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Abstract

This thesis assesses the nature and extent of anti-lesbian/gay violence, using the results of a 1994 survey of 420 lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in Greater Vancouver. It explores the relationship between personal attributes and lifestyle practices and likelihood of victimization. As well, it examines why the majority of homophobic incidents are not reported to authorities, as well as the relationship between level of “outness” about one’s sexual orientation and the likelihood of reporting incidents.

The thesis uses symbolic interactionist theory (particularly the writings of Goffman, Becker and Wilson) to argue that normative constructs marginalizing individuals as deviants, outsiders, or inferior persons are directly implicated in violence against the stigmatized. In the context of anti-gay/lesbian violence, it is argued that pervasive societal heterosexism and homophobia act to reinforce a cultural climate in which lesbians, gay men and bisexuals remain marginalized, victimized and unwilling or unable to report anti-lesbian/gay violence to authorities.

The survey was distributed in a variety of ways using the purposive method. It was placed in both gay and non-gay establishments in the two gay/lesbian neighborhoods in Vancouver; was printed in the July issue of a local monthly gay/lesbian newspaper; and was inserted into 1,500 copies of a weekly non-gay/lesbian paper in Vancouver’s West End. The survey data reveal that the vast majority of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in Greater Vancouver have faced some form of discrimination or harassment or have been bashed due to their sexual orientation. The data suggest that, of sampled respondents, the most frequent victims of homophobic violence are those individuals who are most out, who are most active in and integrated into lesbian and gay communities, who live in lesbian or gay neighborhoods (males only), or who most conform to popular stereotypes of what lesbians and gay men should look, act, or be like. The results reveal important differences between males and females in determining the nature of victimization. The sample data also indicate that most anti-lesbian/gay violence in Vancouver is never reported to authorities. However, the sample data suggest that if a report is made, it is more likely to be made by those who are out than those who are not.

The thesis represents the largest and most comprehensive examination of homophobic violence in Canada to date. The results have important social policy implications including: the need for increased public education concerning both homosexuality and the extent of anti-gay/lesbian violence; the importance of legislation at all levels of government that guarantees equality rights for lesbians and gay men; and the need for a more pro-active approach by police in order to diminish the extent of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Greater Vancouver.
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Chapter 1. Introduction, Theory & Literature Review

A. Introduction

The work of lesbian and gay activists since the 1960s has challenged negative attitudes concerning homosexuality and the legal codes that have marginalized and discriminated against lesbian/gay persons, relationships and families. Since the decriminalization of homosexuality in Canada in 1969, we have seen (among other things): openly gay lesbian individuals elected to public office at all levels of government; the inclusion of sexual orientation into the human rights codes of both territories and eight of the ten provinces; the extension of same-sex spousal benefits to many individuals employed in the public, private, and non-profit sectors; as well as the lifting of the ban on “out” gay men and lesbians in the military. One of the most important milestones in the struggle for gay/lesbian equality in Canada came in June 1995, when the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that sexual orientation cannot be used as a grounds for discrimination. However, while there is much to celebrate, there remains cause for concern.

In addition to the myriad remaining discriminatory statutes and a growing anti-gay/lesbian lobby that is organized, well-funded, and vocal, there remains the disturbing problem of a rising tide of anti-gay/lesbian violence in North America. The existing literature and data from this research of 420 lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals in Greater Vancouver, indicate that homophobic violence continues to be a pervasive problem for many lesbian, gay and bisexual persons, manifest in discrimination, threats of victimization, or actual instances of physical assault. These constant reminders of one’s marginal status and precarious safety often give rise to feelings of fear and insecurity, the temptation to pass oneself as “straight” in dangerous situations, and self-deprecating beliefs concerning one’s self-worth and one’s place in society.

The thesis is informed by the theoretical insights of symbolic interactionists, who argue that the formal (legal) construction of homosexuality as “deviant” and “wrong” stigmatize and marginalize lesbian, gay and bisexual persons (and lifestyles). Since (socially constructed) legal
codes influence individual behavior in the course of everyday life, it is argued that they are directly implicated in the on-going victimization of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals. The actual research is guided by nine hypotheses that seek to explore not only the extent of anti-lesbian/gay violence, but also the various contextual, lifestyle and personal attributes that intersect in victimization.

After examining the survey results and the validity of the research hypotheses, the thesis concludes with a list of the thirteen most common recommendations that, according to respondents, will be effective in combating anti-gay/lesbian violence.

B. Theoretical Orientation

The relationship between legal codes, norms and values and the ways in which these are internalized, interpreted or otherwise acted upon by individuals in everyday life adduce two important issues in sociological theory: first, how society is constituted and maintained; and second, the socially constructed nature of dominant social codes, values and beliefs. The former issue (i.e., what constitutes society) forms the core of the macro-micro debate between those who argue that social life is (largely) determined by large-scale structures, institutions and processes, and those who posit the primacy of individual action and interaction in everyday life. The latter issue (i.e., the socially constructed nature of dominant social codes and values), represents a radical response to the structural-functionalist view that dominant social codes and values are necessary, important, and legitimate simply because they exist.

While it is beyond the scope of this research to re-state or to contribute to either the macro-micro debate or the social constructivist argument, this thesis is predicated on the assumption that both macro and micro phenomena are important determinants in the constitution of social life and interpersonal relations, and that dominant social codes are social constructions that privilege some individuals, groups and lifestyles at the expense of others. For example, while dominant social norms and values are implicated in on-going homophobic victimization, individual and collective action in everyday life serves to challenge and (sometimes) reconstitute norms, values and legal
codes that denigrate homosexuality and deny the legitimacy of gay/lesbian lifestyles. Since the concern with understanding how socially constructed values and beliefs impact upon individuals in everyday life is central to the symbolic interactionist perspective in sociology, we turn to three symbolic interactionists who make important contributions to our understanding of the relationship between this theoretical issue and anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The perspectives of both Howard Becker (1963) and Erving Goffman (1963) and the more recent feminist work of Susan J. Wilson (1991) challenge structural-functionalist assumptions about "normalcy" and "deviance", explicate the socially constructed nature of social values and beliefs, and contribute to an understanding of the dual character (macro-micro) of social life. More importantly, however, they facilitate an understanding of the ways in which stigmatization, inequality and marginalization perpetuate and legitimate the vicious cycle of domination and subordination that permeates the lives of many lesbians and gay men. We begin with an examination of the relevant insights of Becker and Goffman for this study of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

1. **Becker and Goffman: The Social Construction of Deviance in Everyday Life**

All societies use normative rules to create symbolic boundaries between persons and behavior deemed to be normal, good, and acceptable on the one hand, and abnormal, bad, and unacceptable on the other. In classical structural-functionalist sociology, demarcating between normal and deviant was regarded as relatively unproblematic: normal behavior was functional, allowing for the maintenance of social order and stability; deviance represented a threat to social cohesion and thus was dysfunctional, something to be both avoided and eradicated. Becker and Goffman challenged these functionalist assumptions by arguing that while all societies create normative codes concerned with the correctness or appropriateness of social behavior, these distinctions are social constructions only. In other words, social boundaries demarcating
“normal” from “abnormal” are not fixed and universal, but rather are culturally and temporally specific, and variously observed or ignored in interpersonal interaction.

Becker (1963: 9-14) argues that “social groups create deviance by making rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. [D]eviance is not a quality that lies in the behavior itself, but in the interaction between the person who commits the act and those who respond to it”. In other words, a particular behavior becomes “deviant” if the parties to the behavior judge (or label) it so from one micro context to the next. Recognizing that “deviance” exists at the micro level of social interaction allows for a better understanding of both the slippery, contextual nature of deviance (and how behavior deemed to be deviant varies from one micro context to the next), and also of the ways in which normative standards are maintained and enforced.

Becker identifies another important and often dangerous phenomenon at work in the construction of deviance, namely “master and subordinate statuses”. Becker (1963: 33) notes how an individual’s deviant status—what he calls the “master status”—overrides and subordinates her or his other statuses, qualities and attributes. Since the persons’ deviant identity “becomes the controlling one”, she or he is “denied the ordinary means of carrying on the routines of everyday life open to most people” (Becker, 1963: 35). Becker (1963: 34) notes that while one’s sexual orientation rarely impedes one from doing one’s work, making oneself known as a “homosexual” at work may make it difficult or even impossible to continue working there. In this example, we see how an individuals’ status as a “homosexual” becomes more important than his or her other characteristics such as efficient office worker, trusted colleague or friend, tennis partner, or member of the Rotary Club. The latter “neutral” or “positive” statuses become subordinated to and perhaps irrelevant in relation to his or her overriding and negative “master status” as a “homosexual”. Since deviants are not “proper” or “normal” people, their negative status serves to legitimate violence against them. In other words, dominant social values that marginalize lesbians and gay persons, relationships and cultures, ensure that lesbians and gay men become
(legitimate) targets for victimization. Hence dominant values that discriminate against lesbians and gay experience are directly implicated in anti-lesbian/gay violence. While Becker recognizes that deviance is a social construction that is arbitrarily applied to some individuals and not others, and that it is negotiated in social interaction, it is Goffman who highlights the problematic and dangerous aspects of social deviance and stigmatization.

Goffman’s analysis is focused on the way that stigmatization can subvert the processes of routine social interaction and re-define “everyday” social situations. Maintaining that the possession of a stigma creates dangerous situations for those who possess them, Goffman (1963: 9) notes how the individual who is “disqualified from full social acceptance” is often faced with a “proneness to victimization”. In addition, he differentiates between “discredited” and “discreditable” identities. A discredited identity belongs to those individuals who cannot hide their particular stigma statuses, while a discreditable identity characterizes individuals who know they possess a stigma but manage to keep it concealed. This typification accords with the daily lives of most lesbians and gay men who often wrestle with the difficulties of “information control” concerning public disclosure of their sexual orientation. Goffman’s understanding of how the person with the discreditable identity is faced with the decision “to display or not to display; to tell or not to tell; to let on or not to let on; to lie or not to lie; and in each case, to whom, how, when, and where” has a familiar and haunting ring for most lesbians and gay men. Goffman (1963: 100) notes how disclosure of this information often has an unsettling effect on the individual by instantaneously and “radically transforming his situation from that of an individual with information to manage, to that of an individual with uneasy social situations to manage”. The extent to which situations involving the disclosure of stigma identities become uneasy, dangerous, or relatively unproblematic, usually depends on the response of the “normal”. Anti-gay/lesbian violence perpetrated by non-gay persons (including the homosexually repressed) often centers on a particular individual or group of individuals’ reaction to outright displays (disclosure) of (already stigmatized) lesbian/gay identities in specific social contexts.
Like Becker, Goffman (1963: 91) argues that the more the stigmatized person keeps her or his stigma a secret from "normals", the more she or he is forced to demarcate her or his world into two relatively distinct categories: those who are ignorant of her or his "real" identity, and those who are not. Goffman argues that the stigmatized inevitably rely on the latter for emotional and social support. He adds that the stigmatized person "co-opts for his masquerade just those individuals who would constitute the greatest danger" to her/his personal health, security, and safety upon discovering her/his stigma (Goffman, 1963: 95). Managing one's physical and mental security often becomes a matter of "passing" oneself off as socially "acceptable" whenever the situation warrants. As long as homosexuality carries a negative social stigma, anti-gay/lesbian violence will continue to be an omnipresent, micro-level danger for those who refuse to pass and who choose to be "out" about their sexual orientation at home, work, school, or elsewhere in public.

If disclosure of stigmatized identities is so potentially dangerous, why take the risk? Acts of disclosure serve several important psychological and sociological purposes despite the inherent difficulty, insecurity and proneness to victimization that often accompany them (Goffman, 1963: 101). First, as Goffman (1963: 113) maintains, "the nature of an individual is generated by the nature of his group affiliations". Accepting this and "unlearning concealment" becomes "a state of grace" or "the final, mature, well-adjusted phase to one's moral career". Lesbians and gay men often remark on the psychological importance of "coming out" and "being true" to yourself and others (indeed this is what "gay pride" is all about). Second, coming out is an inherently political act. Revealing oneself as gay or lesbian to heterosexual family, friends and colleagues in everyday life often serves to break down stereotypes and prejudices, (perhaps) furthering the cause of social acceptance and understanding in heterosexual society. This emphasizes that micro-oriented action can affect macro-level values, beliefs and codes.

