestic violence and sexual assault. It was from interviewing both perpetrators and survivors of sexual assault that I first became aware of the prevalence of the problem as well as the numerous effects it has on survivors. It was then that I first recognized the severity of the problem, in terms of both procedural and policy issues.

It was during my time at the University of Pennsylvania, both through classwork and fieldwork in my MSW program, that I furthered my knowledge of and clinical experience with sexual assault. As a social work intern, I provided individual and group therapy to undocumented Spanish-speaking immigrants from Latin America and they often disclosed to me their experiences of being raped and/or sexually assaulted when crossing the border. My second internship was at a hospital which had a methadone substance abuse clinic, where I provided individual and group counseling for those primarily with heroin addictions. I was surprised to learn that the vast majority of my clients had been sexually assaulted in their lives. I believe that their substance usage may
have been one coping strategy for their pain.

I have found myself being personally affected by erroneous beliefs regarding sexual assault, rape myth acceptance, and continued acceptance of victim blaming and rape culture, including those occurring on college campuses and universities. Misinformed notions regarding sexual assault, lack of awareness surrounding issues of consent, victim-blaming, and the disbelief of survivors all contribute to rape culture which allow for sexual assault and rape to continue. I am specifically interested in the experiences of sexual assault of gay men of color, as this topic has been largely ignored in literature and has yet to be fully addressed. This is shaped by my own experiences of being discriminated against, bullied and harassed due to my nationality, sexual orientation, and ethnicity. I have also experienced other instances of not being taken seriously by those in authority especially around issues of inequality, mistreatment, and harassment. I should note that I have also had positive experiences where I was taken seriously by individuals, however these people were never in administrative positions.

As a researcher, I believe that my personal identity and experiences are mostly beneficial to my research but that they can also serve as a hindrance to my research. The fact that I am a gay Latino male was beneficial when interviewing other gay Latino men about their experiences with reporting being sexually assaulted, as it helped to develop trust during the interview process with them. I believe that many of the gay Latino men I interviewed felt more comfortable speaking with me, simply due to the fact that I am also a gay Latino man. They were able to talk about sensitive topics with me without feeling judged and likely assumed that I also have experienced instances of racism and/or homophobia. Some literature has addressed that how interviewees may feel more comfortable being interviewed by people of their own race/ethnicity. For instance, Foster (2004) addresses this phenomenon of how participants may be more receptive when being interviewed by
a person of their own race, mentioning that Black teachers verbalized that they felt more comfortable being interviewed by a Black interviewer than by a White interviewer.

While I often related to men on the basis of my sexual orientation and ethnicity, I did my best to be cognizant of the fact that my own personal life experiences might bias my perceptions of these men’s experiences. During the interviews, I found myself relating to some similar aspects of their lives and differing on others. There were times where I realized how fortunate I was to have not experienced certain negative circumstances and other times had felt the same pain. A few times, I had to remind myself to not interject or agree or disagree with a point that they had made. I realized my role was as a researcher and not as a clinician. At times, I wanted to validate their experiences or state that I related to them on a certain topic or viewpoint. It was difficult not to do so, but I did not want to bias the interview and did not give an opinion to the viewpoints they expressed. This was difficult in certain instances where they sought verbal reassurance. In these cases, I used my clinical skills and repeated what they said back to me, without taking an affirmative stance. I only validated their experiences in telling them that they were not to blame for being sexually assaulted and that any feelings they had were normal. I made a professional judgment to do so. In cases where I was unsure of what they were stating and to reduce bias, I asked follow-up questions, and clarified possible misunderstandings, and conducted member-checking, when necessary. This was particularly relevant for those who reported being sexually assaulted, as their stories were complex and consisted of various individuals who had a role in the reporting process. I wanted to ensure I understood and reported their stories accurately.

I was extremely cognizant before beginning the interviews that I could identify personally with a given participant which might affect my ability to remain unbiased during the interview. There were occasions during the interviews, even on topics unrelated to main research questions,
where I identified with their experiences and reminded myself to not become to personally attached to their stories during the interview. I also had to ensure not to delve into topics that were too far outside the scope of the interview, even if they were of personal interest to me. Such ethical considerations have been documented by researchers engaged in qualitative research. Milner (2007) cautions that a researcher’s interests and personal agendas may overshadow that of the participants when conducting research. To this extent, I followed Milner’s (2007) advice that both the narrative and counter-narrative should be reported in order to provide fair evidence during research. I reminded myself to ask open-ended questions and to avoid asking leading questions, as much as possible. I was aware that I could enter the research believing I would find blatant examples of homophobia and racism to confirm my personal beliefs that may not be present. There were certain instances where racism was not a perceived factor and I reminded myself that racism did not have to be a factor for everyone and to not ask follow-up questions if they stated that racism was not a factor. I also had to remind myself that not finding racism as a barrier is an equally important factor as finding racism as a potential barrier. Following Milner’s (2007) advice, I was aware of my own biases and agendas when the data was contradictory to my original beliefs and I adequately reported the data. This mainly occurred when many of the men did not cite racism as a perceived barrier to reporting sexual assault.

I kept memos to account for bracketing during the data collection process. Memos helped me to reflect on my personal feelings during the interviews, as they were very difficult to conduct. The men expressed a significant amount of pain during the interviews and shared intimate details of their lives. I kept memos to reflect on my own reactions, feelings and thoughts from the interviews as way to reduce bias. It was a cathartic experience for me. I also debriefed with Dr. García for times that were particularly difficult for me to process. I was also amazed by the
strength, resiliency, and wisdom of the men. Their courage, bravery, and overall kindness was profound and noted.

One way in which I have power is due to my education. While less than 1% of Latinos have a doctorate, I am extremely aware of how my privilege affects how I relate to others, especially with other Latinos. As a PhD student, I am afforded access to information that other persons may not have simply due to my status of being a doctoral student. In addition, I may have work and educational experience that the participants have not been able to access due to socio-economic status or their ethnicity, as Latinos have historically encountered barriers denying them access to higher education. There may also be privileges or power that I have yet to recognize and need to be open to addressing these factors when conducting future research.

During data collection, I wrote analytic memos, which in part detailed my own personal feelings to their stories. I wanted to account for bracketing, as I am a gay Latino man and had many commonalities with some of the participants. Bracketing, is where researchers set aside their own experiences and take an unbiased perspective towards the phenomena in question (Moustaka, 1994). However, this is rarely achieved (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Moustaka, 1994). As an interpretive researcher, I am aware of how my personal experiences shape my interactions with participants and my interpretations of the data. This highlighted the need for me to take active measures to account for bias and to be reflective and transparent throughout the data collection process. I also made sure to debrief, as method of adding validity towards my study. Debriefing challenges the researchers’ assumptions, helps the researcher reach the next methodological stage and asks hard questions regarding the methods and interpretations (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To this end, I also engaged in debriefing with Dr. García, another important technique in qualitative research to help reflect on my own experiences and be aware of
my own biases before interpreting the data from the research as well as to think critically about the phenomena.

In conclusion, this dissertation was guided by Grounded Theory methodology. This dissertation seeks to explore the lived experiences of gay Latino sexual assault survivors and specifically identity and understand the barriers and facilitators experienced during the sexual assault reporting process. Grounded Theory methodology allows for examining an under researched area with the goal of developing and testing the effectiveness of culturally competent evidence-based clinical interventions practice models to better assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors. In-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with fourteen participants, who spoke about the barriers they perceived to reporting sexual assault or the actual barriers they experienced when being sexually assaulted. The findings and discussion from these interviews are contained in the next chapter.
4.0 Findings

This dissertation sought to identify and understand the barriers and facilitators to reporting being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities experienced by gay Latino sexual assault survivors. An appreciable amount of attention was focused on the role of homophobia and racism in the reporting process for gay Latino men. The lack of extant literature examining the role of racism and homophobia helped to inform two of the aims of this dissertation. The dissertation further sought to identify other barriers and facilitators experienced by these men. Findings of this study are consistent with much of the sparse literature examining barriers to reporting sexual assault of men.

The first aim of this study sought to identity what factors influence gay Latino men’s decision making when deciding to report being sexually assaulted. These findings are addressed in Theme 1: Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault. There were a variety of factors that influenced gay Latino men’s decision-making process when deciding to report being sexually assaulted. Many of these factors overlapped with one another and could not be parsed out theoretically or in practicality. Such instances are discussed in detail. Due to the intersectionality of their multiple marginalized identities, gay Latino men often had to contend with multiple factors simultaneously when deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted to authorities.

The second aim of this study sought to identify barriers and facilitators experienced when reporting sexual assault. These are addressed in Theme 2: Negative Repercussions Experienced When Reporting Sexual Assault and Theme 3: Facilitators to Reporting Sexual Assault. These findings are discussed in detail in each section.
The third aim of this study was to understand how the racial/ethnic background and sexual orientation of the participants affect how authorities respond to and address their complaints of sexual assault. Much of this discussion relates to Theme 2 (Barriers), while only a few of the findings were consistent with Theme 3 (Facilitators). That the majority of the findings for this particular aim were barriers demonstrates a large need to address barriers to reporting in order to enhance the process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

Gay men experienced a wide range of feelings throughout the reporting process, both in their decision-making process as well as throughout the entirety of the reporting process, for those who did report to authorities. Many of these feelings occurred as a result of negative and positive responses from others. Other feelings occurred when deciding whether it was best for them to report or not to report to authorities. Many of these feelings were related to larger concepts around their identities as a man, a gay man, a Latino man and/or a Black man, and often were not able to be separated from one another. Consistent with prior literature, men experienced a wide range of feelings both with coping from the sexual assault as well as during the reporting process. Feelings included: being anxious, scared, angry, depressed, sad, overwhelmed, hopeless, hopeful, glad and relieved.
4.1 Theme 1: Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault

4.1.1 Gendered Stereotypes

Many of the men spoke about how being a male and the expectations and gendered norms associated with being a man affected their decision-making process in deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted to authorities. Men felt that their identity as man resulted primarily in 1) being blamed 2) not being believed or not being taken seriously, and 3) being emasculated/seen as less than a man.

Some men felt that they were at a disadvantage in reporting being sexually assaulted due to their identity as a male. Many men referenced that women are not taken seriously when reporting being sexually assaulted and that experiences in reporting being sexually assaulted may even be worse for them as men. These findings corroborate prior literature on barriers to reporting sexual assault among men, which include: 1) fear of not being believed, 2) not being taken seriously, 3) perceptions of masculinity 4) being blamed and 5) being emasculated (Davies, 2002; Davies et al., 2012; Davies et al., 2006; Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; Javaid, 2016; McLean, 2013; Pino & Meier, 1999). This perception of a potential barrier was often tied into the notion that men cannot be raped. Men also expressed that their identity as a man would be questioned by reporting authorities, having been raped by another man. Although not explicitly stated in these terms, men felt they might not be viewed as a man if they “allowed” another man to rape them. Participants referenced the commonly-held perception that men should be able to defend themselves and that reporting authorities may hold this belief and therefore blame them for being sexually assaulted. If the belief is that men should be able to defend themselves, then men cannot be raped and
therefore these men would not be taken seriously or believed by reporting authorities. This finding was consistent with prior literature that identified that the perception that men cannot be raped can serve as a potential barrier (Davies, 2002; Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; Javaid, 2016). These barriers were tied to their identity as men.

Some of the men stated that they did not report being sexually assaulted because they did not believe that they would be taken seriously, due to the fact that they should be able to protect themselves or that others would believe that they should be able to protect themselves from being sexually assaulted. For example, I asked Ricardo if he could give specifics on how being a man influenced his decision to not report being sexually assaulted. He responded: “Sure. I mean, because, as a man, you're like you just don't ... How is that possible? It's not like you can't defend yourself. It's not like you aren't physically able to fend it off.” Other participants expressed similar sentiments. Some of the men expressed that they felt that they would not be taken seriously as men due to the fact that they should be able to protect themselves or that others would believe that they should be able to protect themselves from being sexually assaulted.

This gendered expectation influenced how men felt their complaints would be taken and whether they would be believed and/or blamed by reporting authorities. As consistent with the literature, the perception of their masculinity was a potential barrier for some of these men (Davies, 2002; Pino & Meier, 1999). Ryan clearly expressed this belief of how being a man and men’s masculinity directly affected whether men reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Ryan stated:

I think that would really help get rid of the stigma, because as men, we're supposed to be strong, we're supposed to be masculine, be the protectors. But I think if we take away all of that, and we just say you know what, this can happen to anyone. No matter how strong
you are, no matter how masculine you are, no matter how independent of a woman you are. Nothing. Nothing matters. This can happen to anyone. I think if we do a better job on that, I think we can make some progress here. I think that's what's also part of the issue of why men are not reporting, because we ourselves have a certain view of what masculinity is, and what it's not.

Gendered norms also intertwined with their identity as gay men, which was nuanced in the way that their identity as a gay man emasculated them (according to others). Not only did gendered norms overlap with their emasculation as gay men, victim-blame rhetoric used towards women, was also perceived as a barrier. Specifically, men believed that they would be subject to similar treatment as women who report being sexually assaulted. Men felt that they would similarly be told that they were “asking for it”, as is often the case with women. Many of the men felt that they would be taken less seriously than women, as consistent with the literature on this topic (Davies, 2002; McLean, 2013). This often centered around the notion that they would be perceived as “asking for it” or being hyper-sexual. Victim-blaming was key factor that men identified as a barrier in reporting being sexually assaulted. Many of the men did not report, in part because of their identity as men.

Sebastian stated that his identity as a male influenced who he felt comfortable reporting to and that he would only feel comfortable disclosing that he was sexually assaulted to other men. Sebastian spoke to the belief that men cannot be raped and how it differs for men than women. I asked: “How do you think being a male differs on how people perceive sexual assault or rape as opposed to when women are sexually assaulted?” He replied: “Like it can't happen because you're a male, it can't happen.” I asked him to expand on his answer and he said: “Not believable because you're able to overpower people… in a way that you're not gonna be able to defend yourself. Stuff
like that.” Sebastian’s perceptions of how he would be perceived by others was similar to that of other participants. Many of the men felt that that this gendered expectation of men being able to defend themselves was a factor in deciding not to report to reporting authorities.

Jevon expressed that he did not believe he would be taken as seriously as a woman because people do not consider that men could be sexually assaulted as well as the notion that men should be able to defend themselves.

DJ: And do you think it would be different if you were a woman?

Jevon: Yes, completely agree with that.

DJ: And can you expand on that a little bit more if you're able to?

Jevon: They don't really talk about it on media or ever really about men being assaulted. Yeah, they don't talk about men being assaulted by other men or even by women so I don't think anyone thinks it's even a problem and they think if they're true men that they can defend each other, I mean defend themselves.

Their identity as men at times was also directed inward, particularly around self-blame. Men referenced blaming themselves at some point during the sexual assault process, stating that they wondered if they wore their shorts too low and were concerned they may have come across as “too friendly”. This was notable as was their pain when they disclosed these beliefs during the interview.

In relation to their masculinity as gay men, participants felt that they would be perceived as hypersexual and that reporting authorities would assume that all gay men want sex and that, consequently, the sexual assault was their fault. These barriers are consistent with West and Zimmerman (1987) who postulate that one’s gender can be accepted or rejected by others. Their gender as a gay can be rejected by reported authorities resulting in them being blamed or not being
believed by reporting authorities. The notion that gay men are “asking for it”, it a rejection of their
gender performativity by reporting authorities.

Lastly, their identity as a man as a barrier to reporting was tied to the vulnerability needed
to report being sexually assaulted. This concept was often tied to their own understanding of their
own masculinity and concept of being a man. This occurred in two main ways 1) men were less
masculine for being sexually assaulted and 2) men would be seen as less masculine for reporting.
The first occurrence can be linked to Latino masculinities, particularly around the concepts of
machismo for gay Latino men. Gay Latino men may be viewed as less than a man and not be
following the cultural expectations of Latino men for reporting being sexually assaulted.
According to some definitions of machismo, Latino men are not supposed to display their emotion
to others nor show vulnerability (Abreu, Goodyear, Campos & Newcomb, 2000; Torres, Solberg,
& Carlstrom, 2002). The second occurrence can be linked to machismo, in that gay Latino men
may view themselves as less masculine for reporting by others. Additionally, the second
occurrence also confirms previous research that identifies perceptions of masculinity as a barrier
to reporting sexual assault among men (Davies, 2002; Pino & Meier, 1999). Men had to consider
how their masculinity would be perceived by reporting authorities, both for having been sexually
assaulted as well as for reporting the assault. A few men felt that their masculinity may be brought
into question if they reported being sexually assaulted. Issues around masculinity were tied to
“being a man” and the gendered norms that are associated with being a man.
4.1.2 Homophobia

Participants frequently cited that being a gay man was a barrier to reporting sexual assault, specifically in how they would be perceived by reporting authorities due to their identity as a gay man. This finding was consistent with prior literature that identified that men are more likely to report if they believe they will be perceived as being heterosexual (Davies, et al., 2006; Hodge and Cantor, 1998). Gender performativity explains this phenomenon in that a gay man’s gender is subject to acceptance or rejection by others (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Butler (1988) also contends that gender performativity promotes heterosexuality. Therefore, gay men would be unable to perform their gender in accordance with gender norms. The rejection of their gender performativity (a gay man) may be taken as effeminate and would be rejected by reporting authorities. Such rejection may result in being blamed, not being believed and/or not being taken seriously. The men cited stereotypical beliefs and perceptions that reporting authorities and heterosexual individuals may have about them being gay men, which would result in: 1) being blamed and 2) not being believed and/or their report of sexual assault not being taken seriously. Many men felt that they would be blamed as gay men for the assault itself, consistent with the erroneous stereotype that gay men are promiscuous, constantly wanting sex, and are “asking for it”. Homophobia also resulted in these gay men not being believed or taken seriously. Such homophobic attitudes are based in the notion that gay men are promiscuous, and that these men had consented to the encounter, and therefore were falsely claiming that they had been raped.

The men spoke of this barrier both when specifically asked about what factors they considered when deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted and it was also raised by participants in general conversation. Some men were able to give specifics about how being a gay
man served as a barrier to reporting and other men were not able to specify how they believed reporting authorities would react to them as gay men but believed that their sexual orientation could be a potential barrier to reporting.