Becker and Goffman's recognition of the interpersonal, socially constructed, temporal, and negotiated nature of deviance and stigmatization represents a substantial sociological improvement over the static structural-functionalist approach. Moreover their study of deviance
and the power of stigmatized identities provides a basis for examining how forms of identity status act as powerful forms of objectification and (often) victimization, as well as an understanding of how the issues of identity, context and “information control” (i.e., passing, disclosure, concealment) intersect with victimization in instances of anti-gay/lesbian violence. However, Becker and Goffman’s emphasis on the micro level minimizes the relationship between social structural phenomenon, on the one hand, and (inter) personal beliefs, values and practices on the other. Beyond a recognition of the socially constructed nature of deviance and stigma at the micro level, their analyses fail to explain how, for example, these beliefs are sustained and legitimated by structural institutions and forces. In sacrificing the structural in favor of the interpersonal, Becker and Goffman’s analyses tend to be limited to a discussion of the effects of deviance and stigmatization. This comes at the expense of a fuller understanding of how structural phenomena such as legal and political codes work to maintain both inequality based on sexual orientation and the dominance and subordination of lesbians and gay men in everyday social situations. In order to more fully understand the interdependent relationship between structure and agency in this context, we turn to the feminist perspective of Wilson.


Wilson’s discussion of “social control” and “normative constraints” represents a more elaborate and contemporary discussion of phenomena that Becker, and especially Goffman, address in their analyses of deviance and stigma. Wilson underscores the socially constructed nature of norms and values related to gender (and masculinity and femininity), while providing a more thorough illustration of the ways in which macro institutional structures and forces serve to generate, maintain, and, ultimately, reinforce social norms and cultural definitions that shape behavior at the level of social interaction.
Relying on Berger’s (1963) conceptualization of “circles of control”¹ and Fox’s (1977) discussion of “normative restrictions”², Wilson (1991: 126) addresses the complex and multifaceted ways in which women are controlled by macro forces (e.g., legal, political and economic structures) that give rise to, and intersect with, social norms and cultural definitions. These macro forces “have a powerful, if subtle, influence on behaviour” at the level of social interaction. And while this influence is often coercive and disabling, it may also serve as a point of reference and basis for activism, thus enabling women (and others) to re-make social structure through individual and collective experience (Wilson, 1991: 134-136). Wilson notes (1991: 126-7) that structural factors restrict women’s access to power and equality at the institutional level of social life, delimiting women’s behavior, experiences, and opportunities. However she argues that these alone do not account for the restricted nature of female experience. She (1991: 126) also argues that there are other important “obstacles and barriers” that exist at the interpersonal level of everyday living. Wilson maintains that from the time we are born our socialization through language, custom, and observation, reinforce strict cultural definitions of masculinity and femininity. Her insight rests in the understanding that while these rigid gender distinctions are “established at the institutional level”, they are often reinforced through acts of intimidation and force at the level of interaction (Wilson, 1991: 126-7).

While recognizing the power of habit and custom in the socialization process, she (like Goffman) points to the normative power of the media in articulating and perpetuating stereotypes of women and men, masculinity and femininity. Also, like Goffman, she argues that sexist patterns are perpetuated in social interaction. But she also argues (1991: 128) that these patterns

¹ Berger, as Wilson notes (1991: 126), asks us to imagine ourselves positioned at the center of a set of concentric circles. The outer circles represent formal, institutional controls (legal, political, and economic), while the inner circles represent the various forms of control that operate at the level of interaction (persuasion, ridicule, gossip and the like).

² Regarding normative restrictions, Fox argues that while there are few explicit, formal regulations governing “acceptable” masculine and feminine behavior, roles, etc. in North American society, our beliefs, behavior and social experience are nevertheless profoundly shaped by subtle but powerful norms and values (Wilson, 1991: 126-7).
form a continuum from the rather “innocuous” (sexist language), to the more serious and obvious (sexual harassment), to the most menacing and overt (acts of violence). All of these represent forms of social domination, and together they remind women of the ways in which their gender alone makes them likely targets of aggression and violence (Wilson, 1991: 131). In fact, physical violence is the coercive extension of intimidation and fear, and all of these, she argues, represent severe forms of male dominance that both conditions and restricts women’s experience in both public and private space.

It is not difficult to draw parallels between the gendered inequality and the social control of female identity and experience, on the one hand, and the social inequality between homosexuals and heterosexuals, and the social control of lesbian and gay identities and experience, on the other. In terms of sexual orientation, inequality and marginality at both the macro and micro levels cause many lesbians and gay men to experience a painful continuum of social control (from the nuances of homophobic discourse, to threats of harassment and violence, to the pervasiveness of anti-gay/lesbian violence). The force of this social control causes many lesbians and gay men to repress and conceal their sexual orientation, their sexuality, and their identity, since disclosure often means experiencing feelings of guilt, shame and self-loathing, if not actual forms of discrimination, harassment, and violence.

Wilson’s notion of how (institutional and informal) sexism oppresses women in everyday life is summarized by Henley and Freeman (in Wilson, 1991), who argue that domination and subordination are played out on the “battlefield” of social interaction. According to Henley and Freeman, the battlefield is where:

women are constantly reminded what their ‘place’ is and [it is] here that they are put back in their place should they venture out. Thus social interaction serves as the locus of the most common means of social control employed against women. By being continually reminded of their inferior status in their interactions with others, and continually compelled to acknowledge that status in their own patterns of behaviour, women may internalize society’s definition of them as inferior so thoroughly that they are often unaware of what their status is. Inferiority becomes habitual, and the inferior place assumes the familiarity—and eventual desirability—of home. (Henley and Freeman, in Wilson, 1991: 128).
I believe if the term women were replaced by lesbians and gay men, this passage would lose neither its poignancy, its truth, nor its relevance. However, our discussion to this point has emphasized that such marginality and inequality is socially constructed and can be changed by those (women, gay men, racial minorities) who refuse to remain the victims of social control. In fact, as Wilson notes, while marginalization and exclusion continue to victimize most women, they also continue to generate and invigorate the feminist movement. The feminist movement continues to challenge and re-make social norms and values as well as influence the macro structures of Western societies. Similarly, the marginalization of lesbians and gay men continues to inspire the lesbian and gay movement, which in turn continues to challenge and re-make social norms, values and institutional policies and practices.

C. Literature Review

1. Homosexuality and the (De-) Construction of Deviance and Stigma

a) Homosexuality as Sickness: Persecution and Resistance

The victimization of homosexual persons by non-homosexuals, and a general disdain for homosexuality, has a long history in Western societies. Ecclesiastical and secular decrees that sanctioned the burning of homosexuals in the Middle Ages, the prescription and use of the death penalty for acts of sodomy that began in England in the 1530s, and the extermination of thousands of lesbians and gay men in Nazi concentration camps in this century, are but a few of the more extreme examples of the effects of institutionalized anti-gay violence (D’Emilio, 1983; Kelner, 1983; Comstock, 1991). In Canada, as recently as the 1950s and 1960s, homosexuality was seen to constitute legitimate grounds for dismissal from the civil service and R.C.M.P., and “out” lesbians and gay men were barred from military service until 1992. At the same time, homosexual sex was illegal in Canada until 1968, and sodomy remains a criminal offense in 21 U.S. states (Herek, 1989: 949). The effects of this homophobia and heterosexism are perpetuated and
legitimated by numerous institutional structures such as governmental and educational, religious, and judicial-legal systems. Before assessing the institutional basis of homophobia, however, we need to analyze the recent social construction of homosexuality and lesbian/gay identities in North American society.

Herek (1990: 322) has argued that because lesbians and gay men today are defined in terms of a deviant and stigmatized “socioerotic identity”, they are often prone to a variety of forms of legal and extra-legal “punishment”. However troubling this may be, D’Emilio reminds us that the situation was much worse in the 1950s and 1960s. Then it would have been inconceivable to consider the victimization of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals to be somehow ‘wrong’ or ‘unjust’. D’Emilio (1983: 9) notes that it was not long ago that violence against lesbians and gay men was considered to be “an appropriate response to behavior that offended common decency, violated accepted norms and threatened the welfare of society”. D’Emilio illustrates that before the late 1960s homosexuality was considered to be something that was morally, psychologically and legally wrong, and was in no sense seen to constitute minority group status (D’Emilio, 1983: 9; see also Reinig, 1990: 885). Berrill and Herek (1992: 2) argue that given the prevailing social mores and legal sanctions toward homosexuality in the 1950s and 1960s, when visible forms of homosexuality were met with physical violence, it is little wonder the vast majority of lesbians and gay men “opted for invisibility as a way to avoid stigma and violence”. By referencing how a 1954 Miami newspaper responded to the murder of a gay man with the “demand that homosexuals be punished for tempting ‘normals’ to commit such deeds”, Berrill and Herek (1992: 2) also capture the anti-gay sentiment of 1950s America. By most accounts, the view of homosexuality as a form of individual mental deprivation, pathology, and social deviance remained largely unchallenged until the summer of 1969. This is when gay men and lesbians, spurred by the civil rights and feminist movements of the time, began to challenge their stigmatized identity (Kopkind, 1993: 602).

The late 1960s were marked by tremendous social upheaval. In the United States, the African-American civil rights movement, the emerging feminist movement, and the “counter-
cultural” and anti-Vietnam war movements represented a serious challenge to the status quo. It is not surprising that the contemporary gay/lesbian liberation movement also emerged at this time. In fact, the date of June 27, 1969 is considered the important turning point in the movement toward gay and lesbian tolerance and equality. On this night, a routine police raid on a gay bar at the Stonewall Inn in New York City was resisted by the patrons and unleashed a riot that spilled out into the streets. The rioting continued for five nights.

The Stonewall event, more than any other, is seen to have initiated the contemporary gay and lesbian civil rights movement in North America and the rest of the Western world. Cruikshank (1992: 3) remarks that Stonewall “unleashed a fury of those no longer willing to be victims” and marked a critical watershed when “homosexuals became gay, when they rejected the notion that they were sick or sinful ... and banded together ... created a subculture and came out in large numbers”. The events at Stonewall, and a similar fury in Canada following the raid of a Toronto gay club in 1981, signaled the birth of a new civil rights movement for a group of people who were tired of persecution, second-class citizenship, and a social life largely confined to “isolated nightspots, private social gatherings and unhappy homes” (Comstock, 1991: 25). Also, the late 1960s marked a watershed in academic discourse on homosexuality. The introduction of a new term, homophobia, turned the traditionally received, psychologically based, and pathological view of homosexuality on its head.

b) Re-considering Homosexuality: Homophobia and Heterosexism

Prior to 1967, academic writing on homosexuality both mirrored and legitimated popular, negative beliefs about the “sin” of homosexuality, the “sickness” of homosexuals, and the “unhealthiness” of the homosexual lifestyle. For example, in Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study of Male Homosexuals, Irving Bieber argues that homosexuality is caused by irrational fears of the opposite sex, and a deep fear of disease or injury to the genitals. He also contends that the depravity of the homosexual lifestyle is due to the “disturbing psychopathology of its members”
(Bieber, in Alinder, 1972: 142). However George Weinberg took a different perspective, arguing that the pervasive denigration of homosexuals (by both heterosexuals and homosexuals alike), represented social rather than personal pathology. In *Society and the Healthy Homosexual*, Weinberg argued that the problem with homosexuality rests not in the "condition" itself, but rather in the ways in which our society constructs it as an illness or problem (a construction in which individuals of all sexual orientations are socialized). In expressing this new sociological conceptualization of the relationship between 'normal' society and the homosexual 'subculture', Weinberg introduced the term homophobia, which he described as:

a pervasive, irrational fear of homosexuality. Homophobia includes the fear heterosexuals have of any homosexual feelings within themselves, any overt mannerisms or actions that would suggest homosexuality and the resulting desire to suppress or stamp out homosexuality. And it also includes the self-hatred and self-denial of homosexuals who know what they are but have been taught all their lives by a heterosexual society that people like themselves are sick, sinful, and criminal (Weinberg, 1972: 5).

Weinberg’s use of the term “irrational” is significant for two reasons. First, it allows for a de-legitimation of mainstream condemnation and fear of homosexuality and lesbians and gay men. Second, it implicates mainstream society for the “violence, deprivation and separation” that he considers to be the consequences of homophobia (Weinberg, 1972: vii).

Despite the importance of Weinberg’s definition of homophobia, it has recently come under both scrutiny and attack in academic writings. Britton (1990: 423), for example, recently re-defined homophobia in simpler terms: the “fear and dislike of lesbians and gay men”. Meanwhile Neisen (1990: 25) argues that the meaning of homophobia has been stretched too far and has lost its conceptual clarity and utility as an academic term. In its place, he proposes the term heterosexism, which he defines as “the continued promotion of a heterosexual lifestyle and simultaneous subordination of gay and lesbian ones”. Neisen argues that heterosexism (rather than homophobia) better points to the societal basis of anti-gay sentiment. Heterosexism is becoming increasingly popular in both academic and non-academic literature on the subject (Herek, 1990).
In this thesis, I retain both terms for two reasons: first, they both continue to appear in the literature; and second, they signify quite different, conceptually significant concerns. While heterosexism refers to the marginalization of lesbian and gay existence and experience in both individual and institutional contexts, homophobia deals more strictly with the ways in which this marginalization becomes manifest in hostility toward lesbian and gay people, their institutions, and their cultures. Heterosexism (in the media, the political sphere, in business, etc.) perpetuates homophobic attitudes and behaviors. These are often premised on stereotypes of lesbians and gay men as (variously): sexually aggressive and predatory (paedophiles); excessively effeminate (in the case of gay men) or overly masculine (in the case of lesbians) and thus seriously transgressing gender norms and roles; or promiscuous and hypersexual and thereby continually transgressing moral standards of "decency" and "proper" social conduct (Nardi, 1991; Harry, 1990; Herek, 1990 and 1984; Britton, 1990; Miles, 1989).