Being judged did not only result in being victim-blamed by authorities but also at times resulted in the men blaming themselves for being assaulted. One participant voiced that he would be judged for being a gay man by reporting authorities, as a result of misconceptions about gay men. I asked Ryan about whether being gay influenced his decision in reporting to authorities. Ryan stated:

Definitely. Yes. And I can answer that very good, because I thought about that one. I think as a gay person, you're already ... people already have the assumption that many people, many LGBT folks, this is not the way they're born. So then, for you to go and report something like this, people are going to then think, what? They're going to think other things, that other people think. Yeah, in fact you did turn yourself this way. That it was a result of it. And so, for me, that was part of the reason why I didn't report it too, because I didn't want to be defined by it.

Other survivors voiced that they would be judged for being gay and for being with other men in the first place. This negative reaction was linked with homophobia as well as male police officers not being equipped or trained to work with gay male sexual assault survivors. Being judged as a gay man was often due to the erroneous negative perceptions of gay men as being promiscuous. This was tied to the barrier of homophobia, as previously discussed.

Many of the men spoke about how homophobia was a barrier to reporting being sexually assaulted. Ricardo stated that he believed that if he attempted to report being sexually assaulted as a gay man, reporting authorities would respond to him negatively. He stated a response would
likely be: “You know you were asking for it because that’s what you do…. Or, if you're a gay man, then you're like oh, well, that's okay, boys do. Come on.” Ricardo felt that reporting authorities would blame him because he is a gay man, rooted in stereotypes about gay men being promiscuous and hyper-sexual. As a result, reporting authorities would blame him for the sexual assault, rooted in the notion that he “asked for it”. This is one manifestation of homophobia that gay men perceived as a potential barrier.

Another participant, Sebastian, stated that while he did not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities, he was aware that his mother would blame him for being sexually assaulted, since he is a gay man. “My mom would say that's what you get for being gay. I know she would and that's sad.” Sebastian was unable to disclose being sexually assaulted to his mother because of victim-blaming ideology stemming from homophobia. While his mother is not an official reporting authority, homophobia still served as a barrier to any form of disclosure for him.

Similarly, Malcolm felt that he would not be believed because he is a gay man. Malcolm spoke to erroneous perceptions and stereotypes of gay men which may result in people not believing that he was sexually assaulted. I asked Malcolm how being gay affected his experience when reporting being sexually assaulted. Malcolm stated:

Oh yeah, I think that affected it a lot just because…the automatic assumption was that I wanted to sleep with him and that I went to his house, I willingly went over to his apartment is partly why people didn't believe me initially because I do think… it's very much in the forefront, so I felt like a lot of people saw it as just a casual hookup that I regretted kind of thing rather than it being assault.

Malcolm felt that because he is a gay man, reporting authorities would believe that the incident was consensual and that he was not actually sexually assaulted. Not being believed by
reporting authorities led to a possibility of being invalidated and dismissed by reporting authorities. Many of the men felt that they would not be believed if they attempted to report being sexually assaulted, and it was therefore in their best interest to not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities.

Another participant, Alfredo, also felt that he would not be taken seriously by reporting authorities if he attempted to report being sexually assaulted. Alfredo felt that he would receive a response based on the notion that he was ‘asking for it’. Alfredo stated:

I’ve heard of like other friends that they’ve been sexually assaulted, and the police make fun of them and saying, ‘Don't you guys all get raped or like getting raped?... just like not really taking you seriously, they think that it’s not really important and that somehow gay men are deviant in some way in that they liked it or deserved it.

In this instance, Alfredo mentions both primary manifestations of homophobia when reporting being sexually assaulted. He references that he would likely not be taken seriously and be blamed for his identity as a gay man. This highlights that homophobic responses often do not occur in one form or the other, that at times they overlap with one another can occur simultaneously.

The second main response that men referenced as a barrier was not being taken seriously by reporting authorities. Many men felt that because they are gay men, they would be viewed as hyper-sexual and promiscuous, and therefore not believed that they had been sexually assaulted. These men felt that reporting authorities would believe that the act was consensual and that they were simply claiming that they had been sexually assaulted after the fact.

Consistent with the literature, some men felt that even being perceived as being gay would be a barrier for them in reporting having been sexually assaulted. One participant, Ricardo, spoke
to this notion. Ricardo felt that being a gay man would serve as a potential barrier, regardless of whether he was gay or not. Ricardo stated, “If you're not out, that's an issue. If they don't agree with your sexual orientation, that's an issue, even if you are out to them.” For him, it was clear his sexual orientation would be under scrutiny by reporting authorities and could affect how they interact with him. Being a gay man may serve as a barrier for men who are not open about their sexual orientation and even those who are out may encounter additional homophobia by reporting authorities.

Another participant stated that he was unsure how his identity as a gay man might influence the reporting process but expressed concern about how he would be responded to by reporting authorities. Jonathan stated:

…another factor that I considered was that we were, we were both men, we were both guys, so, like, how is that going to be perceived, how am I going to report this to, a cop, let’s say, to a straight cop, and you know, what is their reaction going to be initially with this, with this being an instance, an instance of two men, of Gay men, how are they gonna to me being gay versus how they are going to react handling the case itself.

While Jonathan was not entirely sure how heterosexual reporting authorities would respond to him reporting sexual assault or the ways in which their homophobia may play out, he was worried how they would handle his case. This concern was similarly found to be a barrier to reporting sexual assault against men in the military (Sadler, Cheney, & Mengeling, 2018). Another study found that male survivors conveyed they felt they would receive a poor response from police when reporting that they had been sexually assaulted (Javid, 2017). Other men expressed similar concerns about how reporting authorities would react to them reporting being sexually assaulted as gay men, even if they did reference specific homophobic reactions by reporting authorities.
Respondents also indicated that reporting authorities may also not be equipped to work with a case involving two men.

One of the participants stated that homophobia may be a potential barrier in certain instances but may not be a potential barrier in others. This participant, Ricardo, credited this to the area in which he would be reporting the sexual assault. He felt that some areas of the United States would be more receptive to him as a gay man than others. Ricardo stated this when I asked whether he believed that being a gay man influenced his decision-making process:

I've thought about that. I mean, I would never report something like that in Texas. I just don't think it would go anywhere. I know, since I've moved to the East Coast, some 10, 11 years ago, I feel differently about it. My interactions with law enforcement have always been positive. Whether it's like hanging out with gay policemen, or policemen that are just supporters and friends of the LGBT community, I feel they're there to protect me, regardless of what I am…If I were in Kansas or something, I'd just be like oh fuck it. Unless something was really, really bad.

Ricardo highlights that the perceptions of him as a gay man vary on the location of the sexual assault and his prior experience with law enforcement. As he mentions, he would feel comfortable reporting being sexually assaulted in certain areas of the United States but would not feel comfortable reporting the sexual assault in other parts.

4.1.3 Racism

As one of the aims of this study seeks to understand the nuanced ways in which racism and homophobia affect the decision-making process for gay Latino men, this section addresses the
ways in which ethnicity/race and racism served as barriers to reporting sexual assault for gay Latino men. Many times, their race/ethnicity could not be parsed from their identity as a gay man, as specific stereotypes about gay men of color were factors in deciding whether or not to report. Racism for both non-Black and Black Latino gay men were referenced as barriers among men.

Some of the participants referenced the ways in which their multiple identities could not be separated from one another and influenced their decision-making process. For instance, Ricardo shared how his identity as both a Latino and a gay man would affect the ways in which reporting authorities would respond to him reporting being sexually assaulted:

Or oh, you know you were asking for it because that's what you do. Just like to fuck. Gay men just like to fuck. Latinos like to be great bottoms. It's bullshit. Yeah. Or, if you're a gay man, then you're like oh, well, that's okay, boys do. Come on.

It is clear that for Ricardo that being both gay and Latino played a role in how reporting authorities would respond to him. As a gay Latino man, he is oversexualized and stereotyped an account of his ethnicity and being a gay man. His sexuality and perception of being hyper-sexual as a Latino is exacerbated by the fact that he is a gay man. His multiple marginalized identities influence how he is going to be blamed and not taken seriously, specifically on how the act will being believed as being consensual. Ricardo speaks to how being a gay Latino man is often associated with wanting sex and that some may find it difficult to believe that he could be sexually assaulted. Both identities play a role in determining these outcomes, as stereotypes of being Latino and a gay man influence the ways that gay Latino men may be responded to when attempting to report being sexually assaulted.

**Being Black and Latino**
Latino is considered an ethnicity and not a race. Latinos, can be of any races and this dissertation seeks to identify the experience of Latinos, while taking into account their race. The term Latino has been used throughout the dissertation, but it is no way minimizing the experiences of any of the racial groups among the Latino men who participated in the study. The importance of Latinos’ race and how Latinos’ racial identity (identities) significantly influences their life experiences and experiences of racism. This dissertation identifies the men who participated in the study with the racial identity that they identify with. Latinos are not a monolithic group and issues around racism for Black Latino men must be valued and discussed.

Four of the participants identified primarily as Black men. They also identified as being Latino. For these participants, their identity as Black men and their experience in society as Black Latino men resulted in unique and additional challenges for them in reporting sexual assault, due to their race. For two of these men, perceptions about their Black masculinity were both cited as factors for not reporting being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Consistent with the hierarchy of masculinities (Pascoe & Bridges, 2016), white and heterosexual men are at the top of the hierarchy while gay men of color are arguably at the bottom of the hierarchy. Gay Black Latino men, in accordance with this framework, are at the bottom of the hierarchy and are afforded little power. This lack of power and status affects the comfortability and believability factor that gay Black Latino sexual assault survivors may have when reporting to reporting authorities. For Jevon, the need to retain Black masculinity for Black men and the perception of reporting authorities would have of Black men being raped or sexually assaulted were barriers that need to be taken into consideration. Jevon stated that the fragility of Black masculinity needs to be considered and taken into account for Black Latino survivors of sexual assault. Jevon stated:
I think that black men are really fragile about their masculinity so they would most likely not report things because I think a lot of black men already feel that they don't have any power and that their masculinity is in jeopardy. If they felt more confident in their masculinity they would probably report it more.

While non-Black Latino participants had cited masculinity as a factor in being hesitant to report being sexually assaulted, Jevon highlighted the additional challenges that Black Latino may have to consider when reporting being sexually assaulted. Black masculinity is an important factor that needs additional consideration when working with Black sexual assault survivors.

The complex layers of being Black, Latino and a gay man were highlighted by Jevon, when he was asked about considerations in reporting being sexually assaulted. While many participants referenced victim-blaming by reporting authorities as being a barrier, that were often tied to their identity a gay man, there are additional layers of racialized prejudice that may occur for Black Latino men who report being sexually assaulted. Black Latino male sexual assault survivors may also have to contend with anti-Black racism embedded with homophobia which may result in victim-blaming, not being believed and their reports not being taken seriously. I asked Jevon about whether his identity as a Black man influenced him in deciding to not report to authorities. Jevon stated:

No, I guess they mostly don't report it …like that really challenges their masculinity so they wouldn't report that, because they already feel like some type of way about having sex with other men and especially like being on the bottom…, so I think they wouldn't report it for multiple reasons. They already feel kind of like a weakened man for being gay and then being assaulted by another man kind of like makes their masculinity even more fragile so it's really hard.
Notably, this vulnerability of masculinity was at times tied to both race and sexual orientation. One participant referenced that this was true particularly for gay Black men, as they would have to contend with being vulnerable as a Black gay man to be open about being gay and to disclose being sexually assaulted. This participant stated Black men may feel “weakened” from the start for being a gay man. Jevon spoke to how men’s masculinity, particularly for Black men served as a barrier for reporting to reporting authorities.

This occurrence is only possible through the lends of intersectionality, as their multiple marginalized identities influence and overlap with one another, as exemplified in this situation. Moreover, their identity as gay men of color is also congruent with theories concerning the hierarchy of masculinities. Consistent with theories on the hierarchy of masculinities, white heterosexual masculinities are at the top of the hierarchy while men of color and gay men are at the bottom of this hierarchy. These findings suggest that masculinities of gay men of color are subject to skepticism when reporting being sexually assaulted.

Deon, another Black male stated that he does believe the stereotypes surrounding Black Latinos may have influenced his decision to not report being sexually assaulted. I asked him if he thought that being Black Latino was a factor in deciding to report or not, and he replied, “Maybe a little. But it didn't, then I didn't believe those …but thinking about it, maybe it probably did, just because of the stereotype of being bi-racial.”

One noticeable difference between the Black participants and the non-Black Latino participants was that two of the Black participants felt that race did serve as a barrier for them, while non-Black Latinos did not always cite racism as a perceived barrier. It appears that the experiences of racism for Black men may shape their perceptions of racial barriers differently than for that of non-Black Latino men. More men would need to be interviewed in order to gather more
generalizable data. However, it should be noted that three of the four Latino men who reported being sexually assaulted experienced racism and were treated poorly on account of their ethnicity for being Latino, when they reported being sexually assaulted. It appears that while non-Black Latino men did not readily cite their race/ethnicity as being a barrier to reporting sexual assault, the majority of the men who did report being sexually assaulted experience racism. It should be noted that for the one participant who did not experience racism when he reported being sexually assaulted, stated that everyone involved in the process was Latino, which is why he did not encounter racism among the reporting authorities. Racism was not commonly considered a potential barrier when deciding to report being sexually assaulted but was an actual barrier experienced by gay Latino men who reported to authorities.

The possibility of negative responses by reporting authorities often overlap each other and are influenced and exacerbated by other factors. For example, possible negative reactions or behaviors by reporting authorities (not being believed/ not being taken seriously, being blamed, being made fun of) are tied to both gendered stereotypes and homophobia. Men cited not being believed as a result of gendered stereotypes, homophobia and racism. While such negative responses by reporting authorities can stand on their own and are often encountered by all survivors of sexual assault, it is important to place these within the context of the experiences of gay Latino men.

4.1.4 Negative/Non-Supportive Reactions By Authorities and Others

The majority of the participants spoke to the possible negative reactions they felt they would receive from reporting authorities as well as negative responses they received by non-
official reporting authorities when disclosing that they had been sexually assaulted. There were three primary negative reactions that were identified: 1) being made fun of 2) being judged and 3) discouraged from reporting. These negative reactions were, at times, not independent of one another; the majority of survivors cited that they could be subject to multiple negative reactions by reporting authorities.

The negative response of being judged by reporting authorities often had to do with being questioned about whether they had been drinking or using drugs at the time of the assault. Some of the men felt that they would be judged and be viewed as less credible if they had been drinking. For the men who had been drinking at the time of the assault, they felt that the reporting authorities may blame them for drinking or doing drugs at the time of the assault. Participants felt that the fact that they had been drinking could lead to 1) victim-blaming and 2) being judged. Some of the men did not want to report to authorities because they did not want to be judged or blamed for drinking that night. At times, this also led to men blaming themselves for the assault that had occurred. One participant, Yuriel, stated:

I considered the fact that when it happened, I was uhm, I was extremely under the influence. I was drunk, and I uhm, I had a prescription medication that was not prescribed to me. I know now that that it didn’t excuse anything and it didn’t make it OK and that wasn’t a reason for it to happen but that made it easier for that person to take advantage of me that one time, uhm, but at the time, well, I thought, I shouldn’t have, I shouldn’t have drunk that much, I shouldn’t have gotten high and uhm, another factor that I considered was that we were, we were both men…

These feelings of shame and embarrassment, often a result of being judged, were referenced as barriers to reporting being sexually assaulted. This is consistent with prior literature
that has found these identified factors to be barriers to reporting sexual assault among men (Davies, 2002; Pino & Meier, 1999). Sebastian and Yuriel stated that embarrassment/shame was one of the primary factors to not reporting being sexually assaulted. Sebastian stated that “embarrassment and not being believed” were the two main factors that caused him to not report. Yuriel cited that blaming himself was the primary factor in deciding not to report to authorities. Yuriel stated that “the primary [factor] was that, at the time, I thought that, it was it was because of my substance abuse. I was blaming myself.”

Another negative reaction experienced was being made fun of after disclosing being sexually assaulted to non-official reporting authorities. Because of receiving these negative reactions, survivors did not wish to be subjected to similar negative reactions by others. While the study mainly focuses on barriers to reporting sexual assault to reporting authorities, men did cite that negative reactions by those close to them also factored into whether they would be likely to report to reporting authorities. Participants spoke about the negative reactions they received from friends and family members to being sexually assaulted.

One survivor, Israel, was made fun of by his friends when they found out he was raped. Israel had returned from a club and was raped by a man at his house. Israel stated his friends were aware of what happened and yet made fun of him by describing the encounter as having sex with an overweight person. This was a horrific example of how Israel was not viewed as a survivor of sexual assault but was instead subjugated by others.

DJ: uh, entonces, después, de, de la agresión sexual, did you ever disclose, what had happened to any of your friends.

Israel: no lo he hablado. No, simplemente le cuento a, al que vivía conmigo, y, y…entre chiste, se salió hacia otro amigo, ese te digo, el el, la situación la toman como, como
chiste, reírse against me, to mock about relations, entonces, si yo hago un chiste de las parejas que tienen, eh… su, o sea lo que me dicen en contra es como, tú te cogiste, tu estuviste con una persona muy muy grande de peso

DJ: mhm

Israel: o sea, y eso así como, lo, lo toman, como si fuera un chiste.

(ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

DJ: uh, then, after, de, the sexual assault, did you ever disclose, what had happened to any of your friends.

Israel: I’ve never talked about it. No, I simply told who, the person who lived with me, and, and… as a joke, another friend heard, and I’m telling you, the, the, the situation they take it as a joke, laughing against me, to mock about relations, then, if I make a joke about the partners they have, uhm… I mean they come back at me, like, you fucked, you were with a very very big person.

DJ: mhm

Israel: I mean, and that like, they take it, as if it were a joke.

When later asked if he had ever experienced a positive interaction in disclosing to anyone, Israel responded that he had not. Israel confirmed that he had not disclosed being raped to anyone else after being made fun of by his friends. Our interview was the first time he had spoken about this subject since being made fun of by his friends. It is evident that negative experiences in disclosing to others can affect whether sexual assault survivors will feel comfortable in sharing their experiences with others.
Many survivors cited negative experiences when disclosing that they were sexually assaulted to others, which discouraged them from reporting to official reporting authorities. Men often reported to various people in non-official capacities including friends and family members. The men who disclosed that they had been sexually assaulted to others experienced negative reactions which including discouragement from reporting being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. At times, men who reported to family members and friends were not believed, which in turn led them to not report to reporting authorities. In other instances, men were believed but were not encouraged to report to reporting authorities. At times, reactions from others were not entirely negative but did not encourage them to report to authorities. This was the case with Deon, who had disclosed being sexually assaulted to a close family friend. Deon stated:

It's a tie. I felt like it was positive because I was telling someone what had happened to me and but I felt like it's also a negative because it didn't give me any encouragement to tell other people or those friends of my mother or father or tell them or anyone else. I mean it left me kind of in the middle, I guess.

4.1.5 Not Wanting Others to Know

Many of the men spoke about how they did not disclose to reporting authorities and other people because they did not want other people to know that they had been sexually assaulted. This notion was often tied to 1) feelings of embarrassment/shame 2) being judged and 3) not wanting publicity. Some men did not want family members and/or friends to know that they were sexually assaulted, and worried that his could occur as a result of reporting being sexually assaulted to
reporting authorities. Some men felt that if they reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities that it may somehow be leaked to the press or that their parents or friends may find out.

A few of the participants did not want their family members to know that they had been sexually assaulted. This often occurred for participants whose family members were not accepting of them being gay. This was linked to the barrier of homophobia. As previously mentioned, this was the case for Sebastian, who stated that his mother would blame him for being sexually assaulted as a gay man. Other men also shared that one or both of their family members would not believe them if they found out that they had been sexually assaulted or would blame them for being sexually assaulted. There was also a general worry about feeling embarrassed or ashamed of having been sexually assaulted. Many of the men referenced that they felt embarrassed that they had been sexually assaulted and would also find it embarrassing to disclose this to others. Consequently, there was also the possibility that these men would be judged by other people for being sexually assaulted. This was at times tied to homophobia. In other instances, there was a general feeling of being judged by others.

For example, Israel was worried that his parents would find out that he was sexually assaulted if he reported being sexually assaulted to authorities. I asked Israel if his identity as a gay Latino had any influence in reporting being sexually assaulted. Israel responded “la verdad siento que, no quise estar involucrado en algo legalmente para que mis papás no se dieran cuenta. Creo que es eso. Creo que, no quería que, un día tuviera que ir a declarar, o que mis papás se dieran cuenta, entonces fue eso” (ENGLISH TRANSLATION). Israel responded, “I think that, I mean… the truth is that, I didn’t want to be involved in something legally so that my parents wouldn’t know (0.1). I think that’s it.”
Other men did not express concerns about being believed by their parents or being blamed by their parents for being sexually assaulted, however they simply did not want their parents to find out that they had been sexually assaulted. This was the case for Malcolm. While Malcolm did report being sexually assaulted to an agency, he did not report being sexually assaulted to police. He expressed his overall concern that his mom would find out that he was sexually assaulted. Malcolm stated, “And I think my mom doesn't know what happened. I have no idea if she would notice anything so that was kind of my biggest worry or my biggest concern is regretting to report and that my mom finds out.”

Many of the men spoke to the fact that they did not want people to know that they were sexually assaulted. Some of the men were worried that a story would be published, and people would read about it in the newspapers and/or online. These men did not wish to receive any publicity on the case as they did not want the public to know that they had been sexually assaulted. For example, Malcolm said:

I was concerned about my name getting out there for sure. Thankfully, it didn't, and it still hasn't gotten out there but I was very worried about that. [Interviewer: Although it might be self-evident, if your name was publicized, what was your major concern about everyone knowing?] I was worried I was going to be attacked online.

4.1.6 Lack of Details

Many of the participants stated that one of the reasons for not reporting sexual assault was that they did not know details regarding the perpetrator or other aspects of the sexual assault itself, which they believed would not lead to a successful complaint or case. Some of the men felt that
they did not have enough details necessary to give to the police or other reporting authorities to make an official complaint. The lack of details for these survivors led them to not report because 1) they did not have enough details about the perpetrator and 2) they did not have enough other evidence which they thought would make their case hard to prove.

Additionally, many of the survivors said that they did not know the perpetrator who attacked them, as they met the person online and only knew them from a social media app. Many of the men did not know the perpetrator’s name or any other identifying information about them. At times, their concerns about meeting people online and not having enough details about the perpetrator were tied to their concerns about the possibility of being subject to homophobic reactions by reporting authorities. Some of the men felt that reporting authorities would judge them for meeting strangers online and that they would be further stigmatized for doing so as gay men. In addition, survivors felt that not knowing the perpetrator or having enough details about the perpetrator would also be a barrier in reporting to authorities. For example, one of the participants, Ricardo, stated the only details he could provide was the approximate height of the person and the person’s race. He did not know the perpetrator by name and would therefore not be able to provide any useful details to the police. Among other reasons, these were factors that led him to decide not to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Another participant, Israel also cited the same barrier. He stated:

este… bueno la verdad que yo tenía una… o sea, el dejó en mi apartamento ropa, y yo quería como que, o sea, como que buscar quien fue, ¿no? Pero después, no recuerdo, o sea no recordaba ni como era, ni quien, si era Latino, si era Hispano, yo solo recuerdo que era, o sea, yo, negro no era, era entre Hispano o Latino, entre- o Blanco o Hispano, entonces
como no sabía quién era, no sabía, me daba como pena el reportar y decir me violaron y no supe quien fue. ¿no? O sea, si, me dio como pena y preferí no hacerlo.

(ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

Israel: well… the truth is that I had a … I mean, he left clothes in my apartment, and i wanted, like, I mean, to find out who was it, right? but then, I don’t remember, I mean, I didn’t even remember what he looked like, whether he was Latino or Hispanic, I just remember that, I mean, he wasn’t Black, it was between Hispanic or Latino, be- or White or Hispanic, so like I didn’t know who he was, I didn’t know, I was embarrassed to report and say I was raped and I didn’t know who he was, right? I mean, yes, it was embarrassing, and I preferred not to.

Other men stated that while they knew who the perpetrator was, they did not know enough details about the perpetrator to be able to provide useful information to the police. The lack of details about the person became a barrier for them in reporting the assault to police. Ricardo spoke to this when he said, “I didn't have details. I didn't know the address of where we were at. I didn't know the address of where we ended up. I barely remember what the guy's face looked like. I was just like, why am I gonna report this with somebody?”

Other men stated that another barrier to reporting was that they did not have enough evidence to prove that they were sexually assaulted. As some of the men spoke about not having evidence which consequently would make it difficult to prove they were sexually assaulted, it became apparent that this was at times linked to being a gay man. Deon was one male who spoke to the concerns about not having evidence. I asked Deon about what made him decide it was best for him to not report being sexually assaulted. Deon stated:
Well, I've never reported it and I feel like I would have to not only report it but be believable. Like I would have to, like I'm a victim but I would have to have like some kind of evidence or something because I feel like being the gay male of the assault, people will automatically assume that hey, you were the one provoking it or like you enjoyed it. But in reality, no. It was not, I was assaulted.

Deon was able to speak to the sentiment that many of the other gay Latino survivors felt. They would not be able to report without evidence of the assault having taken place. While many survivors may be concerned with having sufficient evidence of the sexual assault, gay Latino and gay Black Latino men may even feel that they need additional evidence in order to prove they were sexually assaulted due to their multiple marginalized identities. As with many of the barriers, they are often interconnected. Gay Latino men believe they have a greater need to have proof because they may have to contend with homophobia and racism.

4.1.7 The Perpetrator

Another barrier that prevented men from reporting being sexually assaulted was their relationship to the perpetrator of their assault. This was mostly focused around their feelings of personal safety and well-being. The relationship to the perpetrator as a barrier was due to four factors: 1) personal safety 2) fear of retaliation 3) not being believed and 4) power dynamics.

A couple of the men expressed that they did not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities due to fear for their personal safety. Men were worried that the perpetrator would further harm them if they reported being sexually assaulted. Christian, who was raped in jail, was threatened by his rapist after the assault. Christian’s perpetrator stated that he would kill him if
Christian reported being raped to the authorities. Although scared for his safety, Christian reported being raped to the guards in the jail and was moved to another pod. Another survivor, Adam, was concerned for his personal safety if he reported to police. Adam knew he would not be safe and might be subject to further abuse if he reported to authorities. In both of these cases, the survivors were in situations that they could not be physically separated from their perpetrators. Malcolm was in the same cell as his perpetrator and Adam was living with his perpetrator.

Another barrier to reporting that men cited was fear of retaliation by their perpetrators, whether it be physically or legally. Malcolm was concerned about retaliation, but it did not prevent him from reporting to authorities. He stated:

I was afraid of being threatened and I was afraid that my assailant was going to try to legally do something because at that point it's like… my thought process was: there's a gag order against these people, like, I wasn't sure like what could he do to me at this point. I didn't know what he could do to me because I was the one who told these people about what happened. I was afraid that like what if he tried to put a gag order towards me or what if he tried to do something else legally. I was just afraid of that kind of thing.

Other men referenced that they may not be believed, as the perpetrator may be more likely to be believed over them. This was often tied to the perpetrator’s position of power. Some of the men expressed that there was a power imbalance between them and their perpetrator, which resulted in being hesitant to report the sexual assault. For example, Adam noted the significant age difference between him and his perpetrator; there was a clear power differential as his perpetrator was three times his age.

Other power differentials and power imbalances occurred as there was hierarchical structure in their employment. Ryan spoke to one occurrence where he was assaulted by an
administrator in his job. Ryan stated that since he was in a less powerful position than his perpetrator, he decided not report the incident. I asked, “And do you think that their position had any effect on how comfortable you felt on reporting it due to their position?” Ryan replied:

I mean, that's a very good question, because at the time I wasn't a full time [job position]. I was sort of just working at two different colleges, working my way up. This person was a [administrative position]… And so, I didn't want to…anything there, or minimize my chances of getting a job. So yeah, definitely, the power that this person had, you know, had an influence

An imbalance of power in relation to their perpetrator served as a barrier to reporting for these men. It was clear that they did not want to risk being further harmed by their perpetrator either physically or in relation to their career.

4.1.8 “I Didn’t Want To Like Deal Like With Drawing This Out”

Many of the men cited that they did not want to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities because they did not want a long or drawn out official process to take place. Many of them were worried that an official report would take up a large amount of their time. Their concerns were tied to wanting to avoid re-traumatization. As prior literature has indicated, there has been a noted lack of best practices and procedures for handling sexual assault cases and lack of trained enforcement to investigate sexual assault complaints. Their reasons for not wanting to prolong the process included 1) not wanting to be questioned about the assault 2) not wanting a legal case, and 3) wanting to move on.

Some of the men spoke of not wanting to be continually questioned about being sexually
assaulted in detail. For example, Ricardo stated, “You don't wanna have a lot of people that are in your face, ad nauseam, asking you every detail, and questioning your own mental facility.”

Other participants were concerned that a legal case would result from reporting the sexual assault. Many were unsure of what a legal case regarding sexual assault would entail. Israel was one of the men who stated he did wish to have his report result in a legal case.

Many of the men expressed that they wanted to be able to move on from the sexual assault. They did not feel that they would be able to move on if they had to deal with an open case, which would entail questioning from police, filing forms, waiting for long periods of times and having to talk about the sexual assault. Yuriel was one participant who spoke to not wanting to prolong the reporting process, stating, “And then, once, once I actually sat, and actually thought about it, I, it was a lot of the same, of like, I didn’t want to, kind of, drag out the drama. I didn’t want to keep dragging the situation, I wanted to just be done with him.”

4.1.9 “Because They Straight and Everything”

Another barrier that prevented gay Latino men from reporting that they were sexually assaulted was that they did not feel comfortable reporting to systems and organizations that they believed were heterosexist or homophobic. This finding corroborates prior literature that has found that men often are not sure of what resources are available to them (Pino & Meier, 1999). Men were worried about having to deal with heterosexual reporting authorities. This barrier is different than homophobia in that they were not only or necessarily worried about dealing with homophobic reactions but rather they felt that the systems were not 1) inclusive of gay men, 2) designed or equipped to handle situations involving gay men, and 3) did not necessarily want to assist gay men.
Among the men who cited being worried about reporting to heterosexual reporting authorities was Sebastian. Sebastian stated that one of the major factors for not reporting being sexually assaulted was that he did not believe that heterosexual police officers would take his complaint seriously. He felt that heterosexual reporting authorities may have biased attitudes towards gay men and would not be equipped to handle the complaint. When asked about what factors led him to not report to reporting authorities, he stated:

It's like pretty much as a gay man, I knew even then whenever it happened to me that people always think like, you know, oh, it's just gay guys who want sex and everything, and the thing is that like on top of that, too, like you know, policemen 'cause they're straight and everything, they don't take sexual assaults on men very seriously and everything, and I feel like they kind of just like drop it off and not even take it serious.

Other men felt that the systems were not friendly towards gay men. For example, Jevon stated that he would not go to heterosexual/straight medical clinics because they are not gay friendly and would only go to gay clinics. I asked Jevon if he felt included in his university’s programming to address sexual assault and, while he stated he did feel included in the conversations, he said that he would not seek services at heterosexual clinics. I asked him: “When your university told you about the services did you feel that as a black gay man you were included in those conversations or did you feel excluded?” Jevon replied,

I felt included but I wouldn't go get services from like a straight organization because I've gone to like STD clinics and like regular straight clinics in the past and they're kind of mean to gay men so I usually just go to only gay places.

It is interesting to note that while Jevon felt included in the conversations and services provided at his university, he still would not seek out services at places that were heterosexual due
to his treatment there as a gay man. Jevon noted that while the services provided at the university stated they did include men, the services were mostly focused on women. It is clear that Jevon was still hesitant to receive services from heterosexual organizations.

The findings from this study confirmed previous research that investigated barriers to reporting sexual assault among men. The participants in this study cited how their identities as men, gay men and gay Latino men influenced their decision to not report being sexually assaulted to authorities. Many of these barriers overlapped with one another and influenced one another in their decision-making process. It is evident that their experiences must be addressed from an intersectional lens, as the findings demonstrate that their identities influence one another. Men also were influenced in deciding whether to report to authorities based on previous experiences in disclosing to others. Barriers pertaining to racism and homophobia were often linked to another, as gay Latino men must contend with racism and homophobia. These findings add to the literature on the sexual assault reporting practices among gay Latino male survivors.

4.2 Theme 2: Negative Repercussions Experienced When Reporting Sexual Assault

The second theme was the negative repercussions that the men experienced when reporting having been sexually assaulted. Men who reported being sexually assaulted overall had negative experiences when reporting that they had been sexually assaulted. Some of the barriers that were perceived by participants who did not report were experienced by gay Latino men who did report being sexually assaulted. Consistent with Aim #2 of the study, the dissertation sought to
understand whether racism and homophobia played in role in reporting sexual assault among gay Latino men. Consistent with prior literature, homophobia was a barrier encountered by all four of the men interviewed who did report their sexual assaults to reporting authorities. Adding to the literature, findings revealed that among the men who reported, three of the four men experienced racism. Other barriers were experienced by those who reported, which also resulted in negative repercussions and at times led to re-traumatization. Taken together, men experienced various barriers during the sexual assault reporting process. Survivors provided detailed accounts of their reporting process. First, the men’s stories of reporting being sexually assaulted are provided to give context to the concepts that were generated from the data. Following the men’s individual stories, the findings resulting from their stories are provided.

**Christian’s Experience**

Christian is a gay Latino male who was raped twice while in prison. Christian was first raped by an inmate who was in his cell while in prison. Unfortunately, Christian was left in the same jail cell with his perpetrator immediately following the rape. Christian was crying and calling out to get help but no one was around or came to assist him, and he had to wait until the next morning to report the rape. The rapist threatened to kill Christian if Christian told the guards what had happened, and Christian was scared to report the rape due to concerns for his own safety. However, Christian was in a lot of pain from the rape and the next morning reported the rape to the guards when he was taken out of the cell.

When Christian reported being raped, the guards yelled at Christian and blamed him for not reporting the rape sooner. Christian told the guard that he wanted to report it sooner but that he was scared. The guard then immediately yelled at him and called him homophobic names. The guard then proceeded to push Christian into the wall and continued to yell at him and told him he
did not wish to hear any more about this, while insinuating that Christian had made everything up and put him back in his cell. Christian was then terrified and began to scream and yell to be let out of the cell. The guards then let Christian out of the cell and he told them the details of the rape once he was let out. The guards then put Christian into a lock up cell.

Approximately a year and three months later, Christian was drugged and raped by another inmate in the jail. He then reported it to another guard, who then took him to the infirmary to get some medical care. When he reported it to the guard and the major, they asked him what happened. The guards then stated they did not want to fill out paperwork and later find out that it was not rape. The guard then stated he was aware that Christian had already reported being raped and did not believe that Christian had been raped again. The guard said that he was just going to move Christian to another cell. Christian said the nurse came to do an HIV test but then they did not do anything to help him and simply covered up the rape.

Christian said he was aware of the Prison Rape Act and that the jail had been covering up rapes for a long time period. He said the guards then went to look at his file and claimed there was nothing in his file, including that he had ever taken a HIV test. Christian then spoke with the guard he initially reported to and the guard claimed that he did not remember that Christian had ever told him that he had been raped. During his time at the jail, he told two other staff members, including a counselor that had been sexually assaulted.

**Javier’s Experience**

Javier was another participant who reported being sexually assaulted. In 2014, Javier was assaulted in a large urban city in California. Javier went to the hospital to report that he was sexually assaulted as well as to receive medical care, as he sustained physical injuries as well as was concerned about contracting STDs. Javier waited four hours to be seen by anyone. Javier first
disclosed that he was sexually assaulted to a female nurse, who questioned him on the details of the assault and questioned whether he was intoxicated or had been using drugs. Javier stated the nurse insinuated that the encounter was consensual and that he later claimed it was sexual assault. Javier stated that the nurse did not believe him. Javier had asked the nurse to give him a specific type of medication, as he was texting with a friend who is a pharmacist. The nurse claimed she did not have that medication.

After being told the medication was unavailable, Javier became frustrated, angry and argued with hospital staff. Javier stated in his own words that he had a breakdown. The nurse claimed she felt Javier was going to become aggressive and staff tied him to the chair with the arm straps, sedated him with a needle, which put him to sleep for many hours.

The first male doctor that Javier reported to discouraged Javier from reporting the sexual assault to police. The doctor told Javier that it would take a long time to make a report and that the sheriff would take a long time to arrive at the hospital. The doctor also told Javier that it would be a long waiting process and continued to discourage Javier from reporting. Javier was very clear that he wanted to make an official report, but the doctor continued to discourage him and even discouraged him from making a report at the hospital. The doctor gave Javier a card to the nearest sheriff’s office and encouraged him to make a report only after leaving the hospital. Javier insisted on receiving medication but was told they did not have it to give to him there. Javier stated that both the doctor and nurse were white and he believes they were heterosexual. Javier stated that neither of them believed that he had been sexually assaulted.