Heterosexism and homophobia, then, are significant precisely because they underline both the constructed basis of normative standards of "normal" versus "deviant" behavior, and the ways in which normative standards act as powerful forces in the objectification and victimization of social minorities and marginalized groups. In addition, recognition of the societal basis of both homophobia and heterosexism helps to challenge conventional attitudes that often seek to "blame the victim" for her or his victimization (e.g., women who wear tight-fitting clothes, and gay men who go out to bars at night are "asking for it").

Societal homophobia and heterosexism represent a significant and dangerous societal pathology that is directly implicated in anti-gay/lesbian victimization. Smith (1994: 43) argues that "homophobia and heterosexism and the real threat of homophobic abuse affect every aspect of the lives of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals". Heterosexism and homophobia are directly implicated in high suicide rates amongst homosexual persons (Smith, 1994; Hunter, 1990; Ehrlich, 1990), in the self-hatred and fear that keeps individuals in the agony of the closet, (Herek, 1990; Garnets, 1990; Reinig, 1990; Berrill, 1986), and in anti-lesbian/gay violence. Petersen (1991: 252) has argued also that "mainstream culture generates queer bashers". She notes that because
lesbians and gay men are marginalized, and the ways in which “our cultures are erased, our families ignored, our communities ridiculed, and our contributions devalued” we are more susceptible to “heterosexist violence” that is not only tolerated, but also “encouraged” by mainstream society (Petersen, 1991: 252).

The power of heterosexism and homophobia, and their deleterious effects upon the lives of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals, have prompted a number of academics to attempt to uncover some of the causes that have given rise to them. The literature suggests three key factors in the maintenance and power of pervasive homophobia and heterosexism: 1) religious doctrine, particularly through Christianity and the church; 2) the hegemony of a dangerous and compulsive masculinity; and 3) macro economic patterns and processes. Each of these will be discussed in order.

Herek’s research indicates “a very direct correlation between the frequency people tell me they attend church and the extent to which they are hostile to gay people. The more they go to church, the more hostile they are” (Herek, in Dadisman, 1991: 25). While there has been considerable literature on the relationship between radical, right-wing, fundamentalist Christianity and anti-gay/lesbian victimization, three authors will be highlighted here. Both Clarke (1991) and Comstock (1991), for example, argue that the Christian church has played and continues to play a crucial role in either organizing or condoning acts of violence against lesbians and gay men. Clarke (1991: 268) states that “[o]nce homophobia became official Christian policy, the Church could endorse and later encourage anti-gay violence and pogroms”. Meanwhile, both authors note that both orthodox Catholics and fundamentalist Protestants continue to spearhead prominent and relentless attacks on lesbians and gay men. Clarke (1991: 277-78) cites Pope John Paul II’s 1986 pastoral Letter to the Bishops, which disqualifies homosexuality as a “morally acceptable option”, and which goes on to suggest that even an inclination toward homosexuality represents “a more or less strong tendency toward an intrinsic moral evil”. Comstock, too, (1991: 123) cites a passage from this Letter, a passage that is even more instructive (and alarming) since it tends to legitimate anti-gay/lesbian violence. He notes that the Letter states that while “violent
malice’ against homosexual persons may be ‘deplorable’, an ‘increase in such irrational and violent actions’ [is] a not surprising response to social approval of homosexuality and the introduction of civil legislation which ‘protect[s] behavior to which no one has any conceivable right.’"

Kopkind (1993) posits a practical and functional factor that is behind the incessant homophobic vitriol that comes from the Christian Right: solidarity and money. He argues that (1993: 602) “now that international communism is a dead issue, and abortion is no longer leading edge”, homosexuality has become “the Christian [R]ight’s number one bogey and its chief source of money”. In other words, anti-gay/lesbian rhetoric serves as an important organizing principle for the fundamentalist movement as a whole. Fundamentalist rhetoric galvanizes the disparate elements of the movement together around a common cause, arouses passions, and ensures an enormous amount of revenue from those willing to enlist their dollars to help fight God’s “holy war”. By creating a cultural and social climate in which homophobia and heterosexism are allowed to flourish, the rhetoric and actions of the Christian Right legitimate homophobic violence.

While there can be little doubt that fundamentalist Christian religious doctrine plays an important role in maintaining heterosexist norms, and fueling homophobic sentiment and behaviors, it is important to note that the evangelical denominations represent only one (albeit increasingly popular) form of Christianity. The Metropolitan Community church has emerged as a Christian church established largely by and for lesbians and gay men. In addition, a few mainstream churches have adopted positive positions on gay/lesbian issues. The United Church of Canada, for example, now ordains “out” lesbian and gay ministers. These more progressive Christian denominations have created a gay/lesbian-friendly space within Christianity and act as a powerful foil to the virulent anti-gay/lesbian bias of the fundamentalists.

In addition to religious bias, others (e.g., Kopkind, 1991; Ehrlich, 1990; Harry, 1990a; Herek, 1990; Miles, 1989; Frank, 1987) argue that homophobia and heterosexism are caused by and perpetrated through a dangerous masculinity in our culture. Frank maintains that what passes for
masculinity in contemporary Canadian society is but one particularly ruthless form of patriarchal domination of women and men by other men. Frank (1987: 161) argues that the dominant masculinity manifests itself throughout the society in both institutional and interpersonal contexts. Like Frank, Miles (1991: 29) views masculinity in terms of the gendered powered relations that it creates. He argues that the cause of heterosexism is sexism, and that contemporary notions of masculinity and femininity reflect deep-rooted, narrow and constraining beliefs that not only delimit the affectual possibilities open to males, but more importantly, prescribe violent actions and behaviors as acceptable ways of validating and expressing maleness.

Both Miles (1991) and Comstock (1991) claim that the recent backlash against women and minorities (including lesbians and gay men) reflect a profound crisis of masculinity brought about by the declining economic fortunes of a large number of men. They maintain that the most virulent backlash tends to come from males who are already marginal in terms of status and power, namely youth, the working class, and minority males. As a result, these men seek to displace their frustrations onto legitimate scapegoats, notably, other minorities, women, and lesbians and gay men. Comstock argues that macro-economic forces represent another cause of the recent homophobic backlash. He argues that increased visibility and tolerance for lesbians and gay men have coincided with a period of enormous economic expansion in North America. He warns that until recently North America has not had to “exclude and define itself narrowly”. However as the economic stature of North America (and of North American males) becomes challenged and displaced in the new global order, “we might expect that [North] America [and North American males] may seek new ways to exercise authority, however reduced and limited” (Comstock, 1991: 133). It would not be surprising if the recent emergence of “populist” neo-conservative social, political, and economic agendas and the rise in anti-gay/lesbian rhetoric and violence may be the most immediate and tangible results of the process Comstock has described. While these three causes of homophobia are by no means exhaustive, they have contributed to the institutionalization of homophobia in Western societies.
In addition to these three causes of homophobia, a number of writers discuss the significance of homophobia in the legal-judicial system. Arguing that anti-gay/lesbian bias in the legal-judicial system lends both a legal and moral legitimacy to anti-gay/lesbian violence and discrimination, many have commented on the ways in which homophobia pervades the criminal justice system (Berrill, 1992; 1990; 1986; Herek, 1990; 1988; Smith, 1994, Gross, 1992; Dahl, 1995); how legal and juridical limitations on lesbian and gay equality represent particularly egregious symptoms of institutionalized homophobia (Berrill, 1992; Petersen, 1991; Herek, 1990; 1988), and how recent, seemingly favorable rulings are often informed by heterosexist bias (Banks, 1993).

Herek (1988) notes how anti-sodomy laws (upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1986) in the U.S. often place police in difficult legal positions when they protect gay men. Berrill (1992) points to the fact that federal justice institutes in the U.S. have refused funding for anti-gay violence projects, while judges and juries continue to fail to administer severe punishments for the murders of lesbians and gay men, sometimes administering little or no punishment at all. For example, in 1989 a Florida District Court Judge “jokingly asked the prosecuting attorney ‘That’s a crime now, to beat up a homosexual?’ The prosecutor answered, ‘Yes, sir. And it is also a crime to kill them.’ To this the judge replied, ‘Times have really changed’” (Berrill and Herek, 1990: 404). Peterson (1991: 249) discusses several examples of homophobia in the legal system including another instance of how the personal homophobic biases of Judges influence their sentencing. She notes in particular how a Dallas District Court Judge recently refused to impose a life sentence for the murder of two gay men. He argued that he “put prostitutes and queers at the same level...And I’d be hard put to give somebody life for killing a prostitute”, and commented that it would have been different if the victims had been “a couple of housewives out shopping, not hurting anybody”. The judge concluded that the two gay men were not “entirely blameless” in their victimization since they “wouldn’t have been killed if they hadn’t been cruising the streets picking up teenage boys.”

While some might point to the fact that these instances of homophobia are based in the United States, Dahl (1995) argues that homosexuality continues to be stigmatized, and anti-gay violence
legitimated, through homophobic attitudes in the Canadian justice system. Dahl (1995: 15) notes how the “homosexual panic defense” in the courts allows many men quite literally to “get away with murdering” gay men, and remains a disturbing product of the homophobia of the 1950s. Dahl cites the 1994 case of how a gay man in Vancouver was “picked up” in a gay bar and accompanied home by another (it turns out heterosexual) man. When in the gay man’s home, the “straight” man decided to take a shower. When the gay man made a pass at the man in the shower, he was stabbed over 60 times, was brutally mutilated, and murdered. The assailant successfully used the “homosexual panic defense” and had his charge reduced to manslaughter. He received a sentence of less than three years and may be back on the streets of Vancouver within 10 months of being sentenced.

In addition to these outrageous examples of homophobia in the criminal justice system, Banks (1993) has argued that judge’s decisions concerning gay/lesbian rights (and especially same-sex relationships) are often informed by a heterosexist bias, even when the ruling is favorable. Banks describes (1993: 288) the homophobic and heterosexist undercurrents behind a 1991 ruling in British Columbia that forced the Medical Services Plan of B.C. to recognize same-sex relationships under the Provincial Medicare Plan. First, the homophobic nature of our society enabled the court to invade the privacy of the two men by examining the intimate details of their relationship (i.e. bank accounts, property, wills etc.) in order to evaluate the legitimacy of their relationship. Banks notes that heterosexuals never or rarely have to “prove” the validity of their relationships, even if the (heterosexual) couple do not combine their assets and resources or live quite separate and apart for most of the time. She also argues (1993: 297) that since the Judge ruled that the two men live “as husband and wife”, she imposed a heterosexist model onto their

---

3 This so-called “panic” refers to the temporary and uncontrollable rage experienced by straight (or latent gay) men who are confronted with alleged “unwanted homosexual advances”. This defense has long been and remains a spurious, but unfortunately successful means of legitimating (often) brutal murders of gay men across North America, resulting in either reduced sentences or “not guilty” verdicts for perpetrators. Dahl (1995: 15) notes how this defense remains the sole preserve of straight men, and is not available for straight women, lesbians, and gay men who incur an “unwanted heterosexual advance”.
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same-sex relationship by "obliging same-sex couples to cast themselves in [a heterosexual light]. Banks also argues that when same-sex couples are forced to "conform to a traditional heterosexual model to obtain spousal benefits", this reinforces "the notion that heterosexuality is the "norm" and the standard by which others are measured" (Banks, 1993: 297). Bank's argument has important implications for both the ways in which same-sex relationships are treated by the legal system and society as a whole, as well as the fact that lesbians, gay men, bisexuals and transgendered persons take when challenging discriminatory legislation in future. Governments in Canada and the United States continue to fail to amend legislation that denies equality to lesbian and gay persons, and that marginalize and discriminate against lesbian and gay relationships. Consequently, lesbians and gay men generally have to turn to these same courts (and in some cases homophobic judges) to have our rights and relationships recognized and made legitimate. At the same time, the often homophobic orientation of the criminal justice system continues to reinforce the generally negative views of the gay and lesbian communities toward the legal-judicial system and the police.

2. Hate Crimes: Assessing the Nature of Social Violence

a) What are hate crimes?