When Javier woke up, there was another team of doctors and nurses. A female doctor saw Javier and provided him with the medication he wanted. Javier restated that he wanted to make an official report of being sexually assaulted but she discouraged him from doing so by stating he
could be waiting for another eight hours. She then left the room and never came back. At noon, a nurse came in and discharged him from the hospital. It is important to note that Javier never received any medical care, was never able to file an official report, and was not tested for any STDs. Javier stated that one report from the hospital said that he was sexually assaulted, but that he was also suffering from depression and anxiety. Additionally, the report also stated that he was heavily medicated and was argumentative. The hospital staff did not provide him with a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner, (SANE nurse) nor did they ever try to contact the police or a sheriff on his behalf. Although Javier requested to be tested for STDs, he was not tested nor was he given any reason for not being tested. The hospital simply advised him to follow-up with his primary care physician. The staff also did not provide him with any resources nor advise him of his rights.

After he left the hospital, Javier went to a walk-in clinic to receive the medical care that he did not receive at the hospital. Javier had a much more positive experience at the walk-in clinic. Javier stated that he received help from a white female doctor at the clinic. She was understanding and caring and provided him with the care and the resources that he needed. She also encouraged him to report if he chose to do so. She also provided him with a therapist and psychiatrist to help with being sexually assaulted. Additionally, she followed up with him and provided him with numerous resources. Javier stated he did not report to anyone else because he was too emotionally tired after his experience at the hospital, even though the doctor at the clinic encouraged him to do so. Javier stated that he still speaks to the doctor and still sees his therapist.

Javier believed that the poor treatment he received at the hospital was because he is Latino. Javier stated that he was viewed as being aggressive and was strapped to the chair because he was Latino. When asked, Javier does not believe he was treated poorly because he is gay but rather because he is Latino. Javier stated that he knows white gay sexual assault survivors who were not
treated in the way that he was. For example, the white sexual assault survivors were provided with resources, unlike Javier.

Four months after the sexual assault and his negative reporting experience, he reached out to a public figure who works with the LGBT community to bring his experience to her attention. He did not receive any response from her. The public figure is white but is a member of the LGBT community. He used an app to send a message and saw that the message was read but never heard from her. Javier described this as heartbreaking, as he thought she would have been very supportive. Javier believes she did not respond to him because it would bring a negative story to the city. Javier took a year to disclose being sexually assaulted to anyone else. In total, Javier reported to three different agencies and six different persons. Only one person and one agency took him seriously and provided him with care, compassion, assistance, and resources.

Malcolm’s Experience

Another participant, Malcolm reported being sexually assaulted and went through a very long and painful reporting process. From the time of the sexual assault to when the reporting process concluded was over a year and five months. Malcolm is an out gay Latino man who works with LGBT Latinx organizations to enhance the well-being of the community in a large city in California. Malcolm initially disclosed being sexually assaulted to a few close friends because he was wrestling with a lot of negative effects following the sexual assault, including self-blame and being confused over what had occurred. Malcolm also recalled the physical pain resulting from the sexual assault and then anger over what had happened to him. Malcolm stated one of the friends who he disclosed to minimized his experience, although other friends were more supportive of him. One of his friends encouraged him to make an official report and asked him to write a
statement. Five months from initially disclosing the sexual assault to his friends and ten months after the assault, Malcolm made an official report to authorities.

Malcolm wrote a statement providing some details of the assault to an organization that funds the organization that the perpetrator worked for in August 2016. After providing a statement and sending an e-mail to a specific person, Malcolm did not receive any response from the organization. During this time, Malcolm began to repress his feelings as he did not hear anything regarding his statement. Malcolm later found out that a group of people within the organization did meet with the perpetrator. The perpetrator stated that he had hired a lawyer and was not going to speak to anyone and put an official gag order on everyone that made them unable to speak about it publicly. Malcolm was not included in the gag order. Malcolm was only made aware of this after the fact. There was an unofficial meeting held with Malcolm, where they asked him what outcome he would like. Malcolm told them that he would like to have the perpetrator held accountable and for people to be educated on the issue. Malcolm stated they were supportive of him and believed him and that he left the meeting feeling very hopeful that something would be done.

A few months later, to his surprise, Malcolm was sent an article that covered his sexual assault and the organization that had covered up the sexual assault. Malcolm was completely unaware that someone had written an article about him being sexually assaulted. Malcolm’s name was not used but there were enough details that people could possibly identify him. Malcolm stated that the writer was supportive of Malcolm in the article and used the article to garner attention to the issue. The woman risked her career since she violated the gag order and “called out” the organization in the article. Malcolm was very thankful and appreciative of the woman for writing the article. One downside of the article being published on social media was that Malcolm saw
comments being posted stating that he was jealous of the perpetrator and made up that he had been sexually assaulted.

Malcolm stated that the organization the perpetrator worked for brought in a woman who specialized in transformative justice to resolve the issue. The woman had worked with minor sexual abuse but had not worked on cases regarding adult sexual assault. When asked, Malcolm stated he was not aware of her having any experience with gay males or with Latinos. Malcolm felt that she wished to resolve the sexual assault through mediation and have the perpetrator transform his behavior. Malcolm stated that the woman did believe him but that she wanted the issue to be resolved with both he and the perpetrator together in a circle to reach a conclusion. Malcolm was suspicious since she was hired by the organization that he worked for and that it was unclear what her end goal was. This process went on for months, the process was emotionally overwhelming for Malcolm and he began to see a therapist to help him during the process. Malcolm said there was no progress for months. Later he was asked to write a letter describing everything that had happened, his feelings and the effects that it had on him. Malcolm wrote a four-page letter but was asked to revise his letter and remove what they considered aggressive, as they felt the tone of the letter was too angry. Malcolm complied but he stated he only did so because he wanted the process to end. Malcolm added that he did so because he was scared of what would happen if he did not tone down the letter. He said all his anger was real and he felt that he had to take out how he really felt about the situation. Malcolm did find the process to be cathartic but did not agree with the concept of transformative justice. Malcolm said he wanted to move on.

Eventually, a mediation took place with Malcolm, the hired mediator, the perpetrator, and members from the organization. The group meeting lasted fourteen hours. Malcolm spoke about everything that had happened, including how he felt about the assault as well as about how the
organization handled the situation. Malcolm had to do this in front of the perpetrator. Malcolm said the perpetrator cried and apologized. Malcolm said he did not pay him much attention, did not react and does not recall what he said. Malcolm stated he felt both nervous but strong when speaking about his feelings to everyone. He said he felt safe because there were other people in the room. After the meeting concluded, Malcolm stated he felt relieved that it was all over. Malcolm added that the organization was supposed to write a public statement apologizing for how they handled the situation. However, the statement was self-congratulatory and inferred that Malcolm was a willing participant in the process and gave all the credit to the organization. Malcolm was not happy with the statement, however, he was glad the process was over. Malcolm stated the only beneficial part about the process was going to therapy.

**Julio’s Experience**

Julio was sexually assaulted on a subway coming back from Caribbean pride in New York City with his boyfriend. There were a lot of people on the train and many were wearing masks and costumes. Some of the men began talking and Julio, who did not speak fluent English at the time, was unable to discern what the men were saying to one another. One of the men began to touch his body and Julio moved away. The man followed him and was erect and began to rub on Julio’s body and touch him. Julio moved away and tried to get him away. Then, he and other men began hitting Julio and beating him. Julio was thrown onto the floor and was hit in his lip and nose. His boyfriend’s nose was broken. Once the train got to the next destination, three of the men ran off the train. The train conductor notified the police, but the police never came.

Julio and his boyfriend then walked home. Upon arriving home, Julio decided it was best to report the sexual assault to the police. Julio did not wish to go to the hospital because he was embarrassed to state that he had been sexually assaulted. Julio asked the police to come to his
house. The police advised him to go to the hospital and be interviewed there but Julio stated he did not wish to do so. The detectives then brought Julio and his boyfriend to the station to be interviewed. Julio and his boyfriend were interviewed together and then separately. They interviewed him for no more than a half an hour. When Julio was being interviewed individually by the police, the police officer stated that he did not believe that Julio was gay, the police did not believe that he was sexually assaulted. Both of the detectives were white and Julio believed that they were heterosexual. Julio stated that they told him that he didn’t look gay. The detectives did not want to deal with the case. When asked about how they treated him, he said, “Ahí no había empatía, no había, nada, ni siquiera un vaso de agua, quiere una aspirina, nada. Era como si fuera, como que yo era un animal…otro animal más en la selva.” (ENGLISH TRANSLATION) “There was no empathy, there wasn’t, nothing, not even a glass of water, do you want an aspirin, nothing. It was like, like I was an animal…another animal more in the jungle.”

While a file was opened, the police never followed up with Julio. Julio stated the detectives gave him a business card but never advised him of the status of the case. Julio stated that while the detective never contacted him, he also did not wish to contact them to follow up on the case. Julio described the detectives as having no empathy. Julio believes that being Latino was also a factor in how he was treated by the police.

Julio also spoke to a news reporter and described to her what had happened. He stated that this was a positive experience. His interview was published in a local newspaper. A few days later, Julio reported what had happened to him to an organization that deals with hate crimes in New York City. He spoke to a Black gay male intake coordinator who was helpful. One major difference was that he was believed. He said, “Oh, he was, he was so nice to me, and so so friendly, and he
showed so much empathy, and so much, you know, candor, you know, very open-minded, very, he believed in me from the very first minute, you know. He was perfect.”

It is clear that Julio had a vastly different experience when reporting being sexually assaulted to the intake coordinator at the organization. One of the main reasons for this difference was that he was believed. The intake coordinator offered Julio all the services they had available and referred him to counselors who worked with sexual assault survivors. Julio stated that he was encouraged to report being sexual assaulted to the police but had advised the organization that he had done so. Julio later went to his primary care physician for the physical injuries as a result of the sexual assault but did not disclose that he had been sexually assaulted to his doctor. Julio only stated that he had been in a fight. When asked about reporting to the police, Julio described it as being “Useless, completely. I would never bother again, if any of that happened. Never.” It is clear that the negative experience Julio had with the police affected whether he would report it to reporting authorities again. One negative experience of reporting can prevent these men from reporting in the future.

**Themes and Theories**

There were various barriers to reporting being sexual assaulted experienced by the survivors who reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. At times, these barriers overlapped with one another, as certain barriers manifested themselves in different ways with one another. For example, homophobic and racist attitudes often resulted in different behaviors by reporting authorities. Certain barriers did not stand alone or where influenced by other barriers. The barriers and their relationships to one another are discussed.

Practice theory allows for us to understand each survivor’s unique experience in reporting being sexually assaulted to authorities. All participants experienced negative repercussions when
reporting being sexually assaulted to authorities. However, the challenges experienced by survivors occurred within different contexts and in nuanced forms, depending on the setting and agents involved. Additionally, homophobia and racism, at times, manifested themselves in different ways among survivors. These individual differences can be accounted for by practice theory.

Practice theory heavily relies on the agency of each individual agent and their dualism/interaction with the other agent. Practice theory purports that each individual has their own individual agency by which they can act upon in the manner of their choosing and the other agent can react by exercising their own agency. The dualism between the two agents is dependent upon one another and is a series of repetitive actions between the agents. This accounts for the varying experiences among the survivors. Each survivor’s experience is dependent on how the reporting authority responds to them and the dualism between the two. Reporting authorities may choose an action that is homophobic and/or racist and determine the way in which the action is externalized. The other actor (the survivor) then chooses the action in which they respond to the given homophobic and/or racist action, which is also dependent upon the exact behavior (verbal, physical, lack of attention) and the setting (hospital, prison, police station). Practice theory highlights that these actions are repetitive in that they may shift at any moment, based on one individual action. That is, a survivor’s experience can quickly shift throughout the reporting process since it is dependent on other actor’s actions. A survivor may begin with a negative interaction with another agent but later have a more positive experience.

Another important factor of practice theory is to acknowledge the structures in which the dualisms occur. The reporting process may occur in various structures and the agencies in which they belong. Reporting authorities are arguably confined to the structure in which they are placed.
(medical setting, law enforcement, prison, higher education, etc). These structures and agencies have their own unique environment and culture. The culture and environment of each structure allows for the context in which the agents (reporting authorities) are functioning and the choices (individual agency) that they make. Certain structures may have different perceptions of sexual assault as well as the resources to support gay Latino sexual assault survivors. The structure can be a large determining factor in the agency that that the individual actors chose to make or believe they should make. Some structures may be more supportive of male sexual assault survivors than others and/or create an environment that allows for individual agents to be more likely to support gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

4.2.1 Homophobia

All of the men who reported being sexually assaulted experienced homophobia from reporting authorities. Homophobic responses manifested themselves in four main ways: 1) physical assaults 2) verbal assaults 3) not being believed/not being taken seriously and 4) being blamed. The perceived attitudes of authorities detailed by those who did not report were actual barriers for the men that did report being sexually assaulted. It should be noted that homophobia not only resulted in initial negative responses, but that it additionally resulted in actual behaviors, such as avoidance and/or physical and verbal assaults by reporting authorities. Homophobia may have also been the cause of these men being denied services and programs. Since these men were denied support services and programs, it is possible that their longer-term health may have been affected as a result. Many of these instances of homophobia were referenced in their stories, and highlights from these stories are included.
Christian experienced explicit homophobia that was exemplified by being called homophobic slurs by the guards. Additionally, the guards’ homophobic attitudes also resulted in Christian not being believed when he reported being assaulted both times. The first time Christian reported being raped, the guard stated that he believed the occurrence was consensual, which was a homophobic response by the guard. Christian recounted the story:

So I go with them and then I'm inside in like this little room at the gym and they're talking to me and I tell them. So the lieutenant says, `Are you telling me you waited all this time and you want to report it now?' I said, `I tried to, I tried to, I was scared.' He says, `Well you know all these motherfuckers, you all do this shit, you all have lovers and you all do this and that and then if something goes wrong, you're all mad and you all want to say they raped me and shit.'

Christian expanded that he was then pinned against a wall and called homophobic names by the guard. The homophobia in this instance was exemplified in three ways: verbal assaults, physical assault and not being believed. Christian was raped a second time a year and three months later and also reported being raped to a guard. While this guard did not use homophobic slurs towards Christian, he did not believe Christian was raped because Christian is gay. Christian recounted this experience:

He goes, ‘Man’, nah’ Are you really seriously gonna make me do all this paperwork, man?' I said, ‘What are you talking about?’ He goes, ‘You're gonna make me do all this paperwork and come to find out that you all had something going on in the beginning? Because, then then he pulls out the paperwork. You already reported once saying somebody raped you.' And I was like, it’s true. He goes, 'We're not buying to that shit. We're just gonna move you to another fucking wing.
In this instance, while Christian was not subjected to verbal or physical assaults, he was not believed by the guards when he reported being sexually assaulted. This was a form of homophobia, which many of the men who did not report perceived as being a barrier. Unfortunately, this was an actual barrier experienced by Christian when he reported being raped.

Malcolm and Julio both experienced homophobia when they reported being sexually assaulted. Julio stated that he was not believed by the police when he reported being sexually assaulted, which he believed was a result of homophobia. Julio was told by the police that he did not look gay and therefore could not have been sexually assaulted. Such homophobic nuances can be explained by gender performative and process theories. The guards did not accept his gender performativity and processed his gender and experience as not being valid. Julio also cited hostile behavior by the police which he believed was a result of their homophobia. Julio stated they sat in a specific way, did not exhibit any empathy, and treated him as if he was an animal. Julio recounted this when he said:

_Bueno, porque, por la forma, porque también hay una cosa, Danny, que yo no, que es una cosa que es muy difícil de explicarle a la gente. Hay una cosa que se llama body language, yo no se si tu entiendes la forma en la que ellos estaban sentados, escuchándome. Ahí no había empatía, no había, nada, ni siquiera un vaso de agua, quiere una aspirina, nada. Era como si fuera, como que yo era un animal…otro animal más en la selva_ (ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

Well, because the way, because there’s one thing, Danny, that I don’t, that it’s a thing very difficult to explain to people. There’s one thing that’s called body language, you know what I mean?...The way in which they were sitting, listening to me. There was no empathy,
there wasn’t, nothing, not even a glass of water, do you want an aspirin, nothing. It was like, like I was an animal…another animal more in the jungle.

Julio also felt that the stereotypes of gay men would not allow him to be believed. He stated:

… o en el caso de los, de los Gays, no sé, que nosotros siempre somos los que estamos buscando machos, y que somos capaces de acostarnos con cualquiera, este estereotipo existe en la cabeza de toda la gente y el sistema está ahí para perpetuar ese estereotipo, porque ellos no quieren creer en las historias de nosotros, Danny.

(ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

…in the case of gays, I don’t know, that we are the ones who are looking for men, and that we’re capable of sleeping with anyone, that stereotype exists in everyone’s head and the system is there to perpetuate that stereotype, because they don’t want to believe our stories, Danny.

Julio not only felt that gay men would not be believed, but also that this belief and stereotype about being a gay man helped authorities to find mechanisms to cover up the sexual assault of gay Latino men. Julio reported being sexually assaulted although he felt that he was not taken seriously.

All of the men who reported being sexually assaulted were not believed at some point during the reporting process, most tied this to their identity as gay men. Principally, this notion was often based on the belief that gay men were “asking for it,” which was often referenced by men as a perceived barrier to reporting being sexually assaulted. All of the survivors who experienced homophobia during the reporting process experienced a lack of follow-up by the reporting authorities. It is difficult to discern whether a lack of follow-up during and after the
process was a result of homophobia and/or racism. However, if reporting authorities did not believe the men were sexually assaulted and did not take their complaints seriously, there is a high likelihood that they would not follow-up with the men.

Christian also addressed this erroneous perception about gay men and how they would be viewed by reporting authorities, when attempting to report sexual assault. Christian stated, “…they think that because you’re gay, that you wanted it. How?! That's the part I've never understood. Just because you’re gay that doesn't mean that you want it.” Christian makes it clear that just because you are gay does not mean that you want to have sex or should be victim-blamed.

Malcolm also experienced homophobia when he reported being sexually assaulted to an agency, although he did not encounter racism. Malcolm stated that he was not subjected to racism since the people within the agency were mostly Latino. However, Malcolm stated that he felt homophobic attitudes influenced the way which the reporting process was handled. I specifically asked Malcolm whether he felt that being gay influenced how he was treated by reporting authorities. Malcolm replied:

Oh yeah, I think that affected it a lot just because…the automatic assumption was that I wanted to sleep with him and that I went to his house, I willingly went over to his apartment is partly why people didn't believe me initially…so I felt like a lot of people saw it as just a casual hookup that I regretted kind of thing rather than it being assault.

The issue of not being believed was inextricably linked to homophobia in these scenarios. The men were not believed as having been raped because of their identity as gay men.
4.2.2 Racism

Three of the four men who reported being sexually assaulted experienced racism when they reported to reporting authorities. Racism did not occur in a verbal manner – that is none of the participants were subject to racial epithets or slurs; however, two of the participants were subject to physical assaults. Racism manifested itself in two primary ways: 1) physical assaults and 2) dismissive behavior.

Christian was physically assaulted by the guards in the jail while being subjected to homophobic slurs. After reporting being sexually assaulted, Javier was sedated with drugs to put him to sleep by the medical staff, as they believed he was possible threat to himself and others. Racism is not always explicit or limited to racial epithets or slurs. Racism also can manifest itself in more nuanced forms; such as differential treatment and/or lack of attention. Consequently, racism can be difficult to prove. This was the case for Javier. While Javier, Christian, and Julio were not subjected to racial slurs, they all explicitly affirmed that they believed their mistreatment by reporting authorities was because they were Latino. Javier stated that he was aware of white gay male sexual assault survivors who were treated well by the medical staff at the same hospital. Javier said these men were not sedated with drugs, were not denied medication, and received resources upon leaving the hospital. I asked Javier: “Do you think that if you were white you would have been responded to differently?” He responded, “I think I would have. I met other survivors who went to the hospital that I’m talking about, and one of them was a white survivor, and he had a completely different experience than I did.”

When I continued this conversation and asked Javier about specific behavior differences that he was aware of between Latinos and Whites, he stated that the white survivors were given
resources by hospital staff. When asked, Javier also stated that he did not believe he would have been tied to the chair if he was not Latino. Racism manifested itself behaviorally in the reporting process for Javier in how he was treated by medical staff when he reported that he had been sexually assaulted.

Christian also spoke to his belief that racism affected the way in which he was physically and aggressively treated by the guards in the jail. While the guards did not direct any racial epithets to him, he was held up against a wall by the guards when he reported being sexually assaulted. I then asked Christian whether he believed that racism played a role into how he was treated by the guards. Christian responded:

Yeah, because if you were white it would be different. If you're white it's different. It's always been like that, it's still like that. If you're white, it's different. If you're white and you do something and if you're mixed skin and if you're Black, you're gonna take the heat for everything and they're not. It's like that in there.

Christian had a terrible experience when he reported being raped. Christian was both verbally and physically abused by reporting authorities and was not believed either time when he reported being raped. When asked about his experiences of reporting sexual assault as a gay Latino man, he believed that his experiences would be notably different if he were both white and heterosexual. “You know what, I always thought well maybe if I was straight it would've been different. If I was white and straight it would've been different, and they would believe me.” It is clear that Christian believes that both aspects of his identity resulted in reporting authorities not believing that he was raped.

Julio also spoke about how racism factored into his mistreatment by reporting authorities. For Julio, he believed that stereotypes of Latino men influenced the ways in which the police
treated him even before being interviewed. Stereotypes about his immigration status, accent, and inclination towards violence were all stereotypes that Julio believed played a role in how they responded to him. When asked if he believed being Latino had a role in their reactions to him he responded, “sin la menor duda” (ENGLISH TRANSLATION) “without a doubt.” He then continued to expand on how racism played a role to how the police responded to him.

Porque, sobre todo, acuérdate que la policía funciona con los mismos estereotipos que funcionan otras instituciones del estado y antes que, y antes que tú abras la boca el, el, el tape recorder con que ellos tienen en el cerebro comienza a mandarle señales y a decirles qué es este, de dónde viene, qué hace, a lo mejor es inmigrante, a lo mejor es ilegal, a lo mejor hace drogas, o vende drogas, etcétera, etcétera, etcétera.

(ENGLISH TRANSLATION)
Because above all, remember that the police works with the same stereotypes as the other state institution and before that, and before that you open your mouth, the, the, the tape recorder they have in their brains starts sending signals and telling that this and that, where they come from, what they do, maybe this is an immigrant, maybe this other is an illegal, maybe they do drugs, maybe they sell drugs, etc., etc., etc.

The racist stereotype of Latino men being violent is particularly noteworthy. Julio spoke to how he believed these racialized stereotypes were present for the police who interviewed him and ultimately did not take his complaint seriously and failed to follow up with him. Christian and Javier were both assaulted by reporting authorities. These aggressive behaviors seemed to be based on a belief that Latino men are violent. The reporting authorities failed to see these men as survivors of sexual assault and acted violently towards them.
4.2.3 Discouragement

Three of the four survivors who reported being sexually assaulted were discouraged from making an official complaint by the reporting authority to whom they were reporting or discouraged from reporting to additional reporting authorities (e.g., the police). This discouragement was both explicit and subtle in nature. For example, Malcolm, had a very negative experience when disclosing for the first time that he had been sexually assaulted, but he eventually disclosed to others despite his original negative experience in reporting. Malcolm stated, “It was actually a terrible experience. The first person I told it did not go well so it put me off from really telling more of my friends. I mean I did eventually tell other friends who were really supportive.”

While Julio reported being sexually assaulted to the police, he was initially discouraged from doing so. The train conductor had called the police after Julio was sexually assaulted but they did not show up at the train for Julio and his boyfriend. The police encouraged Julio to go to the hospital, as opposed to the police. He stated, “La policía del Bronx, manda a dos detectives, pero no quieren, quieren que vayamos al hospital, para hacer un, sea lo que sea.” (ENGLISH TRANSLATION) “Bronx police sent two detectives, but they didn’t want us to, they wanted us to go to the hospital to do a, whatever it was.” It is possible that that the police initially did not want Julio to report being sexually assaulted to them and attempted to have him report to another reporting authority.

Christian was also discouraged from reporting by the guards with whom he was first in contact. Christian was not believed by the first guard he told. The guard stated that he thought Christian was inventing the story, which was a way of discouraging Christian from reporting. When Christian was raped the second time in the jail, 15 months later, he was also discouraged...
from reporting by the guards. The guard complained that Christian was making him fill out a bunch of paperwork when he did not believe it was an actual rape. Later, it was discovered that there was not an official complaint on record.

Javier was also explicitly discouraged from reporting being sexually assaulted to the police by the medical staff at the hospital. All four medical professionals (two nurse and two doctors) did not believe that Javier was raped and discouraged him from reporting to the police. Javier was very insistent and clear that he wanted to report that he had been sexually assaulted to the police but was still discouraged from reporting by the hospital staff. One doctor in particular even discouraged him from making a sexual assault report/complaint to the hospital. This doctor also made excuses in an effort to discourage Javier from making a report to the police. Javier spoke about this experience. Javier stated:

I was explaining to him what happened, and I expressed it very clearly that I wanted to report it. He told me that it was going to take a couple of hours for the sheriff to get there so it might not be the most convenient place to wait, and he kept on discouraging me about the wait time and the process it was going to take. He kind of discouraged me from making a report at the hospital. He did give me a business card to the closest sheriff’s station to go myself and make a report after I got released from the hospital, but I was very persistent in trying to get it there.

Ultimately, Javier did not report being sexually assaulted to the police, as a direct result of being discouraged by the hospital staff. Javier stated that he was too tired to report being sexually assaulted to the police, after his negative experience at the hospital, where he was refused medical care, and then having to again disclose being sexually assaulted when receiving treatment at the walk-in clinic. Even when Javier was insistent and determined to report to the police, the persistent
discouragement from the hospital staff ultimately resulted in Javier not making an official report to the police.

### 4.2.4 Being Ignored

These sexual assault survivors were ignored by reporting authorities during the reporting process. This occurred in three main forms: 1) long wait times 2) lack of follow-through during and after the reporting process, and 3) requests being ignored. The reporting process was often long and tiring process for most of the men and the process was unclear for all of them. As a result of being ignored, survivors were not aware of the procedure and were often left wondering about the status of their case. In some instances, this led to re-traumatization for the men.

Javier reported being sexually assaulted to the hospital staff and endured a long process of attempting to report to the police and reporting the sexual assault to the hospital. Although it may be common, Javier waited four hours in the hospital to be seen by anyone. Even though Javier explicitly stated he wished to make a report to the police, his requests were ignored and dismissed by the hospital staff. In total, four staff members ignored his request to report being sexually assaulted to the police. Javier’s request to receive medicine was also initially refused by the first set of hospital staff. The hospital staff ignored multiple requests by Javier throughout the reporting process. This made it increasingly difficult for Javier to feel safe or comfortable at the hospital, which ultimately resulted in him having a breakdown at the hospital. It was then that they viewed Javier as being a threat to himself and others and tied him to the chair and sedated him with a needle which put him to sleep. Javier also wanted to receive a STD screening, which was also not provided to him. The hospital’s refusal to address his needs only exacerbated his condition and
resulted in a negative experience for him. Javier was also ignored when he reached out to a white public figure who was known to be an ally of the LGBT community. After sending a message and seeing that it was read, Javier was ignored by this public figure who never responded to his concerns regarding his experience of mistreatment in the hospital. Being ignored by the public figure was another example of how Javier was dismissed when he reported being sexually assaulted.

Christian was also ignored when attempting to report being raped in the jail. Christian was first ignored when he yelled out for help after being raped. There were no guards present and Christian had to wait in the same cell as his perpetrator until the morning. The consequences for Christian being ignored was that he was left in a dangerous situation where he was at risk of being raped again. The guards initially did not believe him and only later was he moved to a safer place.

Another way in which these survivors were ignored was after Malcolm initially reported being sexually assaulted to the non-profit agency. Malcolm had sent in an e-mail detailing the sexual assault and then was ignored for months and was not aware of the status of his complaint. When asked about what occurred after he reported, Malcolm stated, “But yeah, it was basically just writing a statement and emailing a specific person, and I didn't hear a response back at all from that.” I then asked Malcolm more about the lack of follow up. Malcolm continued to describe the process, “No. I think after that I heard nothing at all, not even from my friend about what happened afterwards, so I was in the dark about that at least till [a number of months later]. So for months I didn't hear anything, there was no follow-up for the first months.”

There was a clear lack of follow up on the status of the complaint. Malcolm was ignored for months and was not advised of the process of the complaint or whether it had even been received. Malcolm spoke about the struggle to cope with not knowing the status of the case and
how he ultimately needed to find a therapist to help him during the entirety of the process, which lasted approximately a year and a half. Malcolm’s needs and concern for his mental health was not considered by the agency during the process. As a sexual assault survivor, Malcolm was ignored through much of the process by not being told of any official reporting guidelines or procedures, receiving follow-up or being told what was occurring during various time of the process. Malcolm voiced that he was glad when the entire process was over.

4.2.5 No Clear Structural Process

The reporting process was not made clear for any of the sexual assault survivors. None of the men who reported being sexually assaulted were advised of the procedures in the reporting process. Moreover, none of the men were advised of their rights as sexual assault survivors nor resources that would be available to them. This proved to be a considerable disservice to these men. As all sexual assault survivors are coping with the trauma from the assault themselves, it is burdensome to place the responsibility of navigating the sexual assault process alone. It was difficult for these men to know their rights and the reporting agencies’ responsibilities during this process.

While Julio reported being sexually assaulted to the police, he was not told of the specific details of the reporting process by the police. Julio stated that after he and his boyfriend reported the sexual assault, they were not informed of the actual reporting process or what they should expect to happen. The police never told Julio what the investigation would entail or how long the process would take. Julio never heard back from the police and never knew whether an actual investigation had taken place.
Malcolm was never informed of the reporting procedure, after he reported being sexually assaulted to the non-profit agency. After he sent the original e-mail describing the sexual assault to the designated point person, Malcolm never received a response and was only told months later that organizers had met with the perpetrator. Malcolm was then later contacted by the agency and was told they hired an outside mediator to “mediate” the discussion. Malcolm was informed by the outside “mediator” of the process involved and was made aware of what was occurring, unlike earlier during the process. After the “mediation” had concluded, Malcolm was made aware that a statement was going to be published by the agency regarding the sexual assault; however, the statement’s sentiment was very much contrary to what Malcolm was told it would be. Again, this process and outcome was not made clear to Malcolm. While there were certain aspects of the process that were made clear, the entirety of the process was not.

There was no discussion of the reporting process or what the reporting procedure would entail for either Christian or Javier. Once they reported to the authorities, they were completely shut out from any details of what would happen following their initial report. Christian and Javier both later asked about whether anything had been put on file. These situations often resulted in the sexual assault being covered up in total or in part by the reporting agency. Since the reporting authorities did not have a clear procedure in place for sexual assault reports or intentionally hid the process from these men, remains unknown.

4.2.6 Covering Up the Sexual Assault

The sexual assault appeared to be covered up by all the agencies involved, to various degrees. While some of the agencies were able to cover up the sexual assault in its totality, other
agencies covered up certain aspects of the sexual assault. Despite all the men reporting that they had been sexually assaulted to reporting authorities, the agencies provided very little documentation, if any, stating that the men had been sexually assaulted. Covering up the sexual assault occurred in two main ways: 1) no documentation of the sexual assault 2) faculty documentation.

Christian’s sexual assault was covered up by the guards at the jail. When Christian reported the second incidence of being raped, he discovered that there was no file of him reporting that he had been raped a year earlier. Christian was aware of the Safe Prisons Rape Act and brought this to the attention of the guards, which did make them respond to his request to look into his file (as they had previously been ignoring him). Christian spoke of how he found out there was no official report in his file. Christian stated:

Yeah, that’s what it is. There was a lot of rapes going on and nothing was being done about it and so they did this thing and they were going around telling the people and everything, reporting and stuff like that. So when I told them about it and everything, they went back and looked at my file and there was nothing.

The guards at the prison did not put an official report into Christian’s file documenting that he had been raped. This resulted in Christian having to have his word believed over the guard he reported it to. The guard stated that he did not remember Christian reporting being sexually assaulted, although he did not outright deny that Christian had reported being raped. Christian then asked them to verify that he received his HIV test in his file, which he received after being raped. There was also no record of an HIV test.

Javier was discouraged from reporting being sexually assaulted to the police by the hospital staff. This was one way which the hospital attempted and successfully covered up his sexual assault.
even outside of their jurisdiction. While Javier’s file did indicate that he was treated for sexual assault, his file also falsely claimed that he was anxious and depressed. By adding this to his file, it ensured a mechanism for covering up his sexual assault. Moreover, the hospital also did not contact the police that Javier had been sexually assaulted nor provided him with a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE nurse).

Julio was not advised of the investigation process that was to be undertaken by the police. While the detectives interviewed Julio regarding the sexual assault and took down his contact information, no effort was ever made to contact Julio afterwards. No follow-up was provided to Julio nor any updates on his case. As such, Julio was never made aware of the outcome of the case or whether an investigation ever took place.

While the agency that hired a mediator to handle the sexual assault report that Malcolm had filed, there were times where Malcolm was not informed of the entire process. After Malcolm had first e-mailed the complaint to the agency, he was not made aware that the complaint had been received or what the reporting procedure would be. Malcolm was only later told what had been done with his complaint. Once the outside mediator was involved in the case, Malcolm was updated on the status of the case. Towards the end of the process, Malcolm was of the understanding that the agency would make a statement acknowledging the sexual assault and apologizing for their wrong-doing. However, their statement was contrary to what Malcolm was told it would be, as it congratulated the organization for their work. Malcolm spoke about this when he said:

And then I was sent a copy of their statement…. It was a terrible statement. It was very self-congratulatory and pretty much gets the credit for everything, all the work the organizers did and made it seem like I was very -- what's the word -- I was very willing to
be part of this process and very willing to work with them to hold him accountable, which
is not at all what I intended, not at all what it actually was.

Malcolm later stated that the organization did try to cover up the sexual assault complaint,
when speaking about how they may have taken the complaint more seriously if he was also an
organizer within the agency. Malcolm stated, “I’m sure if I was an organizer, their reaction
would’ve been a lot more….I don't think it would've been brushed under the rug the way that it
was.”

Malcolm felt that the organization was able to cover-up aspects of the sexual assault by
making a statement that did not accurately reflect his experience or their role in the process. This
statement allowed for the organization to cover up aspects of the sexual assault, which did not
allow for Malcolm’s story to be told.

4.2.7 Retraumatization

All of the participants who reported being sexually assaulted were re-traumatized during
the reporting process. The men were re-traumatized through 1) physical and verbal assaults 2)
being ignored 3) not being believed 4) not being kept informed or the reporting process and 5) a
drawn-out process.

Christian and Javier were both physically assaulted by the reporting authorities. Both of
these men had just been sexually assaulted and were trying to cope with the resulting trauma of
being sexually assaulted. The physical assault of these men by the reporting authorities only
exacerbated their vulnerabilities and trauma. This re-traumatization seemed to be a result of racism
and/or homophobia for these men. Christian was held against a wall and called homophobic names
while Javier was tied to a chair and given medication that put him to sleep. Both assaults further re-traumatized these men who should have received validation, health services, and support from reporting authorities.

Reporting authorities often did not believe that the men had been sexually assaulted. The men demonstrated a significant amount of vulnerability by reporting that they had been sexually assaulted yet were then not believed by reporting authorities. A denial of their truth could be a form of re-traumatization for sexual assault survivors. The men then had to contend with insisting on reporting and making a complaint that the reporting authorities did not believe had occurred.

Re-traumatization also occurred with the lengthy reporting process and the various obstacles that men experienced during the process, this was true for Malcolm. A couple of the men also expressed being concerned about whether they would be believed since other people knew the perpetrator and may not believe that the individual was capable of sexually assaulting someone else. Malcolm stated that he read comments online that people thought he was jealous of the perpetrators success and had made up that he had been sexually assaulted.

The men were also ignored during the reporting process, whether it was through long periods of waiting to initially report the crime, needing to be physically removed from the same space as the perpetrator or not being kept informed of the status of their report. All of these behaviors by the reporting authorities did not allow for the men to quickly heal from the sexual assault. The men were not able to move on from the sexual assault themselves if they were unaware of when the process would end or were kept waiting on having the process come to an end. This was stated by Malcolm, who waited a year and a half for the entire process to come to an end. Malcolm spoke to how the reporting process re-traumatized him. I asked him what the most difficult part of the reporting process was for him and he replied, “Talking about the night of this
whole-- I felt like I was constantly re-traumatized, so being re-traumatized was probably the hardest part for me.” Malcolm found a therapist to help him cope with the trauma of the reporting process on top of the trauma resulting from the sexual assault. The re-traumatization of the reporting process only further prolonged the healing process for these men.