According to Johann Galtung, violence must be seen as anything that prevents an individual from developing her or his full potential (Galtung, in Ehrlich, 1990: 364). Following Galtung's definition of the term, we may assume that violence involves more than actual physical assault or damage to property. In other words, violence includes all acts of victimization: verbal abuse and harassment, threatening graffiti, and the distribution of threatening literature or other communication that threaten both individual and group psychological and physical well-being. Grimshaw notes (in Berk, 1990: 339) that the key ingredient in the classification of a hate crime is the "symbolic status" of the victim. Hate crimes, then, are committed against individuals who can be identified by what Berk (1990: 340) describes as, "some socially or statistically defined
aggregate”, such as gender, race, religion, physical or mental ability, national origin, ethnicity or sexual orientation. If crimes are committed against individuals (or their property) due to the fact that they belong to one of the identifiable groups noted above, then the crime is considered to constitute a hate crime.4

The growing literature on hate-motivated crime illustrates: that hate-motivated violence is on the rise (Kopkind, 1993; Peters, 1991; Dadisman, 1991; FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 1991; Berk, 1990; Herek, 1989; Seidman, 1988); that they are almost always anonymous or “stranger crimes” (Berk, 1991: 341; FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 1992); that it is often particularly brutal and psychologically devastating (Anderson, 1993; Stermac and Sheridan, 1993; Stinski, 1993; Berrill, 1990; Herek and Berrill, 1990; Garnets, 1990; Lieberman, 1989; Herek and Glunt, 1988); and that lesbians and gay men may be the most frequent targets of hate-motivated acts (Reiss and Roth, 1993; Anderson, 1993; Comstock, 1991; Hunter, 1990; Wertheimer, 1990; Herek, 1989a). At the same time, crimes motivated by hate have only recently been recognized as a distinctive criminological phenomenon by government and law enforcement authorities (Anderson, 1993; CQ Researcher, 1993; Lieberman, 1992; Clarke, 1991; FBI Bulletin, 1991).

The literature suggests that hate- (or bias-) motivated crimes, crimes that Ehrlich (1990: 361) terms “ethnoviolence”, represent the most traumatic and damaging form of interpersonal violence because these crimes are identity-based, attacking persons because of who they are (EGALE, 1994; Human Rights, 1993; Stinski, 1993; Ehrlich, 1990; Garnets, 1990; Herek, 1989; Lieberman, 1989). In fact, recent studies conducted by the National Institute against Prejudice and Violence in the U.S. indicate that “victims of [ethno]violence suffer [much] more trauma than other victims of similar crimes” (Stinski, 1993: 27). Ehrlich (1990, 364) points to results from his studies which indicate that “victims of ethnoviolence experience an average of almost two and one half times more symptoms than do victims of other kinds of violence”. Victimization that is identity-based
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4 In order to constitute a hate crime, it must be proven that the criminal act was motivated by hatred or bias toward the victim(s). If hatred cannot be shown to have been the motivating factor behind the incident, then the incident would not be considered an act of hate (Czajoski, 1992: 37)
causes symptoms of social withdrawal, depression, and other forms of psychological distress (Ehrlich, 1990: 364), as well as debilitating feelings of self-degradation and lower self-esteem (Stermac and Sheridan, 1993; Peters, 1991; Garnets, 1990). Empirical research suggests that while most hate crimes directed at ethno-cultural communities tend to be anonymous, or “stranger crimes” (Berk, 1990), Harry (1990a) argues that up to 40 percent of homophobic violence occurs in settings where pre-established relations already exist (i.e., families, at school and at worksites). In addition, Stermac and Sheridan (1993) maintain that compared to gay men, lesbians are more prone to victimization at the hands of known persons. Furthermore, both Wertheimer (1990) and Stermac and Sheridan (1993) note how survivors of anti-lesbian/gay hate crimes often have to deal with homophobic, and hence unsupportive, crime victim service agencies and specialists. Homophobia in social service agencies and programs means that many lesbians and gay men who seek assistance do not receive the kinds of treatment they require. At the same time, many of those who do not seek treatment and assistance at all suffer the consequences of victimization in isolation and silence.

While hate crimes may be committed against non-Jewish straight white men, most hate crimes are directed at social minorities, especially at social “outgroups” (Herek, 1990; Ehrlich, 1990). Ehrlich (1990) notes that the extent to which prejudice and violence are directed at “outgroups” depends upon “the group's visibility, the distinctiveness and salience of stereotypes about the group and whether or not the community is polarized over intergroup relations” (Ehrlich, 1990: 36). Herek and Glunt (1988) have demonstrated how lesbians and gay men are often constructed as “outsiders”, and juxtaposed to the “rest of society” or the “general public”. They argue that this has been particularly pronounced in terms of the AIDS crisis, where gay men are seen as a “risk group” who put the “general public” at risk (Herek and Glunt, 1988: 888).5

---

5 For a broader discussion of the relationships among stigmatization, homosexuality and victimization, see section C.
The effects of hate crimes victimization are serious and complex and require both increased academic attention and analysis, additional levels of social support for victims, and a greater commitment by legislators to enact legislation aimed at increasing penalties for those who perpetrate these crimes. With regards to the last point, governments in both the United States and Canada have begun to enact legislation that address hate-motivated crimes. Two significant pieces of Federal legislation, are the Hate Crimes Statistics Act of 1990 in the U.S. and Bill C-41 in Canada.

b) Federal Legislative Responses to Hate Crimes: The U.S. and Canada

Federal governments in both the United States and Canada have recently enacted legislation that allows for a better understanding of the nature and prevalence of hate crimes, as well as prescribing tougher sentences for perpetrators. In the United States, Congress passed the Hate Crimes Statistics Act in 1990. This legislation not only permits justices to impose harsher penalties on perpetrators of hate motivated incidents, it also requires the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to collect hate crimes data from law enforcement agencies across the U.S. and to publish an annual report of the results. Since Congress did not mandate that all law enforcement agencies in the U.S. must collect these statistics, and since it provided no additional funding for agencies who voluntarily comply, there has been only limited success in determining the actual number of hate crimes in America6 (Jost, 1993; FBI Bulletin, 1992). Despite the limitations inherent in the Hate Crimes Statistics Act, many law enforcement experts in the U.S. argue that merely directing the FBI to request information on bias incidents has helped to sensitize police officials across the U.S. to the existence and prevalence of hate-motivated crimes, as well

6 The FBI mailed information concerning the voluntary collection of hate crimes data to more than 16,000 law enforcement agencies in the U.S., however, only 2,771 furnished hate crimes data to the FBI in 1991. These agencies reported a total of 4,558 bias-related incidents for that year (CQ Researcher, 1993: 6). By 1993, however, the FBI reported 7,684 incidents, even though only "a really small number of the nation's police forces", responsible for 56 percent of the U.S. population, reported hate crimes" (Louis Freeh, FBI Director, in The Globe and Mail, June 29, 1994: A2).
as the importance of being responsive to the needs of victims (Jost, 1993; FBI Bulletin, 1993; Stinski, 1993; Lieberman, 1992).

While there has been much praise for the U.S. program and its efforts towards uniform crime reporting across the United States, the collection of hate crimes data has been much less organized, and hence less successful, in Canada, where there exists no federal equivalent to the FBI program in terms of educating and sensitizing police agencies to the prevalence and seriousness of hate crimes. At the same time, there is no single law enforcement agency in Canada that collects bias-related statistics. The R.C.M.P., the agency most likely to undertake responsibility for such a program, has argued that it will not begin to collect hate crime data until mandated by the federal government. There are no indications at this time that the Canadian government is forthcoming with such a mandate for the R.C.M.P. or any other crime enforcement agency. This is not to say that individual police agencies have not responded to the U.S. example. In fact several large metropolitan police agencies have voluntarily begun to collect statistics, including police departments in Vancouver, Toronto and Ottawa7 (Pepper, 1994).

Although the Canadian government has not established a means for collecting hate crimes data nationwide, it has begun to address the issue. The present Liberal government, under the direction of Minister of Justice Allan Rock, has recently passed Bill C-41 (An Act to Amend the Criminal Code (Sentencing)). Bill C-41 is an omnibus piece of legislation that amends various sections of the Criminal Code in relation to sentencing procedures in Canada. The issue of hate crimes is addressed in sections 718.1 and 718.2 “Principles and Purposes of Sentencing” (Pilon, 1995: 5). Presently, sections 318 and 319 of the Criminal Code stipulate that hate crimes against “identifiable groups” are limited to “colour, race, religion, or ethnic origin” (EGALE, 1994: 10). Section 718.2(i) will broaden the category of identifiable groups to include “race, nationality,

---

7 The Ottawa police have been the most proactive in this regard. They have established a bias crimes unit, have worked closely with minority groups, including the lesbian, gay and bisexual liaison unit who have been given office space in the Ottawa Police Headquarters. Providing space in the police department itself emphasizes their commitment to establishing an on-going dialogue with the gay/lesbian communities. They are also sensitizing and educating officers on ways to effectively respond to bias incidents (Pepper, 1994)
colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation” (Pilon, 1995: 5). Section 718.1 will deal with crimes of hate by ensuring that “a sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence” (Pilon, 1995: 5); hate crimes will continue to be considered particularly grievous offenses deserving of stiffer sentences. While these legislative measures have been supported by many police agencies, social minorities and others, they have recently come under attack, especially in the United States.

In the United States, some civil libertarian groups, academics and others have argued that the Hate Crime Statistics Act and anti-hate crimes legislation introduced by individual states limit free speech and expression (Jost, 1993), and that it is impossible to prove with any certainty what an individual was thinking about (or was motivated by) when committing an incident against a particular victim (Reiss and Roth, 1993; Stinski, 1993; Berk, 1990). Supporters of hate crimes legislation argue that since motive has long been part of existing judicial practice (EGALE, 1994; Smith, 1994), hate crimes legislation predicated on motivation is legitimate. While the State Supreme Courts of Wisconsin, Ohio and Oregon actually struck down anti-hate crimes statutes in those states (Jost, 1993; Human Rights, 1993; Stinski, 1993), there have been no similar rulings in Canada, where provincial courts and the Supreme Court of Canada have consistently ruled that hate-mongering and hate crimes constitute legitimate grounds for punishment (EGALE, 1994).

Despite the difficulties inherent in hate crimes legislation, supporters argue that they remain significant for two reasons. First, they serve an important educational value by signaling to would-be perpetrators of hate violence that such acts are indeed criminal and will not be tolerated by society (EGALE, 1994). Second, anti-hate crimes statutes necessitate education and sensitivity training for law enforcement officials, and demand that police officials respond to and acknowledge bias-motivated incidents (Lieberman, 1992).
3. **Hate Crimes against Lesbians and Gay Men**

a) *The Scope of the Problem*

In the United States, and more recently in Canada, the introduction and passage of legislation aimed at dealing with hate-motivated crimes have been marked by virulent protests to the inclusion of sexual orientation in the legislation. Some vocal conservative politicians in both countries are willing, it seems, to enact legislation that stiffens the punishment for hate-motivated crimes as long as lesbians and gay men are *not* included as a recognizable target group. This is curious, since the literature suggests that lesbians and gay men may represent the most frequent, and under-reported victims of hate crimes across North America (Reiss and Roth, 1993; Anderson, 1993; Comstock, 1991; Hunter, 1990; Wertheimer, 1990; Herek, 1989). The backlash against the inclusion of sexual orientation in Bill C-41 (the Canadian federal legislation dealing with hate crimes)\(^8\) has included a barrage of anti-lesbian/gay rhetoric from several right-wing politicians; this is ironic since these politicians have perpetrated the very kinds of damaging homophobic attitudes that hate crimes legislation is intended to address.\(^9\) The seriousness of the

---

\(^8\) Bill C-41 passed third reading in the House of Commons on June 15, 1995. The Liberal government used its majority in the House of Commons to pass the legislation, despite threats by up to 25 of its right-wing backbenchers to ignore Party unity and discipline and vote against the legislation. In the end, only four Liberal members voted against the bill, joined by almost the entire 52 member caucus of the Reform Party. The fact that Bill C-41 explicitly includes sexual orientation constitutes the primary reason these legislators voted against the legislation. It is quite likely that if lesbians, gay men and bisexuals were not protected in the legislation, it would have passed through the House with very little opposition.

\(^9\) It is instructive to consider a sample of the homophobia that has emerged from the debates over Bill C-41. One Liberal M.P., Roseanne Skoke, stated in Parliament that "homosexuality is based on an inhuman act, defiles humanity, destroys family...and is annihilating mankind" (Mason-Lee, *The Globe and Mail*, October 3, 1994:D2). She added that since homosexuality is "immoral" and is "undermining the inherent rights and values of our Canadian families," it is important that it "must not and should not be condoned" (Thanh Ha: *The Globe and Mail*, September 28, 1994). Ms. Skoke's comments were the most virulent anti-gay rhetoric to emerge during the debate, but they were echoed by other members from both the Liberal and Reform Parties. Liberal Tom Wappel stated that "homosexuality is statistically abnormal, it's physically abnormal and it's morally abnormal" and that "[m]y aversion to homosexuality, which is shared by the vast majority of Canadians, does not mean that we hate homosexuals. ... [O]ne can abhor homosexuality, without abhorring individual homosexuals". M.P. Myron Thompson, the Reform Party Justice Critic, echoed Wappel's comments by asserting that: "I don't hate thieves; I hate stealing. I do not hate murderers, I hate murdering. I do not hate homosexuals, I hate homosexuality" (EGALE, 1994). Finally, Vancouver-area Reform M.P. Paul Forseth commented that the inclusion of sexual
anti-gay rhetoric that emerges during any debate on legislation dealing with lesbian/gay rights and issues (of which the hate crimes bill is but one example) is underscored by the fact that this homophobia both condones and incites anti-gay/lesbian violence. But just how much anti-gay/lesbian violence is actually occurring in our society?