4.2.8 Lack of Support

The men also experienced a lack of support by the reporting authorities to different degrees during the reporting process. The lack of support resulted in a lack of 1) empathy 2) care 3) compassion 4) tangible resources. This lack of support resulted in 1) re-traumatization and at times, 2) covering up the sexual assault. It should be noted that the lack of support experienced by the men was at times motivated by racism and/or homophobia.

The majority of the men cited a lack of empathy and regards for their needs, wants and feelings at various points during the reporting process. Julio stated that when he reported being sexually assaulted to the reporting authorities, that he was not even given water and felt that he was an animal in the jungle. He specifically stated that he was shown no empathy by the reporting authorities. Christian was also shown no empathy or compassion by the guards who physically and verbally assaulted him when he reported being raped. Likewise, Javier was also not shown empathy or care, or compassion when he was tied to the chair, denied medication and was sedated with a needle by the hospital staff. This lack of support was behavioral in nature and only worsened the situation for the men. All of the men were not believed by certain individuals during the reporting process, which was not supportive of them or their needs during the process.
The second main form of lack of support was tangible in nature. Three of the four men were not provided with any resources and the other male still had to seek an outside therapist to help with the trauma from the reporting process itself. Javier was denied medical care (STD screenings), which he specifically requested after being sexually assaulted. Since Javier did not receive the requested medical testing and care from the hospital, he had to seek an outside clinic to provide him with the medical care. Other men were not provided with outside resources, such as organizations, mental health agencies, rape crisis centers, social workers, therapists or SANE nurses, who may have been able to provide them with specific targeted services for male sexual assault survivors. A lack of tangible resources to the needs particularly salient to gay male sexual assault survivors proved to be a significant disservice to these men.

4.3 Theme 3: Facilitators to Reporting Sexual Assault

While a discussion of barriers experienced during the sexual assault reporting process is necessary to understand to this under-researched phenomenon, it is equally important to identify the facilitators identified by gay Latino sexual assault survivors that enhanced their reporting process. The facilitators experienced and identified by gay Latino sexual assault survivors are: 1) being listened to 2) being believed 3) being understood 4) not being judged and 5) being gay friendly.

All of the men who reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities had a positive experience with at least one individual during the reporting process. Notably, all survivors who initially had a negative experience during the reporting process did disclose to someone else.
Fortunately, their second experiences were positive ones. All men stated that key facilitators were being listened to and believed.

Christian had a horrible experience when he reported that he had been raped to the guards in the jail. Although Christian was subject to homophobia and racism during the process, he also disclosed to a nurse who administered his HIV test that he had been sexually assaulted. Christian did have a positive experience with the nurse. He stated:

They knew, well the nurse knew because a couple of nurses would check up on me when they had me at the back of the… when I did it, the testing, and they felt bad for me and everything and they would talk to me and stuff like that and asked me if I wanted to talk to anybody….

[DJ: And how did it feel to be believed by her?]

By her, it felt good, that someone would actually believe you regardless of… whatever. And it felt good for her to come pray with me and it felt good for her to talk to me and didn't look at me-- I mean she looked at me as a person, she knew I was hurt. Just that little bit was enough for me.

Christian was able to be believed and was shown care, understanding and empathy by the nurse. Even the small act of kindness and simply being believed was healing for Christian.

Care and compassion from others was also identified as being helpful to sexual assault survivors. Reporting authorities, regardless of their particular occupation, did not need to have extensive experience in working with gay Latino sexual assault survivors to be effective in providing them with support and healing. For example, Javier had gone to a walk-in clinic after his negative experience at the hospital in order to receive the medical care he was refused. At the clinic, he disclosed to one of the doctors that he had been sexually assaulted. She listened to him,
believed him, and provided him with numerous resources for therapists and others who worked with male sexual assault survivors. Javier stated, “They provided me with the care that I needed. More understanding. They had never dealt with the situation like mine, so afterwards they didn’t know how to react to it, but the doctor was very understanding and caring about it. It did help.” It was clear that although this particular doctor did not have experience working directly with gay Latino sexual assault survivors, she was able to demonstrate empathy and care, which he found to be helpful.

There were other men who did not make an official report to a specific reporting authority but had disclosed being sexually assaulted to others. These men also stated that they found it to be helpful when people believed them and showed that they understood and cared about them and their well-being. Yuriel stated: “I think the support of friends that I tell has been very, very helpful.” Overall, men cited that they did find it helpful when they were listened to, believed, understood and supported. While many of these facilitators seem simplistic, they are powerful, needed, and far too often not provided. In certain aspects, these are simplistic techniques that should and can easily be provided to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. There is hope.
5.0 Implications and Conclusion

This dissertation sought to identify and understand the barriers and facilitators to reporting sexual assault among gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Prior research on the sexual assault of men has not examined the roles of homophobia and racism on the reporting process for gay men of color. An emphasis was placed on examining the role of homophobia and racism in the reporting process among gay Latino men. Considering the lack of research in this area, two aims of this dissertation were to identify the extent to which racism and homophobia affected the reporting process for gay Latino men. Further, this dissertation sought to identify other barriers and facilitators experienced by these men. The study findings corroborated much of the sparse literature examining barriers to reporting sexual assault for men. This study furthered the literature in that it addressed, for the first time, the role of both racism and homophobia during the reporting process among gay Latino men. Findings revealed that racism and homophobia were both barriers in reporting sexual assault to reporting authorities among gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

This chapter discusses the implications of the findings and recommendations for future research in this area. Particular attention is focused on recommendations salient to gay Latino sexual assault survivors, although some recommendations are applicable to all sexual assault survivors, regardless of their race/ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation. Recommendations focus on how to enhance the reporting practice for gay Latino sexual assault survivors. This chapter begins with a discussion of implications and recommendations for future research. The chapter also provides recommendations for policy and practice. Last, it concludes with study limitations.
5.1 Implications for Research

The findings from this study set forth several implications for future research in this area. The implications and recommendations for future research address various aspects of the identities (including racial identities) and experiences of gay Latino sexual assault survivors, including on how to enhance the sexual assault reporting process. Acknowledging that gay Latino sexual assault survivors are not a homogenous group, there are various areas in which substantial research can be further conducted. The participants in this study cited various factors that influenced their decisions about whether to report being sexually assaulted. Furthermore, experiences of racism and/or homophobia manifested themselves differently among the gay Latino men who reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Such factors must be taken into consideration when conducting future research in this area.

5.1.1 Implications for Research Methodology

This population was particularly difficult to reach despite employing various recruitment methods. To my knowledge, this study is the first to investigate barriers and facilitators in reporting sexual assault among gay Latino sexual assault survivors. This study has important implications for researchers wishing to conduct studies that focus on the decision-making process to report sexual assault among gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

Recruiting participants for this study proved incredibly difficult. While it was expected that recruiting men for this study would be challenging, the extent to which it was challenging was beyond initial expectations. Gay Latino sexual assault survivors are not an easily accessible
population, as a result of stigmatization due to their multiple marginalized identities and being sexual assault survivors. Purposive and snowball sampling methods were utilized, as they were appropriate methods for this population. Snowball sampling used to recruit hard-to-reach populations (Engel & Schutt, 2012) and purposive sampling methods are used to gain an in-depth understanding into a phenomenon that is not yet known that cannot be obtained from random sampling (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2012).

In total, 16 agencies, 45 professionals contacts, 6 LGBT themed newspapers, and 2 geosocial media apps were contacted for recruitment purposes. Four agencies posted and advertised the study, a majority of professional contacts advertised the study, one newspaper advertised the study, and one geosocial media app was used to recruit men for the study. These efforts resulted in recruiting fourteen participants. Future researchers may need to employ an array of recruitment methods to locate and recruit participants for similar studies. It appears that gay Latino male sexual assault survivors are difficult to locate, in part because many do not disclose to others that they have been sexually assaulted.

This challenge is consistent with literature citing male sexual assault survivors may not know other male sexual assault survivors (Pino & Meier, 1999). This experience may be in part because other survivors feel extremely hesitant to speak about being sexually assaulted and/or their experiences in deciding to report and/or reporting being sexually assaulted to authorities. For gay Latino sexual assault survivors, non-disclosure may be even more common, due to their multiple marginalized identities. Consistent with gender performativity (Butler, 1988; West & Zimmerman, 1987), this occurrence may be explained by the hierarchy of masculinities (Pascoe & Bridges, 2016); gay Latino men are at the bottom of the hierarchical structure and may fear being believed by reporting authorities. The geosocial media app proved to be the most effective
means to recruiting men. Future research may need to identify other strategies to recruit men for similar studies, as outreach via organizations did not result in successfully recruiting participants.

Overall, 39 participants expressed initial interest in the study. Many of the men expressed hesitancy in speaking about the sexual assault – in part out of fear of losing anonymity. Others had general discomfort in speaking about the subject. It became clear that many of these men (even with advertising that the interviews did not focus on the sexual assault itself) were worried that they would have to speak about the details of the sexual assault. Many expressed relief and thanked me for not asking them about the details of the assault. Researchers should factor men’s possible hesitancy to speak about any issues relating to being sexually assaulted when working with male sexual assault survivors. Researchers who wish to focus on the experience of sexual assault against gay men of color should be cognizant of the risk of re-traumatization. While previous research has found that men are more likely to be assaulted by multiple assailants compared to women (Davies, 2002; McLean, 2013), there is a lack of research examining the nuances of sexual assault against men. While this research may be a notable undertaking, it may prove exceedingly difficult to locate men who are willing to speak in detail about being sexually assaulted. Trauma-informed researchers should be conducting this research with questions aimed to minimize re-traumatization as much as possible. As with this study, participants should be advised that they may discontinue the interview at any given time and even have the interview conducted in multiple segments, if that is beneficial for the participant.

Studies that focus on barriers and facilitators to reporting for Latino men should also consider that men may still be hesitant to speak on any subject tangentially related to being sexually assaulted. One participant only referred his friend to my study after being interviewed himself, as he wanted to ensure his friend would not be subject to any questions that may re-traumatize him.
Many participants thanked me for not asking them questions about the assault and for being sensitive to their mental state during the interview.

Positionality is another factor that needs to be considered for researchers that wish to conduct studies with this population. A few of the participants asked me my race/ethnicity, if I was gay and if I was a sexual assault survivor and why I chose this topic to research before agreeing to participate in the study. Participants indicated that they were most comfortable speaking to someone with the same or similar identities to them, especially given the research topic. One participant stated he would not have spoken to a white heterosexual person conducting the research. He then agreed to be interviewed. While others did not explicitly express this, some participants indicated that speaking with another gay Latino man made them more willing to participate in the study. It remains unclear whether white, female, and/or heterosexual researchers would be less likely to recruit gay Latino and Black sexual assault survivors for a similar study, but it is a factor that should be considered for future research.

5.1.2 Implications for Tangential Research Areas

While this study focused on the barriers and facilitators to reporting perceived and experienced by gay Latino sexual assault survivors, other worthy topics were not explored in-depth, as they were outside the scope of the aims of the study. Such topics include the role of culture on identity development among gay Latino men, mental health outcomes resulting from being sexually assaulted, the effects of sexual assault on gay Latino men’s sex life, and the effects of sexual assault on gay Latino men’s romantic relationships. Many of these topics were referenced and brought up by participants at various points during the interviews.
One such area that was frequently mentioned was the mental and emotional effects that resulted from having been sexually assaulted. Many men stated that they suffered from severe emotional and mental health outcomes resulting from the sexual assault. Consistent with literature, male sexual assault survivors have been found to experience a litany of deleterious mental health outcomes (Du Mont et al., 2013; Elliot et al., 2004; Tewksbury, 2007). As the study was not focused on these adverse mental health outcomes, and to minimize re-traumatization, I chose not to focus on these topics even when they volunteered the information. Emotional and mental health outcomes is an area that should be further investigated, particularly when working to develop trauma-informed and culturally congruent mental health interventions for gay Latino men.

The experiences of Black Latino men is also an area that should be further explored. As this dissertation was guided by an intersectional lens, the multiple marginalized identities of gay Black Latino men cannot be ignored. Black Latino men may encounter additional and different barriers than non-Black Latino men when reporting being sexually assaulted. Anti-Black racism and Black masculinity in relation to the sexual assault of these men should be explored.

Some participants also spoke to their parents’ rejection and/or difficulty in accepting them for being gay, which affected their relationship with their parents and families. Some participants attributed this rejection to their culture. One participant stated that disclosing to others would have been easier if his family accepted him for being gay. While disclosing to others was identified as a barrier, further investigation linking cultural expectations among Latino families and their relevance to feeling encouraged to report sexual assault is needed. As purported by theories of Latino masculinities, under gender performativity, concepts such as *machismo* and *familismo* may play a vital role in determining the likelihood and comfortability of gay men to report being sexually assaulted. These cultural norms may discourage gay Latino men from reporting having
been sexually assaulted to reporting authorities, due to perceptions of their masculinity and family honor. Gay Latino men may feel emasculated by reporting or disclosing that they have been sexually assaulted. Gay Latino men may also feel hesitant to report as they feel it would be too vulnerable for them as Latino men.

Last, some participants indicated that being sexually assaulted affected their romantic relationships in various ways. Other men stated that having a boyfriend would have helped them process their trauma of being sexually assaulted. Understanding the role of romantic relationships as a mediator of sexual assault is a substantive area that could be further investigated. Additionally, the role that sexual assault has on engaging in romantic relationships for gay Latino and gay Black Latino men is another phenomenon that should be explored in future research.

5.1.3 Implications for Theory

Using an intersectional lens to investigate this phenomenon was essential towards understanding the lived experiences of gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Crenshaw’s (1991) theory of intersectionality recognizes how multiple marginalized identities shape one’s experience without being in competition with one another. This was of particular relevance for the findings in this dissertation. Gay Latino sexual assault survivors’ identities often intertwined with one another and each of their identities uniquely shaped their experiences. This is consistent with literature on intersectionality (Choo & Ferree, 2010). The findings in this dissertation highlight how their racial, and ethnic identities were attached to their sexual orientation. The intersectional lens helped to further understand how Black men had different experiences than non-Latino Black men, on account of their racial identity. Crenshaw’s (1991) lens of intersectionality postulates that women
of colors bodies are less valued that the bodies of White women. Intersectionality can be further expanded to include the bodies of gay men of color. The findings indicated that men who reported being sexually assaulted received poor treatment and were subject to both homophobia and racism. Intersectionality allows for an understanding that gay Latino men’s bodies are less valued than the bodies of gay White men.

Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) allowed for gender performativity and practice theory to be understood by considering the multiple marginalized identities of gay Latino men. Intersectionality allowed for the complexities of their identities to be simultaneously considered both among the men who reported being sexually assaulted and among the men who did not. Intersectionality allowed for both barriers and facilitators to be considered, as the theoretical lens focuses on the identities of the men and not the process of reporting.

The findings from this dissertation have implications for theories that pertain to this population. While gender performativity and practice theories provide explanatory power towards understanding the reporting process for gay Latino sexual survivors, there are certain aspects of the reporting process that are not entirely explained by these theories. Gender performativity (Butler, 1988; West & Zimmerman, 1987) and practice theory (Bourdieu, 1977) are mainly concerned with the action or the process among individuals, as opposed to an internal process. Gender performativity and practice theories can explain the occurrences of many interactions between gay Latino sexual assault survivors and reporting authorities, however there are certain nuances that cannot be fully explained by either of the theories. The gaps in the explanation leave room for these theories to be expanded upon to more fully explain the reporting process among gay Latino sexual assault survivors.
Gender performativity addresses the acceptance or rejection of one’s gender (West & Zimmerman) or the way in which one’s gender is performed through a series of actions (Butler, 1988), which in certain instances, encompasses how gay men perform their gender. However, gay men are not solely subjugated on account of their gender but also for their sexual orientation. West and Zimmerman’s (1988) notion of gender performativity does not fully explain how gay men may be subject to homophobia. While their notion of gender performativity accounts for the acceptance or rejection of gay men’s gender it does not account for the acceptance or rejection of their sexual orientation. Findings from this study revealed that men encountered barriers to reporting and during the reporting process due to being a man, being gay and being Latino. Gender performativity does provide a framework to gay Latino survivors’ identity as men and issues around their masculinity. However, gender performativity (West & Zimmerman, 1987) does not account for additional barriers encountered by gay Latino men. West and Zimmerman’s (1987) notion of gender performativity does not fully explain instances of homophobia, as it focused on gender, which is different than sexual orientation. West and Zimmerman’s (1987) notion of gender performativity does take into account facilitators experienced when reporting sexual assault. Gay Latino men who are validated by reporting authorities would therefore have been accepted for performing their gender by reporting authorities, in accordance with this notion of gender performativity.

Butler’s (1988) theory of gender performativity allows for a better understanding of homophobia against gay Latino men during the reporting process. Butler (1988) contends that gender performativity promotes heterosexuality; that if one’s gender is performed correctly it will promote heterosexuality. This notion of gender performativity does include sexual orientation in its understanding of gender performativity. Butler’s (1988) theoretical framework of gender
performativity is more applicable for gay Latino men who may encounter homophobia when reporting being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. This notion of gender performativity further views gender performative as a series of performative acts, which allows for individuals to encounter different responses by different reporting authorities throughout the sexual assault reporting process. This notion of gender performativity also helps to explain why survivors can both have positive and negative experiences when reporting being sexually assaulted within one agency. Butler’s (1988) notion of gender performativity better explains the sexual assault reporting process among gay Latino sexual assault survivors as well as better accounting for homophobia during the reporting process. Gender performativity does not take into account racism experienced among gay Latino sexual assault survivors, which, as these findings highlight is a large role in the experiences among gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Gender performativity only takes one identity of gay Latino sexual assault survivors into account.

As this study found that survivors were subjected to homophobic reactions by reporting authorities, it is evident that their sexual orientation played a large role in their treatment by reporting authorities. While gender performativity accounts for issues around masculinity and gendered roles, gender performativity does not fully provide an explanatory framework for how an individual’s sexual orientation is perceived, accepted or rejected. The survivors expressed that they were concerned that reporting authorities would judge them for being gay and view them as promiscuous. In certain instances, the survivors were believed to be gay men but they were not validated for being gay men. Gender performativity should focus on the validation of one’s sexuality and gender. That is, gay Latino men’s identity is subject to more complexity than acceptance or rejection. It is also based on validation. Reporting authorities often accepted that they were gay men but did not validate them as gay men. They had erroneous perceptions of gay
men even though they accepted them for being gay. Gender performativity needs to include an explanatory framework of validation. Under gender performativity, the hierarchy of masculinities, does not specifically address the intersection of identities. While the hierarchy of masculinities addresses race/ethnicity and sexual orientation, it does not view them from a lens of intersectionality. This framework, while acknowledging multiple identities and oppression, does not fully integrate gay Latino sexual assault survivors’ identities as one. For this dissertation, all theoretical frameworks were understood through a lens of intersectionality, as the identity of gay Latino men cannot be parsed.

Practice theories were most applicable to the men who reported being sexually assaulted, since practice theories rely on dualities and the interaction between two agents. Bourdieu’s (1977) theoretical conceptualizations, particularly around power relations between two agents were applied to the experience of the men who reported being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. One key element of practice theory that is particularly useful to both the group of men who reported and the group of men who did not report, is the concept of agency. Each individual agent has their own agency to make decisions throughout the process. This is applicable to all sexual assault survivors, regardless of their choice of whether to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Agency is key towards understanding the experiences of all sexual assault survivors. While practice theory provides a solid framework towards understanding how individual agency affects the reporting process among those who do report, it does not as fully explain the process for survivors who did not report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Practice theory may also need to take into account the personal process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors, especially with regard to their agency. Additional frameworks may also be needed to better understand the internal process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors when deciding to report
being sexually assaulted. Additional theoretical frameworks may be needed to address the role of racism and homophobia during the reporting process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

5.2 Implications for Policy

This study has several implications for policy regarding sexual assault reporting protocols and sexual assault education/prevention efforts. While there are federal, state-wide and local (including college and university) policies on sexual assault, they are often varied and inconsistent. While many existing policies have been strengthened in recent years, there is still a need to create uniform and inclusive policies within agencies and other socio-political institutions. Sexual assault policies are not always inclusive of persons belonging to marginalized identities or those subjected to various forms of sexual assault, such as evidenced by the FBI’s prior definition of sexual assault. There are other policies which have been based on antiquated notions of sexual assault, which consequently affect the accessibility and effectiveness of programs and services provided to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. The lack of consistent procedures related to Title IX, may also affect the timeline for reporting sexual assault for sexual assault survivors. Recommendations for current policies to be strengthened are discussed as well as recommendations for additional policies that need to be implemented and enforced.
5.2.1 Federal Policy Recommendations

Current federal policies regarding sexual assault have recently become more inclusive, most notably by the FBI’s decision to now include men in their definition of rape, as of 2013. Other federal policies that are most relevant to gay Latino male sexual assault survivors are the Matthew Shepherd and James Byrd Jr., Hate Crimes Act, the Affordable Care Act, Title IX, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2015, and the Sexual Assault Service Program and the Rape Prevention and Education Program. Due to their multiple marginalized identities, gay Latino sexual assault survivors are often only protected for one of their identities under these current policies. All policies should cover survivors regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation.

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) should be amended to include both medical and mental health care for men who are victimized by sexual violence. This dissertation found that many of the men were in need of medical care, resulting from having been sexually assaulted. A couple men stated that health care costs were a factor in preventing them from easily accessing health care, resulting from the sexual assault. Currently, the ACA only covers women who experience domestic violence, under the categories of Women’s Intervention Services and Women’s Support Services. Under the Affordable Care Act, women can receive free screening and counseling for domestic and interpersonal violence. The screenings include preventative counseling for women, as part of preventative measure for domestic abuse. As sexual assault can be a form of domestic violence, men are not covered under the ACA and women who may be sexually assaulted outside of domestic relationships are also not covered. Notably, the Affordable Care Act only mentions the term “sexual assault” six times. The findings from this dissertation reveal that several men
were in need of general medical care and STD testing, after having been sexually assaulted. Two men contracted an STD as a result of being sexually assaulted. These findings are consistent with prior studies that have found that men are more likely to incur physical injuries than women after being sexually assaulted (Davies, 2002; Pino & Meier, 1999). Under the Affordable Care Act, men are able to receive STD screenings, although not in relation to sexual violence. Three participants specified a lack of free or affordable health care that was available to them. This finding is consistent with the study conducted by Done and colleagues (2018). Based on these findings, not only should the Affordable Care Act and similar policies and programming provide STD screenings to men, but also, they should be expanded to include general health care for male survivors of sexual assault. The study also revealed that men sought the need of mental health services to help them with the trauma of the sexual assault as well as the re-traumatization during the reporting process. A few of the men said that finding a therapist would be helpful to them to process the sexual assault. Men are currently excluded from receiving mental or physical health services as sexual assault survivors under this policy. The Affordable Care Act should provide coverage for mental health and physical health services for male survivors of sexual assault.

Another policy that has excellent potential and can be further improved and expanded upon is the Sexual Assault Service Program and the Rape Prevention and Education Program. As this dissertation found that men were not aware of what services were available to them and did not always feel that programming was inclusive to them, it is imperative that programs include gay Latino men in their sexual assault education and prevention programming. This finding corroborates prior literature that identified a lack of known available resources as a barrier to reporting for sexual assault survivors (Association Committee on Women, 2012; Amar et al., 2014; Donnelly and Kenyon, 1996; Miller et al., 2011). This federal program is an excellent program
that works with community stakeholders to implement state sexual violence prevention efforts through research and education. The Sexual Assault Service Program and Rape Prevention Education Program is particularly notable in that it can address the inconsistencies in state and local sexual assault laws and policies. Not only does this initiative provide funding to states to gather sexual assault evaluation data but it also provides training on sexual assault education and prevention. Training and prevention education efforts targeted to medical care providers, police, Title IX workers and other individuals on the issues salient to gay Latino sexual assault survivors should be created and implemented. This program should work to collect cross-national data on sexual assault survivors focused on individual characteristics (race/ethnicity, sex, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) that may begin to reveal and document statistics on LGBT people of color. Additionally, this program should collect data, investigate and make recommendations to state and local agencies on how best to assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

**Title IX/Clery Act**

Title IX policies and procedures had been strengthened by the Obama administration to protect sexual assault survivors. The recent and disturbing proposal to roll back many of these guidelines by the Trump administration is detrimental to all sexual assault survivors, particularly gay Latino sexual assault survivors. At a minimum, Title IX guidelines outlined by the Obama administration should be followed. Colleges and universities should not weaken their commitment to following Title IX guidelines enhanced under the Obama administration but should strengthen their own respective campus procedures, in accordance with the Clery Act. College and universities should be transparent in their policies and make clear reporting procedures and clear policies for sexual assault survivors on their campuses. Colleges and universities should also provide trainings on the challenges unique to LGBT and students of color on college campuses.
Gay Latino and other LGBT sexual assault survivors of color are likely to experience additional challenges on college and university campuses, as a result of their multiple marginalized identities. This is imperative to implement especially considering that studies have found that college and universities often had a lack of trained law enforcement, a lack of coordinated oversight with Title IX, and a lack of best practices and procedures being followed correctly and a high number of uninvestigated cases of sexual assault complaints (DeMatteo et al., 2015; McCaskill, 2014).

Students of color and/or LGBT students may experience racial microaggressions, exclusion from social campus activities, a lack of mentorship, a lack of LGBT and faculty of color, unfair treatment, dismissal by university administration, feelings of exclusion, isolation and homophobia on campus. These negative experiences may affect their likelihood to report being sexually assaulted to campus officials, especially if they do not feel valued or respected at their institutions.

5.2.2 Agency Policies

The individual sexual assault policies set forth by organizations should be clear and widely available and easily accessible to students, staff, employees, and administration. The findings from this dissertation revealed that men were not aware of their legal rights nor the sexual assault process, regardless of the reporting agency. Many men also felt that they would not be taken as seriously as female sexual assault survivors. The findings showcased that men were often not made aware of the reporting process and/or were not kept informed of the status of their case. While it remains unclear what, if any, sexual assault reporting processes were in place at the respective agencies, an articulated clear reporting process would have been beneficial for these men. If
reporting policies and procedures were in place, it remains unclear the extent to which they were not followed by the reporting authorities.

Based on these findings, all sexual assault policies should be inclusive and non-discriminatory in nature. Policies should afford equal protections to sexual assault survivors regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender, sex, perceived or actual sexual orientation and gender identity. It is incumbent upon agencies to provide detailed and clear reporting procedures for sexual assault survivors.

Previous studies have found that college and university campuses had a lack of oversight and a lack of best practices being followed (DeMatteo et al., 2015; McCaskill, 2014). The findings of this study indicate that gay Latino sexual assault survivors were not aware of their rights or the specific reporting procedures at any given agency. Most of the men who reported being sexually assaulted were not provided with time frames concerning the reporting process. These findings highlight a need for agencies to provide clear and precise reporting procedures that will allow sexual assault survivors with at minimum: a designated timeframe, a designated point person, a clear procedure, and a grievance reporting process. Lengthy report processes and investigations likely re-traumatize survivors and subject them to victim-blaming, judgment and other negative responses. Even if they would not have entirely negative experiences, a lengthy report process would only prolong the process of their healing. These findings identify a tremendous need for an overseeing agency (not comprised of lawyers hired by the given agency or a board comprised solely of lawyers) to investigate violations of agency policy. The overseeing agency should also set financial and social repercussions for agencies found in violation of such policies and disseminate public notices that such agencies are under investigation. Agencies should also make a substantive effort to educate themselves about the LGBT and Latinx communities. Agencies
should be familiar with appropriate terminology and disproportionate health outcomes for LGBT and Latinx populations. Training and education will help staff to provide better services to gay Latino and other sexual assault survivors.

5.3 Implications for Practice

5.3.1 Educational Programming and Practice

There are numerous ways in which sexual assault prevention education and programming can and should be implemented across college and university campuses, law enforcement agencies, and medical care providers. The opportunities for institutions of higher education to enhance their educational programming and training through Title IX should not be ignored or dismissed. One participant shared that while he did receive information on Title IX programming at his university, little attention was focused on services available for male sexual assault survivors. While Title IX should continue and strengthen their outreach and programming for women, Title IX programming should also make substantial efforts to enhance their programming for men. Current Title IX programming should be expanded and strengthened across institutions of higher learning. This will allow for gay Latino sexual assault survivors to know where they are able to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities. Not only should Title IX officers and higher education administration be conducting training to the entire university, but university staff and administration should also be receiving training on issues salient to LGBT sexual assault survivors of color. Although more attention and efforts have been made within intuitions of higher
education as of late to address sexual assault on campuses, there still exists a lack of attention towards addressing sexual assault of gay Latino/ Black Latino students. Despite the recent findings that students identifying as LGBT are more likely to experience unwanted sexual contacts compared with their heterosexual peers (Cantor et al, 2015), there has been little done to address the sexual assault of LGBT students of color. More targeted strategies of intervention and prevention should be created and implemented to address sexual assault against LGBT students of color. Campus administration should receive what is often referred to as cultural competence or diversity training, specifically to include LGBT students and students of color. Latinx and other students of color encounter various challenges in higher education that should not be ignored. This study, while not focused on campus sexual assault, does corroborate previous findings concerning an overall lack of best policies and procedures being followed, discouragement of reporting sexual assault, a lack of trained law enforcement and a lack of knowledge about sexual assault (DeMatteo, 2015; McCaskill, 2014). Institutions of higher education should actively work to strengthen and better coordinate their sexual assault and prevention programming and work to design and implement strategies to assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

5.3.2 Law Enforcement Practices

Findings from this study indicated that law enforcement were not well trained or equipped to investigate male sexual assault, consistent with previous findings regarding law enforcement handling of gay male sexual assault (Jamel, 2008; Javaid, 2017). Consistent with prior literature investigating homophobia among male sexual assault survivors (Javaid, 2015, 2017), homophobia negatively affected the reporting process for gay Latino men. Law enforcement agencies should
receive training in working with male sexual assault survivors and general knowledge of the LGBT community. Law enforcement agencies should implement clear reporting procedures with designated timeframes for an investigation. Officers should advise male sexual assault survivors of their rights and refer them to rape crisis centers and health care. Law enforcement should not use racist or homophobic language or engage in inappropriate behaviors at any point when working to assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors. The findings from this dissertation found that men were subjected to homophobic language by prison guards and homophobic behavior among law enforcement. Law enforcement should receive additional training and education on male sexual assault, the LGBT community and on best practices when working with gay male sexual assault survivors.

5.3.3 Agency Wide Practices

This study found that gay Latino men were often unaware of what resources were available to them as well as reporting feelings of exclusion and discomfort from existing agencies. Participants primarily cited a lack of inclusion for men and gay men from local agencies. Social service agencies, including rape crisis centers, women’s centers and health clinics should make a veritable effort to include programming targeted to gay Latino men through advertisements, training, prevention efforts, seminars and outreach. Furthermore, agencies should make genuine efforts to have more representation of men of color on social media and explicitly state that they provide services for gay Latino men. It is not sufficient to simply advertise and offer services to gay Latino men. Agencies such as the Gay Men’s Health Crisis (GHMC) and Pittsburgh Action Against Rape (PAAR) have included gay men of color in their advertisements regarding sexual
assault and sexual health. It is incumbent upon social service providers to be well-equipped to work with and provide services to gay Latino men. This can be accomplished by receiving training from outside agencies, educating themselves on sexual assault against men as well as being knowledgeable on issues specific towards LGBT Latinx communities. Agencies should also locate books and referral information on male sexual assault for survivors who may wish to receive more information on their legal rights or about sexual assault. Many survivors have a difficult time processing that they had been sexually assaulted. Books providing information to sexual assault survivors would be especially helpful to male sexual assault survivors, to gain more information on other survivors’ experiences and resources. Agencies are able to provide support to gay Latino sexual assault survivors but only if they are intentional and strategic in doing so.

Findings from this dissertation revealed that gay Latino men were subjected to homophobic slurs and homophobic references when they reported having been sexually assaulted. Men also revealed that they were subject to racism that manifested itself in physical assaults and a lack of attention toward them by authorities. These findings further demonstrate a need for agencies to use appropriate terminology towards the LGBT Latinx community and better the reporting process for gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

The findings from this study also revealed that men were often victim-blamed during the reporting process, both for being a man and for being a gay man. It is therefore imperative that agencies receive general education on sexual assault, including the sexual assault of men. Sexual assault of men and the barriers to reporting sexual assault for male sexual assault survivors, can be notably different than that of women (Davies, 2002; Davies et al., 2012; Davies et al., 2006; Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; Javaid, 2016; McLean, 2013; Pino & Meier, 1999). It would behoove agencies to learn more about the sexual assault of men, which may help to dispel myths about
sexual assault of men and help them in better assisting male sexual assault survivors. Such education may enhance the reporting process for gay male sexual assault survivors.

5.3.4 Medical Care Practices

Results from this study clearly demonstrate a need for culturally congruent, trauma-informed and evidence-based medical health care to be provided to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. A myriad of challenges was encountered by the gay Latino men who attempted to receive care from medical providers, who often failed to provide effective, if any, medical care to them. Findings specifically revealed that gay Latino men often requested STD/STI screenings to medical care providers, as they were worried of having contracted STDs/STIs from being sexually assaulted. These requests were also found to have been denied. Based on these findings, there is clear need for medical care providers to provide effective medical care to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Medical practitioners should provide requested STD/STI screenings to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Medical care providers should not deny any provision of medical care to them.

Additionally, medical practitioners should provide all medical care deemed necessary resulting from being sexually assaulted. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners should be provided to gay Latino sexual assault survivors, if the hospital and/or clinic participates in a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program. None of the survivors who reported being sexually assaulted were provided with a SANE nurse. Participants who reported being sexually assaulted were not provided with a sexual assault medical advocate to assist them in the reporting process. A medical advocate is an individual, often from a rape crisis center, who can provide resources and emotional
support to a survivor in the hospital, following the sexual assault. As the findings revealed that men were denied medical care and were not provided with resources in the hospital, a medical advocate would be essential towards assisting survivors in medical settings. These findings highlight a need for SANE nurses and sexual assault medical advocates to be provided to gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

Sexual assault survivor medical advocates should also be offered to gay Latino sexual assault survivors, even if not requested by the survivor. The survivor should be able to choose whether they wish to have a medical sexual assault survivor with them during the reporting process. The study revealed that some men were not aware of what services were available to them within and outside the medical setting. Medical practitioners should offer all services available to sexual assault survivors and inform gay Latino sexual assault survivors of the services offered at the medical center for sexual assault survivors.

This study found that one survivor was repeatedly discouraged by medical staff to reporting the sexual assault to law enforcement. Medical practitioners should not discourage survivors from reporting the sexual assault to other agencies or discourage them from reporting within their own agencies. The findings also indicated that medical staff had limited experience working with gay Latino sexual assault survivors. This may account for a lack of effective skill-sets when engaging with gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Hospital and medical clinic staff should be trained to work in an effective and culturally congruent manner with gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Medical practitioners should have a clear procedure in place to assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors. The findings from this study also revealed the negative consequences resulting from medical practitioners failing to provide effective care and empathy towards gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Conversely, the study revealed the positive and healing effects that culturally
congruent and effective health care treatment by medical practitioners afforded gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Medical practitioners should validate, listen to, empathize with and believe gay Latino sexual assault survivors and take their concerns seriously. Medical staff should provide gay Latino sexual assault survivors with resources in the local community as well as nationwide resources available to them.

5.3.5 Mental Health Clinical Practice

Mental health practitioners and counselors were of substantial importance for gay Latino sexual assault survivors who participated in this study. Some survivors noted that they sought therapy to cope with their trauma from the sexual assault as well as from the re-traumatization of the reporting process. Some of the survivors who did not report being sexually assaulted, did state that having a therapist could be beneficial for them. Many of the men did state that it would be important for them to find a therapist who understood their concerns as gay Latino men. Based on these findings, it is important for mental health care providers to have knowledge of how to work in an evidence-based, trauma-informed and culturally-congruent manner with gay Latino sexual assault survivors. In accordance with the NASW Code of Ethics, therapists who do not possess the skill-set to work with gay Latino sexual assault survivors, should refer them to another mental health care provider.

Many participants spoke to the numerous adverse mental health effects that the sexual assault had on them, as well as how it consequently affected their relationships, feeling of intimacy, self-esteem and overall mental health. Although this dissertation did not focus on these outcomes, it was evident that men needed and continue to need trauma-informed, culturally-congruent and
evidence-based mental health care provided to them. Mental health care practitioners should receive additional training to effectively work with gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Mental health counselors should always validate, believe and support gay Latino sexual assault survivors during therapy. Mental health counselors should be trained in trauma-informed and evidence-based clinical mental health interventions when providing therapy to gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Counselors and therapists should also tailor their clinical interventions to be salient to the needs of gay Latino sexual assault survivors. Lastly, mental health providers should always support gay Latino sexual assault survivors in their ultimate decision of deciding whether to report to authorities. Mental health providers should always work to support and validate gay Latino sexual assault survivors.