In the United States, official hate crimes statistics collected by the FBI for 1993 indicate that of the 7,684 incidents reported to authorities, 777 (10.1%) were committed against lesbians and gay men, compared to 2,476 (32.2%) racially motivated incidents against blacks and 1,054 (13.7%) antisemitic incidents (Globe and Mail, June 29, 1994: A2). Meanwhile, 1994 data gathered by the Klanwatch Project of the Southern Poverty Center in Alabama (a group that monitors hate-groups) determined that anti-gay/lesbian bias crimes constituted 57 or 25% of the 228 incidents it uncovered, including 11 of 18 murders (Reuters Internet Service, March 30, 1995). Finally, of the 305 bias incidents reported to the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Bias Crime Unit in 1993, 45 incidents or 14.8% were perpetrated against (3) lesbians and (42) gay men (Pepper, 1994:6). Since anti-gay/lesbian violence constituted only 10.1%, 25% and 14.8% of these official statistics, one might conclude that homophobic violence is less prevalent than bias incidents based on, for example, race or religion. The literature, however, suggests otherwise.

According to the U.S. National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF), which annually tallies the total number of bias incidents reported to seven U.S. lesbian/gay organizations, anywhere from 58 to 91% of incidents reported to gay and lesbian organizations are never reported to authorities (NGLTF, 1993). Due in large part to these NGLTF statistics, the U.S. National orientation in Bill C-41 was unnecessary since it is his understanding that the majority of anti-gay/lesbian violence represents “gay-on-gay” (male) violence. Forseth argues that in the gay community “there is a lot of jealousy, they have a lot of short-term relationships, they are vengeful, and their health isn’t very good”. He also notes that while there may be the odd gay-bashing perpetrated by “skinheads”, that is just “one kind of marginalized group doing its thing against another marginalized group, which essentially has nothing to do with human rights before the law. It’s purely one gang going against another gang”. (Peter O’Neil, Vancouver Sun, March 18, 1995, A3)

10 The seven organizations are: Community United Against Violence in San Francisco; The Fenway Community Health Center in Boston; the Gay and Lesbian Community Action Council in Minneapolis-St. Paul; the Gay and Lesbian Community Center of Colorado in Denver; Horizons Community Services in Chicago; the Lesbian Community Project in Portland, Oregon; and the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project.
Justice Institute recently declared that in spite of official statistics, “homosexuals may have become the most frequent victims of hate violence today” (Anderson, 1993: 16). There is a general recognition among law enforcement officials (and many lesbians and gay men), that most lesbians and gay men are not willing to report victimization to the police. Anderson (1993) notes that a police officer in the Boston Police Department’s Community Disorders Unit recently remarked that “[o]nly in the gay community do you get this kind of fear [to report incidents]. . . I never see it in the bias crimes involving blacks or Hispanics” (Anderson, 1993: 17). While lesbians and gay men may be hesitant to report bias incidents to authorities, data in the United States reveal that they are more likely to report homophobic victimization to local gay/lesbian community centers with anti-violence hotlines.

The NGLTF is the most informative source for anti-lesbian/gay hate crimes data in the U.S. In 1992 the NGLTF reported that a total of 1,898 incidents were reported to the seven agencies they monitor. In fact, tremendous discrepancies exist between official statistics of anti-gay/lesbian incidents reported to police, and those reported to the gay/lesbian organizations in several U.S. cities.11 For example, while only 86 incidents were reported to New York City police in 1992, the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project reported 662 incidents; in San Francisco, only 164 incidents were reported to police, while Community United Against Violence recorded 435 incidents; 42 homophobic incidents were reported to the Chicago police, while Horizons Community Services (a lesbian/gay organization in Chicago) received 252 reports; finally, the Minneapolis-St. Paul police reported 30 incidents compared to the 311 reported to the local Gay and Lesbian Community Action Council (NGLTF, 1992: 3).

A subsequent report, a collaborative effort between the NGLTF and the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project (NYCAVP), found that while there were 2,064 anti-gay/lesbian incidents reported to gay/lesbian agencies in ten cities in 1994 (a 1.6% increase from 11 The NGLTF notes that 1,001 of the 1,898 incidents “met FBI criteria to be investigated and prosecuted as crimes motivated by anti-gay bias” (NGLTF, 1992: 4; their emphasis).
the same cities in 1993), law enforcement agencies in the ten cities reported only 289 anti-gay/lesbian crimes (a 14% decrease from 1993). The NGLTF-NYCAVP report also indicated that there were 70 gay-related murders reported in 25 states and DC in 1994, that 46% of the anti-gay/lesbian crimes resulted in injury compared to 36% for all hate crimes, and that anti-gay/lesbian crimes involve crimes against persons in 81% of cases, compared to 73% of all hate crimes (NGLTF-NYCAVP, Internet, March 13, 1995).

Similar results are found in the most recent survey conducted by the Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force (1992). Their Philadelphia and Pennsylvania-wide study of 2,652 lesbians and gay men found that 72% of female respondents and 62% of males reported no incidents to police, while only 10% of females and 11% of males claimed to have reported all incidents to police. Interestingly, these results are down considerably from those of their earlier survey carried out in 1988 (N=721). At that time, 52% of females and 56% of males reported no incidents to police; while 22% of females and 24% of males reported all incidents to police. Authors of the report note that of those who did report incidents, only 20% of the women and 25% of the men rated the police performance as good or excellent, while over half rated it poor (PLGTF, 1992: 17).

Comstock's (1991: 159) much smaller sample (N=294) shows similar results: of those respondents who suffered all forms of victimization, 114 of 157 or 73% made no report to police (41/53 women and 73/104 men). And 58% (18/30 women and 40/71 men) of those who experienced what he termed "very serious victimization" did not report the incident to police.

Unfortunately, since there is no equivalent to the NGLTF in Canada we have a much less clear understanding of the scope of anti-lesbian-gay violence here. However, statistics from Toronto indicate that while 30 incidents were reported the lesbian and gay bashing hotline there in 1994

---

12 The ten cities in this statistical report were: Bloomington (MN), Boston, Chicago, Columbus, Denver, Detroit, Minneapolis-St. Paul, New York, Portland (OR), and San Francisco.

13 In Vancouver, there exists no central violence report line for the lesbian and gay communities, and hence no agency in Vancouver systematically tracks and records anti-gay/lesbian incidents.
(127 incidents were reported in 1991, 53 in 1992, and 55 in 1993), only 11 anti-gay incidents (all crimes committed against men only) were reported to the Hate Crime Unit of the Metropolitan Toronto Police (out of a total of 249 reported bias incidents). With no central monitoring agency in Canada, and a dearth of organized bashing report lines in major cities, it is difficult to determine discrepancies between official statistics and data from other sources.

Despite the relative paucity of statistical data on anti-lesbian/gay violence in Canada, there can be little doubt that homophobic violence is endemic in Canadian society. In fact, few lesbian and gay Canadians would argue with Comstock's (1991: 138) statement that "resistance to violence has been the primary organizing principle for the post-war lesbian/gay community". Considering this, and given the fact that lesbians and gay men are believed to bear the greatest brunt of hate crimes victimization, we need to discern several things from the existing literature. First, what is the nature of the victimization, that is, what are the various forms it generally takes? Second, what are the contexts of anti-gay/lesbian violence, that is, where does it tend to occur and to whom? Finally, why do most lesbians and gay men not report their victimization?

b) The Nature of Anti-Lesbian/Gay Violence

In addition to the data gathered by the NGLTF and the Toronto bashing hotline, there have been several important surveys in both Canada and the United States that, taken together, provide a general overview of the nature of anti-gay/lesbian victimization. Before examining actual statistical profiles, however, it is important to note that, like violence against women, anti-gay/lesbian violence is often extremely brutal and vicious (Bissinger, 1995; EGALE, 1994; NGLTF, 1992; Comstock, 1991; Berrill, 1990; Hunter, 1990). Melissa Mertz, Director of Victim

14 While at first glance the figures might lend one to assume that anti-gay/lesbian violence is on the decline in Toronto, newly appointed bashing hotline director Karen Baldwin believes that the opposite is in fact true and that the statistical decline on the Toronto line is much more indicative of financial and organizational problems that have made the line more or less irrelevant since its much publicized appearance in 1991. She expects that increased awareness of the line’s existence this year will result in figures that more accurately reflect the degree of homophobic violence in Canada’s largest city (personal conversation: March, 1995)
Services at Bellevue Hospital in New York City, "notes that attacks against gay men were the most heinous and brutal I encountered. They frequently involved torture, cutting, mutilation, and beating, and showed the absolute intent to rub out the human being because of his [sexual orientation]" (in Berrill, 1990: 280). Brutal acts of anti-gay/lesbian violence occur in Canada as well; here are some recent Canadian examples: In Vancouver, a gay man was murdered in 1989 after he was stabbed 15 times, and in March 1995 another Vancouver man was fatally stabbed 68 times before his body was mutilated (Dahl, 1995: 15). In one of (at least) 14 murders of gay men in Montreal since 1989, a Montreal gay man was savagely murdered in 1992 during what was believed to have been an initiation ritual by a new group of white supremacists in the city. Apparently the initiation ritual required that the new members attack at least 10 gays and lesbians (Globe and Mail, December 4, 1992, A1, in EGALE, 1994: 5). Also in Montreal, a gay AIDS activist was murdered in 1989 on a crowded city bus when a gang of about 15 youths boarded the bus, called the man a "faggot", and then stabbed him to death with scissors, hunting knives and kitchen knives (Peterson, in EGALE, 1994: 5). In July 1993 a passing motorist in Ottawa jumped out of his car and assaulted a pedestrian after he learned the pedestrian was gay (EGALE, 1994: 4). Also in Ottawa, a man presumed to be gay was stopped on the Interprovincial Bridge between Ottawa and Hull. After his neck was slashed, one of his perpetrators held him by his feet, said "nice shoes" and dropped him into the river to his death (EGALE, 1994: 4).

While these examples of severe physical violence are the most sensational form of anti-gay/lesbian victimization, they barely begin to scratch the surface of the increasing amount of violence that confronts lesbians and gay men across North America (NGLTF statistics for 1992, anti-gay/lesbian violence rose by 35% between 1990 and 1992). While these NGLTF statistics

15 The perpetrators of both of these murders successfully used the "homosexual panic defense". In the 1989 incident, the perpetrator received a three year sentence and was released after eight months, and the perpetrator of the 1995 incident was able to "call evidence to attack the character of the murder victim and to suggest that the violence [was] justified" (Dahl, 1995: 15). This perpetrator also successfully invoked the "panic defense" and is now facing a manslaughter charge only. Also, see Bissinger, (1995) for some outrageous examples of how this defense has recently been used to acquit the perpetrators of unspeakable murders of gay men in Texas.
largely reflect physical assaults, it is important, as Grimshaw reminds us, to remember that violence comes in many forms and need not involve actual physical violence. In many instances verbal abuse and the threat of violence can be extremely debilitating (Stermac and Sheridan, 1993; Comstock, 1991; Berk, 1990; Berrill and Herek, 1990; Garnets, 1990; Hunter, 1990; State of New York, 1988). Garnets et al. (1990: 215-16) argue that “[l]ike hate-motivated physical violence, anti-gay verbal assault” is debilitating because it “challenges the victim’s routine sense of security and invulnerability, making the world seem more malevolent and less predictable.” In addition, Garnets et al. (1990: 215) maintain that threats of violence constitute a form of “symbolic violence” that serves to remind one that danger is ever present, while at the same time reinforcing the recipient’s “sense of being an outsider in society, a member of a disliked and devalued minority, and a socially acceptable target for violence”. Finally, they argue (1990: 215) that psychological abuse may be just as damaging as physical abuse and perhaps more insidious since its effects are much more difficult to detect and remedy than physical wounds. The deleterious effects of both psychological and physiological abuse are important considerations in relation to anti-gay/lesbian violence since every major survey reveals that the vast majority of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals have been victimized by either psychological or physiological abuse, and often both (Smith, 1994; NBCHRR, 1193; PLGTF, 1992; NGLTF, 1992; Comstock, 1991; State of New York, 1988; Kelner, 1983; Harry, 1982).

Statistics from several surveys of lesbians, and gay men and bisexuals in both Canada and the United States indicate that: 1) there is considerable consistency of the data for each of the types of victimization; 2) there does not appear to be a marked difference between Canadian and U.S.-based survey data; and 3) that lesbians, gay men and bisexuals face not only an extraordinary degree of victimization across North America, but also an overwhelming belief that they will continue to be victimized in the future. Table 1-1 provides a summary of some key data that is common to several of the surveys.
Table 1-1: Comparison of Canadian and U.S. Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Verbal Assault</th>
<th>Violent Threats</th>
<th>Physical Assault</th>
<th>Chased/Followed</th>
<th>Property Damage</th>
<th>Abuse at School</th>
<th>Abuse by Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLGTF</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=2,252</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGLTF</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=2,074</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSPIRG</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=294</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBCHRR</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82**</td>
<td>35**</td>
<td>18**</td>
<td>34**</td>
<td>19**</td>
<td>40**</td>
<td>10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=176</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comstock</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25**</td>
<td>14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=291</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Results from the PLGTF 1988 survey (N=721)
** Figures are not broken down by gender
† Canadian data

Despite the fact that not all of the surveys recorded the same types of victimization, one can conclude from the data in the Table 1-1 that (on average): 88% of gay men and 75% of lesbians have been verbally abused; that 50% of gay men and 30% of lesbians have been threatened with physical abuse; that 43% of gay men and 29% of lesbians have been chased or followed; that 27% of gay men and 9% of lesbians have been physically assaulted; that 21% of gay men and 16% of lesbians have had their personal property damaged or stolen; that 49% of gay men and 26% of lesbians have experienced abuse at school; and finally that 22% of gay men and 12% of lesbians have been abused by police. Furthermore, the PLGTF reported that 31% of gay men and 34% of lesbians have experienced abuse from family related to their sexual orientation, while a full 80% of gay men and 88% of lesbians feared they would face victimization in the future.

c) The Context of Anti-Lesbian/Gay Violence

According to Harry (1990, 1982), anti-gay/lesbian violence can be classified into two broad categories: cultural and opportunistic. The former, cultural victimization, refers to situations in
which there exists “no preexisting relationship” between the victimizer and the victim, and where perpetrators rely on “popularly accepted criteria or stereotypes” of what the victim should look, act, or be like as well as where s/he is most likely to be found (Harry, 1982: 547-8). Cultural victimization characterizes much of the anti-gay victimization that occurs in larger urban centers and is usually carried out by what Harry describes as “activists”, or those individuals “who go out of their way to find homosexuals to assault” (Harry, 1990; 354). Opportunistic victimization, on the other hand, arises out of “previously contracted relationships” where victimizers rely on prior knowledge of a victim's identity as the basis for an attack (Harry, 1982: 547). According to Harry, opportunistic victimization tends to characterize anti-gay violence in smaller communities where there are both fewer gay-identified areas, and where lesbians and gay men tend to “go to greater lengths to conceal their sexual identity”. Harry asserts that both cultural and opportunistic victimization are often dependent upon where one lives, how integrated one is in gay of lesbian communities, and the extent to which one does or does not conform to popular stereotypes of the appearance and mannerisms of lesbians and gay men. According to Harry, when these variables are taken together, they represent an excellent indicator of the relationship between lifestyle, self, and victimization.

Statistics compiled by Harry (1982) and by various of the other surveys indicate some support for the propositions. For example, in his 1982 survey of 1,556 gay men in the Chicago area, Harry (1982: 555) found that only 17% of those who were “Very Masculine” had been assaulted, compared to 22% of those who believed themselves to be “Masculine” and 39% of those who described themselves as “A Little” or “Very Feminine”. Harry also discovered that those men who lived in gay-identified areas tended to be more susceptible to attack that those who did not

---

16 Appropriately, Harry uses the term “opportunists” to describe the perpetrators of opportunistic victimization (Harry, 1990: 354-5).

17 In order to illustrate his point concerning the popular stereotypes of what lesbians and gay men are like, Harry cites a 1989 study which found that “70% of both males and females in the general population “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” that “Homosexuals act like the opposite sex.”” Harry argues that it is probably safe to assume that bashers would hold similar views, and that this means that gay men should appear and act effeminate while lesbians should appear and act in a masculine manner (Harry, 1990: 355)
(27% of 713 men versus 20% of 728 men, respectively). Comstock's results reveal a similar pattern with 59% of the victimization in his survey \((N=294)\) occurring in lesbian/gay areas (45% of women and 66% of men), versus 31% in non-gay/lesbian areas (42% of women and 26% of men). In addition, Harry found that of respondents who indicated that "All or Most" of their friends were gay, 28% (of 751 men) had been assaulted, compared with 20% (of 793 men) whose friends were "Half/Mostly/All Straight". Since it is likely that those who reside in gay areas and have more gay friends are likely more "out of the closet", we can assume, then, that those who are out tend to be more prone to victimization than those who are not. Similarly, Comstock found a very direct relationship between outness and victimization at work. For example, 43% of those who were "out to all" at work had been assaulted, versus 34% of those who were out to only "a select few", and "only" 21% of respondents who were "out to no one" (Comstock, 1991: 53). Finally, Harry discovered that 31 percent of those who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that "It is important for me to 'be out' to straight people I know" had experienced gay bashing versus 21 percent of other respondents (Harry, 1990: 356).

In terms of both conformity to stereotypes and extortion victimization, Harry's results prove interesting, especially in relation to Goffman's theoretical discussion concerning first, the dangers inherent in the possession of a "discreditable", or stigmatized identity, and second, the importance of disclosure (or the acceptance one's stigma status). For example, in his study, Harry found that 12% of the "Very Masculine" \((N=147)\), 16% of the "Masculine" \((N=1190)\), and 23% of those "A Little or Very Feminine" had been threatened with extortion. At the same time, 32% of those who were "out" \((N=71)\) were threatened with extortion versus only 17% of those who were "less visible" \((N=169)\). However, for those men who reported that all or most of their friends were gay and who had been threatened with extortion, only 25% of these extortion attempts were successful. This compares with a successful extortion rate of 44% \((N=125)\) against those threatened with extortion and who reported that one-half to all of their friends were not gay (Harry, 1982: 559). Based on his results, Harry (1982: 561) concludes that while there is "a considerable amount of victimization of the seriously stigmatized based on that stigmatization", it
appears that “having gay friends seems to reduce the costs attendant on discrediting”. Clearly, as Goffman suggests, and Harry discerns, while possession of a stigma identity creates a proneness to victimization, there remains a degree of comfort and safety to be found in accepting one’s “spoiled” identity and immersing oneself in one’s “discredited” community.

These findings are contradicted by Miller and Humphreys (1980), who suggest that the “movement of homosexual marginals into openly gay lifestyles appears to decrease their vulnerability to violent crime”. Miller and Humphreys (1980: 182) argue that the lesbian and gay communities offer “a variety of social, affectional and cultural opportunities” to protect members from potential perpetrators. The contradictions in findings by Harry and Comstock, versus Miller and Humphreys, illustrate one of the most interesting and important tensions in the relatively scarce literature offering substantive interpretations of homophobic violence. It appears, however, that methodological considerations may account for the discrepancy; Harry (1982) and Comstock’s (1991) findings are based on quantitative survey data, while Miller and Humphreys’ results are based on qualitative data gleaned from 1) high-profile murders, reported in newspapers and other media, and 2) Humphreys’ interviews with men who participate in tearoom sexual encounters (sex in public washrooms). It seems that the majority of the victims in Miller and Humphreys’ sample were covert gay men (some of whom were married) who were “cruising” for anonymous sex in unsafe areas. Thus in Miller and Humphreys’ sample, these “marginals” were more vulnerable to victimization than overt gay men who tend not to venture into these dangerous areas. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the tension between Harry and Comstock’s and Miller and Humphreys’ findings is that gay men face a proneness to victimization if they are both “closeted” and “out”. Nevertheless, the data indicate that there seems to be a correlation between an increase in outness and an increase in victimization.
4. Stigmatization and Fear: Reporting Victimization to Police

A number of academics have examined the relationship between the stigmatization of lesbians and gay men as deviants or outsiders on the one hand, and the pervasiveness of anti-gay/lesbian victimization on the other (Berrill and Herek, 1990; Harry, 1990; Herek, 1990; Reinig, 1990; Glunt and Herek, 1988). Glunt and Herek (1988) and Reinig (1990) argue that while, in Durkheimian terms, demarcating between normals and deviants and between the acceptable and the unacceptable serves the functional purpose of increasing community solidarity and cohesion, the real consequence is that entire groups of individuals are branded “unworthy” or “inferior” in relation to the dominant cultural group (Reinig, 1990: 885). Goffman (1963) argues that to be stigmatized in our society, one must possess at least one of three “discrediting” attributes:

First, there are abominations of the body—the various physical deformities. Next, there are blemishes of individual character perceived as weak will, domineering or unnatural passions ... these being inferred from a known record of, for example, mental disorder, imprisonment, addiction, homosexuality. ... Finally there are the tribal stigma of race, nation and religion (Goffman, 1963, in Reinig, 1990: 885; emphasis in Reinig).

The stigmatization associated with homosexuality is complex because it intersects with all three of these forms. For example, while lesbians and gay men are not necessarily characterized by physical deformities in the same sense as the handicapped individual, lesbian and gay stereotypes are often predicated on body-based phenomena, and lesbians and gay men constitute a sexual minority whose social identity is defined in terms of a sexuality that is “deviant” in relation to the (hetero)sexual “norm” (Herek, 1990: 321). Also, homosexuality is often viewed and portrayed as not only unnatural, but also the result of unnecessary, self-indulgent choices, or due to pathological behavior (Herek, 1990: 322). At the same time, Reinig (1990: 886) notes how, peculiarly, lesbians and gay men often fit into not only the second, but also the third of Goffman’s attributes, that is, they are viewed “not as individuals who do a certain type of thing, but rather as people who are a certain type of being” (my emphasis).
At best, the construction of lesbians and gay men as a “type of being” manifests itself in the form of a quasi-“ethnic minority status” similar to those predicated on nationality, language, religion or race (Herek, 1985: 136). At worst, otherness attached to homosexuality and lesbians and gay men leads to objectification and marginalization that contributes to and legitimates acts of homophobic violence. This is illuminated by the words of a young male who, when questioned about brutally murdering a gay man stated “I don’t think of killing a fag as like killing a person, I mean, I don’t think of them as people ... it’s like they’re their own race or something” (Berrill and Herek, 1992: 21). The stigmatization of homosexuality as deviant, abnormal, unnatural, and sinful (among other things) results in the perpetuation and legitimation of anti-gay/lesbian violence. At the same time, stigmatization often inhibits lesbians and gay men from reporting their victimization to authorities, as well as seeking the usual (familial, fraternal and institutional) sources of social support so important to survivors of crime.

Berrill and Herek (1990) use the terms primary and secondary victimization to distinguish between two forms of anti-gay/lesbian victimization. They argue that lesbians and gay men experience primary victimization when they are targets of hate crimes, and secondary victimization when they report these hate crimes to authorities and others. According to Berrill and Herek (1990: 401), primary victimization includes the various forms of violence we have discussed (i.e., verbal abuse, threats of violence and physical assault), while secondary victimization takes many forms, but includes: indifference, rejection and stigmatization from family and friends, community agencies and society in general; social and/or familial estrangement; the loss of employment, eviction from housing, denial of public accommodation; the loss of child custody; and verbal and/or physical abuse from police.18

---

18 A recent decision by the B.C. Supreme Court to impose a publication ban on the names of three gay men testifying in the murder of a gay man by his former partner provides an excellent illustration of the reality of secondary victimization. In his ruling, Justice R. Low noted that “the application [for the ban] is brought on the grounds that the three witnesses are homosexuals, that they must testify to that fact in their evidence and that such disclosure is likely to damage each of them in his personal and professional life”. Justice Low commented on the petition for the ban, stating that “I was impressed with the sincerity of each of the three witnesses. ... Each is concerned with how the public revelation of his sexual orientation would likely affect him in the work place and
While secondary victimization takes many forms, there is no denying that it "shapes how lesbians and gay male survivors respond to the primary victimization of hate crimes" (Berrill and Herek, 1990: 402). For example, U.S. studies indicate that lesbians and gay men, more than any other social group, do not report victimization to police. While the U.S. National Crime Survey indicates that 65% of all victims and 51% of victims of violent crimes do not report incidents to police, the following rates of non-reportage of serious anti-gay/lesbian incidents have been gleaned from surveys in various parts of the U.S.: Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, 90%; New Jersey, 80%; Baltimore, 87%; San Francisco, 82% and Minneapolis, 91%. In his survey \( N=291 \), Comstock found that 67% of those who had experienced serious victimization did not report because they believed the police were anti-gay, 14% feared direct abuse from the police, and 40% feared the effects of having to disclose their sexual orientation (Comstock, 1991, in Berrill and Herek, 1990: 404).\(^{19}\) Ultimately, then, the stigmatization of homosexuality and the construction of lesbians and gay men as outsiders and deviants (maintained through discriminatory legislation, negative stereotypes and beliefs, and the general invisibility of lesbians and gay men in mainstream society) serve to perpetuate and legitimate homophobic violence, on the one hand, and make it difficult and even dangerous for survivors of this violence to seek not only legal recourse and justice, but often familial and other forms of personal and institutional support.