Additional clinical trainings on how to effectively work with male and gay men of color sexual assault survivors should be provided to mental health care providers. Black men from the study also spoke about how they had to contend with being believed as a Black male sexual assault survivor. Therefore, training for mental health care providers should cover training on working with gay men of color. Trainings should be offered on how to provide effective clinical interventions to gay male sexual assault survivors of color. Trainings should also focus on issues particularly salient to gay male sexual assault survivors of color. This is relevant for social workers and other mental health practitioners who are working in medical care facilities who may be assigned to work with or assist a gay Latino sexual assault survivor who is deciding whether to report to a reporting authority or inquire about their options. Such training is also of particular importance for mental health care practitioners who are working with gay Latino sexual assault survivors who may be deciding on whether or not to report to authorities or may be going through
the sexual assault reporting process. It is imperative for mental health care practitioners to have the skill-sets to best assist gay Latino sexual assault survivors in clinical practice.

5.4 Limitations

There are a few limitations of this research study. As with some qualitative studies examining marginalized populations, the sample size was limited. This study consisted of fourteen individuals. While qualitative studies seek theoretical saturation, I was not able to determine that saturation was achieved. However, Guest, Bunce and Johnson (2006) contend that twelve interviews meet theoretical saturation. The study consisted of fourteen one-on-one in-depth semi-structured interviews regarding the lived experiences of gay Latino sexual assault survivors. While there was a small sample size, the goal of the study was not to be generalizable but to gain information about a phenomenon that has not yet been explored.

Many potential participants had expressed initial interest in the study but later decided not to participate. Some of these men stated that they were hesitant to speak about the topic, and others did not respond to follow-up communication about participating. It is evident that there are gay Latino sexual assault survivors who are not yet ready to speak about being sexually assaulted or their process in deciding to report being sexually assaulted or their experiences in reporting being sexually assaulted. Their stories are important but were not able to be included in this dissertation. There are other narratives that have not been captured, which limits the understanding of the experiences of other gay Latino sexual assault survivors.
Sampling bias is another limitation of this study. Convenience sampling was utilized for this study, as opposed to random sampling. As such, men were recruited from LGBT themed newspapers, personal contacts and LGBT themed geosocial networking apps. The men in this study were men who were most likely involved within the gay community. Most of the men were sampled from Grindr, which is a social networking app for gay men. It is likely that most of the men would be single who use this app. Therefore, there is an over-sampling bias due to the convenience sampling methodology.

Researcher bias is another potential limitation of this study, due to the qualitative nature of this dissertation. The researcher’s positionality and life experiences as a gay Latino male does potentiality influence the way that the researcher interpreted and understood the data. While it is impossible to eliminate all bias, the researcher employed various methods to be aware of the bias brought into the dissertation. Specifically, the researcher kept memorandums, reflecting upon the interviews and the researcher’s own thoughts and opinions from the interviews. Additionally, the researcher consulted with members of his dissertation committee, most often with Dr. García to discuss potential bias and personal feelings regarding the subject and the stories from the men.

Triangulation is another limitation of the study. Various data collection methods were not utilized for this dissertation. Data collection consisted primarily of interviews and a demographic sheet was completed by participants. Future research on the sexual assault reporting process among gay Latino men could employ various data collection methods. This is a consideration for future research in this area.
6.0 Conclusion

This dissertation furthers scholarship on the sexual assault reporting practices among gay men. This dissertation sought to identify barriers and facilitators in the decision-making process and sexual assault reporting process among gay Latino men. Gay Latino sexual assault survivors encounter a litany of challenges throughout the entirety of the decision-making and sexual assault reporting process. Much of their struggles can be attributed to racism and homophobia, which are manifested in various ways by perceived and actual reactions by reporting authorities. Their multiple marginalized identities add layers of concern for these men. Gay Latino sexual assault survivors often struggle with how their race, ethnicity, masculinity, and sexual orientation will be perceived by reporting authorities and also how they affect their experiences during the reporting process. Unfortunately, many of the perceived barriers identified by gay Latino men were actual barriers that were experienced among men who reported being sexually assaulted. Institutions of higher education, law enforcement agencies, medical care providers and mental health practitioners can all contribute in helping to assist and enhance the well-being for gay Latino sexual assault survivors. While gay Latino sexual assault survivors have experienced a significant amount of pain and difficulty, there are numerous opportunities to provide assistance and healing to them. These men were not hopeless; they were strong, courageous, and hopeful. We cannot ignore them. We must actively work to conduct further research in this area and develop and implement effective and strategic interventions and programming to enhance their well-being. We must work to help them achieve the justice they are far too often denied. Que sigamos.
# Tables

## Table 1 Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chad</th>
<th>Yuriel</th>
<th>Julio</th>
<th>Malcolm</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>Black/Mixed</td>
<td>Mestizo</td>
<td>Mestizo</td>
<td>Mestizo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality/ies</strong></td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Chicano/Tejano</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosed to Others</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Injuries</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sought Medical Care</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Boyfriend</td>
<td>Boyfriend</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Range</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$30-40,000</td>
<td>$45-55,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>Pursuing undergraduate</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Mestizo</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality/ies</strong></td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino/Chinese</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosed</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Injuries</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sought Medical Care</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>English/ Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Spanish/English/ Chinese</td>
<td>English/ Spanish/ Hebrew</td>
<td>Spanish/ English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Range</strong></td>
<td>$62-63,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$50-75,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jevon</th>
<th>Adam</th>
<th>Ricardo</th>
<th>Deon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>Black/Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black/Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality/ies</strong></td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Salvadorian</td>
<td>Mexican/Portuguese</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosed To Others</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Injuries</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sought Medical Care</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English/ Spanish</td>
<td>English/ Spanish/ Portuguese/ French</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td>Boyfriend</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Range</strong></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>11th grade</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>2 years College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Coding Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript (Verbatim)</th>
<th>Type of Coding</th>
<th>Coded As</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...another factor that I considered was that we were, we were both men, we were both guys, so, like, how is that going to be perceived. (1) how am I going to report this to a cop, let's say, to a straight cop, and you know, what is their reaction going to be initially with this, with this being an instance, an instance of two men, of Gay men, how are they gonna to me being gay versus how they are going to react handling the case itself.&quot;(1, 2)</td>
<td>1) Descriptive (open, first cycle coding)</td>
<td>1) Being A Gay Man, Reasons for not reporting authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Versus Coding (first cycle coding)</td>
<td>2) Gay versus straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION I: IDENTITY QUESTIONS

I really want to thank you for taking time to talk with me today. I want this interview to be as comfortable as possible for you – so if at any point you would like to take a break for any reason, please let me know. I understand that some parts may be emotional for you, so if you wish to excuse yourself, not answer a certain question or parts during an interview, continue another day or even wish to not continue, please let me know. As we discussed, you are absolutely under no obligation to answer anything you don’t want to. It is completely your choice on what you want to do and you know what is best for you. Any questions?

Sigamos. So, just to start, I want to get to know a little bit about you at first, simple questions.

Now, I’d like to get to know a little about your identity and how it affects your life. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Tell me about your racial/ethnic background. Tell me in your own words what this means to you.

2. How does being a gay Latino man affect your perspective on life? What does having this identify mean to you?

3. Tell me about your own culture (family culture, country’s culture). How does your culture influence your life as a gay man? As a Latino? What does belonging to your culture mean to you and others?
Thank you for sharing all of that with me. If you need or want a break, please let me now.

Now, I’m going to ask you a bit about how you think about this process now, reflecting back. Please know there are not judgements at all on you.

SECTION II: INTENTIONS TO REPORT

Now we are going to talk about more serious subjects- about your decision-making process in deciding whether or not to report being sexually assaulted. I know this may be difficult at times and is a highly personal and sensitive matter. At any time, you can refuse to answer, excuse yourself, take a break or do whatever you feel you need to do, if any of the questions become overwhelming for you. I have absolutely no judgements on anything, and I want to assure you that I am supportive of you and please know that you know that this is safe space for you. Again, take your time in answering and know that you can answer whatever you want.

4. What factors did you consider/weigh when making this decision to report being sexually assaulted?

5. Which factor affected you the most? Why?

I realize these questions may be difficult to answer. Again, please take your time and you can take a break at any time you need or end a set of questions or the whole interview.

SECTION III: PROCESS OF NOT DECIDING TO REPORT

6. Walk me through the process of deciding not to report from beginning to end the best you can.

7. What did you consider to be the befits to reporting? What did you consider to the challenges or barriers to reporting being sexually assaulted?
8. What ultimately let you to determine to not report being sexually assaulted? Did anyone help you arrive at this decision?

9. What reporting authority or authorities did you consider reporting to? (police, campus police, campus security, office of student affairs/conduct, employers, women’s center, Title IX office).

10. Were any reporting authorities more easily accessible than others? Did the responsiveness by certain departments affect your decision-making process to report? If so, how?

11. Who did you first disclose being sexually assaulted to? Why?

12. Did your culture play a role in your decision to not report being sexually assaulted? If so, how?

SECTION IV: OTHER DISCLOSURE – NON OFFICIAL REPORTING

13. Did you report any medical personnel? If so, what was that like?

14. How long did you wait to first disclose you were sexually assaulted to someone?

15. What was the total time of the process?

16. Are there any supports you need now?

17. What referrals did they provide you with?

18. Did anyone help you arrive at the decision to report being sexually assaulted?

19. Have you disclosed to anyone since that time?

20. Who was the first person you disclosed the sexual assault to? How longer after?

21. What factors led you to disclose to someone?

22. What as that experiences like to disclose to someone?
SECTION V: REFLECTION QUESTIONS

23. Now, looking back, how do you feel about the decision to not report the sexual assault? Why?

24. What supports did you find helpful during your decision-making process? Not helpful?

25. Did the people you disclosed to personally affect your ultimate decision-making process on whether or not to report to legal or reporting authorities?

26. What was the most painful part of the decision to not report being sexually assaulted for you? Why?

27. What is one thing that you took away from this decision-making process?

Now, I’d like to get to know our thoughts on how the reporting process could be improved and make it better for other men like you. Your input and opinion is very important, as I know you would know best on how to improve the process for other men.

SECTION VI: RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

28. What advice would you give to gay Latino men who are considering being sexually assaulted?

29. What would need to be different for you to report being sexually assaulted to reporting authorities?

30. What would make the reporting process easier for other gay Latino men? Why?

31. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for reporting authorities who are
working with gay Latino men?

32. What is one thing that you would like reporting authorities or people in general to know about gay Latino men who have been sexually assaulted?

33. What supports or services would have been helpful for you to have during the entire process?

34. What supports or services do you need now that would be helpful to you?

35. Is there anything else you feel is relevant, that you would like to share?

36. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Muchimas gracias. Thank you so much for taking your time to speak with me.
Appendix B Interview Guide: Men Who Did Report Being Sexually Assaulted

SECTION I: IDENTITY QUESTIONS

I really want to thank you for taking time to talk with me today. I want this interview to be as comfortable as possible for you – so if at any point you would like to take a break for any reason, please let me know. I understand that some parts may be emotional for you, so if you wish to excuse yourself, not answer a certain question or parts during an interview, continue another day or even wish to not continue, please let me know. As we discussed, you are absolutely under no obligation to answer anything you don’t want to. It is completely your choice on what you want to do and you know what is best for you. Any questions?

Sigamos. So, just to start, I want to get to know a little bit about you at first, simple questions. I’d like to start with knowing about you.

1. Tell me about your racial/ethnic background. Tell me in your own words what this means to you.

2. How does being a gay Latino man affect your perspective on life? What does having this identify mean to you?

3. Tell me about your own culture (family culture, country’s culture). How does your culture influence your life as a gay man? As a Latino? What does belonging to your culture mean to you and others?

SECTION II: INTENTIONS TO REPORT

Now we are going to talk about more serious subjects- about your decision-making process
in deciding whether to report being sexually assaulted. I know this may be difficult at times and is a highly personal and sensitive matter. At any time, you can refuse to answer, excuse yourself, take a break or do whatever you feel you need to do, if any of the questions become overwhelming for you. I have absolutely no judgements on anything, and I want to assure you that I am supportive of you and please know that you know that this is safe space for you. Again, take your time in answering and know that you can answer whatever you want.

4. What factors did you consider/weigh when making this decision to report being sexually assaulted?

5. Which factor affected you the most? Why?

I realize these questions may be difficult to answer. Again, please take your time and you can take a break at any time you need or end a set of questions or the whole interview.

SECTION III: PROCESS OF DECIDING TO REPORT

6. Walk me through the process of deciding to report from beginning to end the best you can.

7. What did you consider to be the befits to reporting? What did you consider to the challenges or barriers to reporting being sexually assaulted?

8. What ultimately let you to determine to report being sexually assaulted? Did anyone help you arrive at this decision?

9. What reporting authority or authorities did you consider reporting to? (police, campus police, campus security, office of student affairs/conduct, employers, women’s center, Title IX office).
If you are comfortable, I’d now like to ask you about your experience in reporting being sexually assaulted. I fully realize that some parts may be painful or difficult to talk about, and please let me know if you need to take a break or if you need to end the interview at any point. Take as much time as you need.

SECTION IV: REPORTING SEXUAL ASSAULT

10. Please walk me through the process of you reporting being sexually assaulted to a reporting authority or authorities from beginning to end.

11. Were any reporting authorities more easily accessible than others? Did the responsiveness by certain departments affect who you reported to? If so, how?

12. Who did you first disclose being sexually assaulted to in general? Why?

13. What authorities did you report being sexually assaulted to? Were some authorities more difficult to report to than others? Were some authorities easier to report to than others?

14. What was the most difficult part of reporting being sexually assaulted?

15. What was the easiest part to report being sexually assaulted?

16. Was the reporting process made clear to you by authorities? How was it or how wasn’t it? Did they help you with this process? If so how? If not, how not?

17. To what extent do you believe your ethnicity or race had anything to do with how reporting being sexually assaulted? To what extent do you think it influenced how they handled your report? On how they reacted to you?

18. Did your culture play a role in your decision to not report being sexually assaulted? If so, how?
19. To what extent do you believe your sexual orientation had anything to do with how your reporting being sexually assaulted was handled? To what extent do you think influenced how they investigated your report of sexual assault? Or how they reacted to you?

20. How do you feel you were treated by reporting authorities?

21. Do you feel they believed you? Why or why not? Do you feel they took your complaint seriously?

22. What factors do you think influenced how they responded to you?

23. Do you believe any of the reporting authorities had any biases towards you? Why or why not?

24. What if anything, went well during the sexual assault reporting process?

25. Do you think any part of your identity worked in your favor? Why or why not?

26. Was there any part of the process that made you feel safe? If so, what was it?

27. Who did you first disclose to, outside of a reporting authority? In a non-official capacity?

28. What was it like to disclose to someone that you were sexually assaulted? What worked well?

29. Were there any negative physical or health consequences to you being sexually assaulted?

SECTION V: OTHER DISLCOSURE – NON OFFICIAL REPORTING

30. Did you report any medical personnel? If so, what was that like?

31. How long did you wait to first disclose you were sexually assaulted to someone?
32. What was the total time of the process?
33. Are there any supports you need now?
34. What referrals did they provide you with?
35. Did anyone help you arrive at the decision to report being sexually assaulted?
36. Have you disclosed to anyone since that time?
37. Who was the first person you disclosed the sexual assault to? How long after?
38. What factors led you to disclose to someone?
39. What was that experience like to disclose to someone?

Thank you for sharing all of that with me. If you need or want a break, please let me know.

Now, I’m going to ask you a bit about how you think about this process now, reflecting back. Please know there are not judgements at all on you.

SECTION VI: REFLECTION QUESTIONS

40. Now, looking back, how do you feel about the decision to report the sexual assault? Why?
41. What supports did you find helpful during your decision-making process? Not helpful?
42. Did the people you disclosed to personally affect your ultimate decision-making process on whether or not to report to legal or reporting authorities?
43. What was the most painful part of the decision to report being sexually assaulted for you? Why?
44. What was the most liberating part about your decision to report being sexually
assaulted for you? Why?

45. What is one thing that you took away from this decision-making process?

Now, I’d like to get to know our thoughts on how the reporting process could be improved and make it better for other men like you. Your input and opinion are very important, as I know you would know best on how to improve the process for other men.

SECTION VII: RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

46. What advice would you give to gay Latino men who are considering being sexually assaulted?

47. What would make the reporting process easier for other gay Latino men? Why?

48. What do you think worked well, that should be repeated or available for gay Latino men who have been sexually assaulted?

49. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for reporting authorities who are working with gay Latino men?

50. What is one thing that you would like reporting authorities or people in general to know about gay Latino men who have been sexually assaulted?

51. What supports or services would have been helpful for you to have during the entire process?

52. What supports or services do you need now that would be helpful to you?

53. What title would you give to your story?

54. Is there anything else you feel is relevant, that you would like to share?

Muchimas gracias. Thank you so much for taking your time to speak with me.
Appendix C Demographic Questionnaire

1) **How old are you?**
2) **What is your gender?**
3) **What is your sexual orientation?**
4) **What is your ethnicity? (Choose all that apply)**
   - Latino
   - Hispanic
   - Non-Latino/Hispanic

5) **How do you identify your race? (please select all that apply)**
   - Black
   - White
   - Asian
   - Mixed
   - Mestizo
   - Indigenous
   - Mayan
   - Incan
   - Aztec
   - Toltec
   - Zapotec
   - Other (please write in)

6) **In what country were you born?**
   (write in)
7) Which country or countries did you grow up in?
8) Are you adopted?
9) What race/ethnicity are your parents?
10) If you were not born in the United States, what year did you arrive in the United States?
11) What country do you identify with?
12) Which language(s) do you speak fluently?
   - English
   - Portuguese
   - Spanish
   - Other

13) Which languages are you comfortable speaking in?
   - English
   - Spanish
   - Portuguese
   - Other

14) What is your primary language?
   - English
   - Portuguese
   - Spanish
   - Other

15) What is your secondary language? (if applicable)
   - English
   - Portuguese
   - Spanish
   - Other
16) What is your highest level of education?
17) What is your income range?
18) Are you currently employed?
19) What sector of employment do you work in?
20) What is your relationship status?
21) Who do you live with?
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