D. Summary and Research Hypotheses

1. Summary

The literature dealing with the stigmatization of homosexuality and the treatment of lesbians and gay men reveals two important things. First, it underscores the success of the contemporary

---

\(^{19}\) Note that the percentages in Comstock’s survey equal more than 100 due to multiple responses by some respondents.
lesbian/gay civil rights movement in shifting the discourse on, and consciousness of, homosexuality to a higher ground. This has resulted in tremendous gains in the lesbian/gay struggle for social acceptance, and an overall improvement in the lives of many lesbians and gay men. Second, these gains serve to confirm the socially constructed nature of social codes, values, and beliefs in general, and Becker and Goffman’s discussion of deviance and stigmatization in particular.

Despite the advances in gay/lesbian equality, however, the continual stigmatization and marginalization of lesbians and gay men forces many individuals to persist in concealing their sexual orientation from family, friends, authorities, or others. At the same time, the literature suggests that those who do “come out” to friends, family and colleagues tend to be the most likely targets of violence. A number of the important theoretical and substantive issues are adduced by this study of anti-lesbian/gay violence in Vancouver, and many are reflected in the nine research hypotheses that have guided the research.

2. Research Hypotheses:

1. The more one is out, the more one is likely to experience anti-gay/lesbian violence.

2. The more one conforms to popular, homophobic, gay or lesbian stereotypes, the more one will experience homophobic victimization.

3. The incidence of anti-lesbian/gay violence will be higher in identified lesbian or gay areas than in non-lesbian or gay areas.

4. Those individuals who live in identified lesbian or gay areas will have experienced more homophobic violence than those individuals who do not live in lesbian or gay-identified areas.

5. The more an individual is active in and integrated into lesbian/gay communities, the more likely is she or he to experience anti-lesbian/gay violence.

6. The number of anti-gay hate crimes reported to police in Vancouver will be considerably lower than those reported on the survey.
7. The more one is out, the more likely one will be to report anti-gay/lesbian victimization to authorities.

8. The more one is active in and integrated in the lesbian and gay communities, the more likely he or she will be in reporting anti-gay/lesbian violence to authorities.

9. The fear of secondary victimization from police, family, friends, workmates and others, keeps people from reporting victimization to authorities.

These hypotheses have been incorporated into the design of the survey instrument, have guided the methodological procedures for distributing the survey, and are reflected in the discussion of the results of the survey in Section III, “Findings”. We now turn to Chapter II, “Methods”, for a discussion of the methodological procedures used to distribute the survey, as well the methodological considerations pertinent to the research.
Chapter 2. Methodology

A. The Research Context: The Greater Vancouver Regional District

Located in the Province of British Columbia (population 3,762,000), and with a population of 1.8 million inhabitants, the Vancouver Census Metropolitan Area (C.M.A.) constitutes Canada’s third largest Metropolitan Region. The Vancouver C.M.A. consists of the City of Vancouver (population 525,000)\(^2\) and the suburban cities of Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam and Port Moody (the tri-cities), as well as Burnaby, Maple Ridge, New Westminster, Surrey, Richmond, Delta, West Vancouver, and North Vancouver. Just to the east of Metropolitan Vancouver lies the largely rural and agricultural Fraser Valley. Due in part to its mild climate and relatively relaxed (or ‘laid back’) social attitudes, Vancouver is often characterized as the ‘California of the North’, and like San Francisco in the United States, Vancouver has attracted individuals from across Canada and throughout the world. At the same time, Vancouver like Toronto has long been a Canadian mecca for lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, transgendered and transsexual persons.

The City of Vancouver is the center of commercial, recreational and cultural activity on the Canadian west coast, and is the most densely populated and most urban city in the metropolitan Vancouver region. It is not surprising, then, that the City of Vancouver rather than the suburban cities is home to large, active, organized and rather visible gay and lesbian communities. These are concentrated in two main gay/lesbian neighborhoods or “ghettos”: the largest and most visible gay/lesbian presence in the city is located in the Downtown/West End area; the other area lies to the east and is centered around Commercial Drive (see Appendices 2 and 3). The downtown/West End is commonly known as the gay male enclave and the Commercial area the

\(^2\) Population data based on the July 1, 1995 PEOPLE projection data program at B.C. Statistics. The data from the 1991 Canadian Census for the Metropolitan Vancouver CMA is 1,696,386, and for the City of Vancouver 491,636.
lesbian neighborhood, although of course lesbians live, work and play in the West End and vice versa for gay men in the Commercial Drive Area.

The Vancouver gay/lesbian communities are served by a variety of media, including: two free newspapers (the monthly Angles and the biweekly Xtra West); a local monthly cable television program; and radio programs on both university stations, as well as on the non-profit Co-op Radio station. In addition, both gay/lesbian areas of the city are home to community centers (the Gay/Lesbian Center of Vancouver in the West End and the Vancouver Lesbian Center on Commercial), as well as bookstores, coffee houses, cafes, and other commercial establishments which cater (either exclusively or predominantly) to a very diverse gay/lesbian clientele. Some of these establishments display flags or signs which signify that they are "gay-friendly", if not gay-owned. Most of the gay/lesbian bars and nightclubs in the city are located in the West End. The only exclusively lesbian bar in the city, however, is located in the Heritage House Hotel\textsuperscript{21} in the Downtown Eastside near Chinatown.

Recent articles in the U.S. gay/lesbian press have depicted a retreat of lesbians and gay men from the traditional (gay/lesbian) ghettos located in the inner cities of the large, metropolitan centers, in favor of the surrounding suburbs.\textsuperscript{22} While these articles suggest a contraction of the gay ghettos in the inner cities of America, and an increase in gay/lesbian visibility in the suburbs, the situation in Vancouver remains quite different. In Greater Vancouver, there is growth in the inner city gay and lesbian enclaves, but there are few signs of organized gay/lesbian life in the suburbs.

\\textsuperscript{21} The Heritage House's location outside of the two gay/lesbian ghettos and in the very poor Downtown Eastside area make it an interesting, if somewhat isolated, enclave.

\textsuperscript{22} Both the March 1995 issue of OUT and the March 8, 1995 issue of The Advocate devoted full-length articles to an examination of the trend toward a "move to the suburbs" amongst once urban-dwelling lesbians and gay men in cities like Detroit, San Francisco, Chicago, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Dallas. The articles note that an increasing number of lesbian/gay commercial establishments such as bars (once the sole preserve of the inner city) are emerging in middle-class suburban districts.
The visibility of lesbians and gay men in Vancouver and their concomitant invisibility in the suburbs has important methodological implications for any survey of lesbians and gay men. Firstly, if one is limited solely to the gay/lesbian enclaves, then one’s sample may be skewed towards “joiners” at the expense of “non-joiners”\(^{23}\). If one is able to access only those who are active in gay/lesbian communities, and who frequent establishments in gay/lesbian areas, then one misses out on the experiences of those individuals who do not. These are the individuals in the suburbs, the small towns and rural regions that are so rarely included in studies of lesbians and gay men, but who are also homosexual.

B. Surveying Lesbians and Gay Men: Methodological Concerns

A number of academics (Harry, 1990b, 1986 and 1982; Friend, 1990; Berger, 1992) have noted that studies of lesbians and gay men are frequently limited in two fundamental respects: the extent to which they can be seen as being representative of gay and lesbian communities, and the degree to which they suffer from a sampling bias. Each of these issues needs to be addressed in relation to this study of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Gay/lesbian research cannot make the same claims about being “representative” of its population as can other sociological research focused on more “mainstream” social groups. In fact, studies of homosexuality and gay and lesbian life and lifestyles underline the fact that lesbians and gay men remain on the margins of society despite recent gains toward social acceptance and understanding. Reflecting this, there are no questions pertaining to sexual orientation in either the

\(^{23}\) Joseph Harry uses the terms “joiners” and “non-joiners” to differentiate between lesbians and gay men whose lifestyle or identity intersects with what he calls the “gay world”. Thus “joiners” refers to those lesbians and gay men who participate in the social structures of organized gay/lesbian life such as bars or other commercial establishments catering to a gay/lesbian clientele, gay/lesbian organizations, or if s/he has a number of gay/lesbian friends who are also active in gay areas, issues, events etc. “Non-joiners”, then, refers to those lesbians and gay men who do not live in or near or otherwise participate in this organized gay/lesbian world. It is these individuals that one has most difficulty reaching in any non-probability sampling of the population.
Canadian Census, the General Social Survey or the National Crime Survey.\textsuperscript{24} Since there is no aggregation of data defining the overall gay and lesbian population, and since representativeness depends on the extent to which a sample's "aggregate characteristics closely approximate those same aggregate characteristics in the population" (Babbie, 1992: 196), one can never state with any real certainty whether one's sample is in fact representative of lesbian and gay lifestyles, experiences, families and households. Harry has made the point that even if questions concerning sexual orientation were included in national surveys, the fear of disclosing one's sexual orientation, even over the phone, may preclude our gaining an accurate or representative slice of the general gay/lesbian population (Harry, 1990b: 92).

Harry (1990b: 101) has noted that "a probability sampling procedure permits one to locate other groups of men [and women] who report homosexual attractions but who do not participate often in the gay world", and he correctly argues that the time may well have come to attempt probability surveys in order to determine more accurately the percentage of the population that is homosexual. Since probability samples are not restricted to large metropolitan regions, and in fact enable researchers to access persons and households in suburban, small town and rural areas, they are, as Harry notes, able to "locate the rarer and less visible homosexual subgroups, and to know the all-important demographics of the homosexual population"\textsuperscript{25} (Harry, 1990b: 103). While this may allow for a better understanding of what a representative sample of lesbians and gay men would entail, the probability sample technique is also limited. Harry acknowledges, for example, that while it may be one thing to have successfully "assessed the respondent's sexual orientation" in a probability sample, attempting to ask "related questions on sexual behavior or participation in the gay world" is quite another thing altogether (Harry, 1990b: 102). Many

\textsuperscript{24} In 1995 Australia will become the first country to include questions related to sexual orientation in its National Census. New Zealand has approved similar questions for its next Census. There is no indication that either Canada or the United States, plan to include similar questions in their next Census.

\textsuperscript{25} Significantly, Harry's recent probability survey of gay men (only) uncovered surprising demographic data—data that are clearly different from that usually derived through more conventional gay/lesbian research techniques.
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lesbians and gay men will be unable or unwilling to disclose this information in anonymity over the telephone, let alone in the presence of someone collecting data for a census. Given this conundrum, it seems that the possibility of obtaining a representative sample of lesbians and gay men remains somewhat illusory. We are therefore left with the issue of the sampling bias inherent in studies that do not employ probability sampling techniques.

The lack of data concerning sexual orientation in national surveys and the census, and the difficulties entailed in collecting detailed experiential attributes through probability sampling, mean that each new study of lesbians and gay men depends on the creation of a new sample data set procured through "purposive sampling". Babbie describes this process as "a type of non-probability sampling method in which the researcher uses his or her own judgment in the selection of sample numbers" based on the researcher's "own knowledge of the population, its elements, and the nature of [the] research aims" (Babbie, 1992: 233).

Harry, (1190b), Friend (1990), and Berger (1992), all argue that the purposive technique reflects a sampling bias that over-represents "active gays [and lesbians], for whom their sexual orientation constitutes a lifestyle" (Friend, 1990: 252). At the same time there is a concomitant under representation of closeted individuals or "secret gays" (Berger, 1992: 87) who according to Friend (1990: 252) "have internalized heterosexist discourse and have either repressed their sexuality or hide it". Purposive sampling tends to exclude lesbians and gay men living outside of the large metropolitan centers, or those who do live in metropolitan centers but who do not participate in "the social structures of the gay world, e.g., bars, gay organizations and friendship networks"26 (Harry, 1990: 90).

---

26 Despite the relatively small size of his sample (16 males out of 663 claimed to be homosexual and 5 bisexual with 15 refusing to answer the question concerning sexual orientation), Harry (1990b) found that a probability sample uncovered some very interesting data that quite likely would not have been accessed by a study using the purposive method. He found, for example, that 54% of these gay and bisexual men did not have a regular gay associate; that 42% were married to women; that 30% had children in school; and that 49% had incomes under $19,999 per year; while only 19% lived in large cities compared to 23% who lived in a suburb of a large city and 52% lived in a small town. Another 6% lived in rural areas.
I employed the easier and much less costly purposive method based own my own knowledge of not only the two gay and lesbian “ghettos” in the City of Vancouver, but also of the various events and gay (and non-gay) businesses, organizations and other establishments which afford access to the “communities”. This study uses a number of procedures in a variety of gay and non-gay contexts in order to gather data that reflect the diversity of gay and lesbian lifestyles in Greater Vancouver.

C. Distributing the Survey

1. High Hopes: A Regional Distribution

I attempted to overcome some of the sampling biases inherent in the purposive method by writing to all of the public libraries and public recreational centers throughout the Greater Vancouver Area, requesting permission to distribute the survey at these locations. In each instance I received a negative response; apparently none of these establishments allows independent surveys to be distributed on their premises. The loss of the public libraries and municipal recreation centers was unfortunate for two reasons. First, it offered a possible circumvention of the sampling biases inherent in distributing the survey through more conventional channels such as gay/lesbian publications, bars etc. Second, and perhaps more importantly, these public facilities are located throughout metropolitan Vancouver including the suburbs. Having lost these facilities as places for distributing the surveys, I was restricted to the “friendlier” confines of the two gay and lesbian “ghettos”: the Downtown/West End and Commercial Drive areas of Vancouver proper. Getting the survey into the suburbs seemed an impossible task given my budgetary constraints, and in many respects the distribution of the survey itself took on the characteristics of the gay and lesbian scene in Vancouver: visible and accessible in the urban city, but invisible and inaccessible in the suburbs.
2. Reality Check: The Method of Distribution in Vancouver

Having resigned myself to the fact that the survey would be confined to the Commercial Drive and Downtown/West End neighborhoods, I believed that the most effective way of combating the sampling biases (generally associated with gay/lesbian research involving the purposive distribution method) was to use a variety of strategies for distributing the survey.

3. Strategy One: Gay/Lesbian Pride Festivals

The survey was first distributed on June 25, 1994, at the Stonewall Festival in Grandview Park on Commercial Drive. This was the first of two summer gay/lesbian festivals in Vancouver, attracting an estimated 5,000 participants. The festival commemorates the 1969 riots at the Stonewall Inn in New York City, an event that is often cited as the beginning of the contemporary gay/lesbian rights movement, and so lends itself well to displaying and discussing socio-political "causes" and concerns. The Stonewall Festival proved to be fertile ground for distributing the survey, since I was able to collect 93 surveys there.

I rented a table at the festival and (thanks to a very supportive festival organizer) I found myself in an excellent location in the middle of the "tables area". I invited (and at times hailed) individuals to either fill out a survey and drop it into the clearly marked boxes positioned at either end of the table, or take one with them and mail it into the P.O. Box number printed on the survey (I had rented a post office box for six months on Denman Street in the West End). Some participants at the festival offered that since they had never experienced anti-gay/lesbian victimization, they probably should not complete a survey. I always responded that it is just as important to know both what forms of victimization people have and have not experienced, whereupon most individuals agreed to complete a survey.27

---

27 Even as I entreated individuals who had not experienced victimization to participate, I became worried that this might skew the results. What if other individuals who had not experienced victimization believed that they should not complete the survey and I was not there to reassure them that their participation was still important? As it turned out, this was not really the case.
The second and larger gay/lesbian summer festival in Vancouver occurs during the first week of August on the B.C. Day long weekend. Again I was located at a table (thanks to the generosity of the Vancouver Pride Society who donated half of their table space to me), with surveys, pens, and a box to collect completed surveys. Since at Stonewall there were often far too many people completing surveys simultaneously for everyone to utilize the table to write on, I brought four clipboards to the Pride festival. This allowed some individuals to more easily complete surveys when there was a crowd of people clustered around the table. Like Stonewall, the Pride Festival is a day of celebration and fun. However, I found Pride Day participants much less interested in both sacrificing the time to complete the survey, and in having to deal with the rather disconcerting issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Perhaps this in part accounts for the fact that I received only 53 surveys at the Pride Festival, when there were an estimated 20,000 participants at the event.

4. Strategy Two: Collecting the Survey in Boxes at Select Locations

The second distribution strategy involved creating a number of boxes to collect surveys and placing them in various businesses and other establishments in both the Downtown/West End and Commercial Drive areas. The boxes themselves were all uniform in design and looked exactly like those I had used at the festivals. I chose standard “liquor store” cardboard boxes which I papered over with thick white wrapping paper. On each side of each box I pasted a (8½”×11”) sign that in bold, black type read: “drop anti-gay/lesbian [or anti-lesbian/gay in lesbian or women-oriented establishments] violence surveys here”. I cut a small, narrow slot into the top of each box which allowed individuals to drop their surveys into the box, but which made them inaccessible to others. I decided to drop boxes at a number of gay and non-gay establishments. In both cases the criteria for locating a box in a particular establishment included: prior permission from the owner/manager, and places where individuals tend to “hang out” and which have tables or counters conducive to completing a survey (generally this meant places like coffee houses and...
similar centers of social life). The response from the owners and managers of these establishments was overwhelmingly positive. Of all the businesses I approached, only one chain of coffee houses refused to participate, on the grounds that their corporate policy forbids the distribution of surveys that are not their own. At the same time it should be noted that my familiarity with both areas enabled me to pick out establishments I assumed would be willing to participate. The following list indicates where boxes were dropped, whether they are gay or non-gay establishments, and (in parentheses) the total number of surveys received from this location. (See Appendices 2 and 3 for maps identifying these locations.)

**Commercial Drive**

*Non-gay establishments*
- La Quena Latin Coffee House (9)
- The Book Mantel Feminist Bookstore (3)

*Gay establishment*
- The Vancouver Lesbian Center (5)

**Downtown/West End**

*Non-gay establishments*
- Otooz Fresh Juice Bar (22)
- Delany’s Coffee House (5)
- Pacific Cinematheque (5)
- YWCA of Downtown Vancouver (5)

*Gay establishments*
- Gay/Lesbian Center of Vancouver (23)
- Little Sisters Gay/Lesbian Bookstore (5)
- The Edge Coffee House (*Scene of a brutal, well-publicized gay-bashing incident in April 1994*) (56)
- Denman Station Gay/Lesbian Club (9)
- Heritage House Hotel Gay/Lesbian Pub (21)
- The Lotus Club Lesbian Bar (*in the Heritage House Hotel*) (4)

**Other**

- Simon Fraser University Women’s Centre (*Burnaby Mountain Campus*) (4)
- Out On Screen Annual Gay/Lesbian Film Festival (*Two organizers of the festival offered to take the surveys and a box to collect them in at five different venues during the festival- located in the Downtown, Mount Pleasant and Commercial areas*) (7)
The number of surveys from the Commercial Drive area was much lower than anticipated. I believe that this is in large part due to the concerns of a First Nations woman who objected to the survey on the grounds that it obfuscated cultural differences between "white" and First Nations peoples concerning issues of both sexuality and violence. Like some other women I spoke with, she also expressed concerns that the survey did not seek information concerning victimization based on gender, race or class. Due to her concerns, the owner of one of the Commercial establishments decided that the survey was "flawed" and made it quite hidden and inaccessible for most of its time in this location on Commercial.

5. Strategy Three: Distribution through Newspapers

I distributed the survey in the July 1994 issue of Angles, a free gay/lesbian/bisexual newspaper with a circulation of 17,000. Angles is delivered to a variety of gay and non-gay establishments in the Downtown/West End, Mount Pleasant, Kitsilano, False Creek and Commercial Drive areas, as well as other sites in Greater Vancouver. The editorial collective at Angles donated an entire page of the July issue for the survey. Readers were asked to remove this page from the paper and mail it to the P.O. box or fax it to me at the fax number printed on the survey. Angles also provided me with a "drawer number" at their office where individuals could drop their surveys. I received 40 copies of the Angles copy of the survey in the mail, while 3 were faxed to me and 6 were dropped off in the drawer at Angles.

In addition, I had surveys inserted into 1,500 copies of the August 17, 1994 issue of the West End Times, a free weekly newspaper with a distribution of 15,000 throughout the Downtown/West End area. This newspaper is delivered to businesses, institutions and apartment building lobbies. I requested that copies of the newspaper containing the survey be left at: the Central Branch and Joe Fortes branches of the Vancouver Public Library; the YMCA of Downtown Vancouver; the Robson Street and the Granville Island Public Markets; The Pacific Centre Shopping Mall; and at the Waterfront, Burrard, Granville and Stadium Skytrain (rapid
transit) stations. Remaining copies of the newspaper containing the survey were distributed at random to businesses and apartment buildings throughout the West End. I received 20 surveys from this source.

In total, I received 430 surveys. Two were excluded because they were missing too much information, and eight were excluded because they were completed by heterosexuals. This left 420 usable surveys.

D. The Survey Instrument: Replication and Originality

1. Replication

The survey is modeled on a sample survey by Berrill and Herek (1992: 285-7) as well as two other surveys on anti-gay/lesbian violence in the United States. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) in Washington, D.C., produces an annual survey and the Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force (PLGTF) surveyed Philadelphia and the entire state of Pennsylvania (Gross, 1992, 1986). Herek and Berrill (1990) have argued that surveys on anti-gay/lesbian violence should include questions dealing with such topics as: the type of attack and its severity; the number and type of assailants involved; whether the assailants were known by the victim; where the incidents occurred; and whether the victimization was disclosed to others (Herek and Berrill, 1990: 416). In addition to these concerns, Harry has argued that there is a need to know more than the extent and nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence but also the extent to which it can be shown to be related to various lifestyle attributes, namely: where one lives; whether and how often one frequents gay/lesbian establishments; the extent to which those victimized conform to popular stereotypes of what lesbians and gay men look, sound and act like; and the extent to which those victimized are out to friends, family, co-workers and others (Harry, 1990: 356-7).

Like the surveys created by Berrill and Herek, the NGLTF, and the PLGTF, this survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Vancouver is designed to capture demographic information
concerning the respondents' place of residence, gender, race, age, income, education, sexual orientation, marital status, and parenthood and custody issues. Like these other surveys, it also contains questions dealing with both the number and types of anti-gay/lesbian incidents experienced by respondents. These range from verbal threats and intimidation to physical and sexual assault and harassment as well as victimization experienced at work, at school, and at the hands of both family members and the police. The purpose of both the NGLTF and PLGTF surveys has been, first, to bring attention to the seriousness of the problem, and second, to collect data for government authorities and the lesbians and gay communities. They are not academic analyses of anti-gay/lesbian violence and victimization. As a consequence, they tend to be much more limited in scope than the survey created for this thesis project in Vancouver.

2. Originality

This survey attempts a deeper and more thorough examination of anti-gay lesbian victimization, unlike the rather more descriptive surveys produced by the U.S. Lesbian and Gay Task Forces- which are limited to the kinds of issues raised by Herek and Berrill. In view of the important and often competing claims made by both Harry (1982) and Miller and Humphreys' (1980) concerning the effects of one's lifestyle and personal attributes with one's proneness to victimization, it was necessary to create a survey instrument that went beyond demographic information and the types of victimization experienced.28 This survey therefore include questions concerning whom the respondent was out to and to what extent; how often she or he frequents lesbian and gay establishments, her or his involvement with lesbian/gay groups and politics and whether she or he considers her or himself to be a member of the lesbian or gay "communities".

28 Miller and Humphreys' findings were culled from reports of anti-gay/lesbian victimization in newspapers and magazines while Harry's results emerged out of a quantitative survey whose scope and method is closely approximated here.
It was expected that these questions would more clearly illustrate the relationship (if any) between lifestyle and victimization.

In addition to the questions concerning the relationship between lifestyle and victimization, the survey includes questions dealing with the extent to which the respondent is out, the extent to which she or he conforms to gay/lesbian stereotypes, and whether incidents were reported, and to whom. The inclusion of these various types of questions make possible a number of cross-tabulations illustrating the effects of lifestyle and one's level of "outness" and integration into the gay and lesbian communities, with one's likelihood of reporting victimization, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of homophobic victimization in Greater Vancouver.

Harry's (1982) research results indicate that the majority of anti-gay incidents occur in gay areas, especially near gay establishments such as bars or gay/lesbian centers. In view of these findings, I asked respondents to indicate where incidents occurred (including whether they occurred in gay neighborhoods, non-gay neighborhoods, suburban or rural areas; in the respondent's home, in the respondent's parents home or in someone else's home; whether they occurred on public transit; in a (gay) "cruising area", inside a bar or restaurant, or near a lesbian/gay business or establishment). The answers to these questions are important for two reasons. First, if they reveal a high number of incidents in gay areas or near gay establishments, then we may accept Harry's argument (and one of the hypotheses of this thesis) that lesbians and gay men are more prone to victimization when in gay-identified areas and/or in the vicinity of gay establishments. Second, such an illustration may prove useful for authorities in legitimating both the inclusion of sexual orientation in Federal legislation on hate crimes and the expenditure of increased police patrols on the streets in gay-identified areas.

What is interesting about Harry's analysis is that it adduces the disturbing but common-sense notion that in some instances, it seems, individuals may be targeted simply because of their appearance. If "activists" (as defined by Harry (1982)) are going into gay/lesbian areas looking for victims, they must have some notion of how to pick these victims out in a crowd. Most often they will do this by referencing popular stereotypes of what lesbians and gay men should look,
act, or be like. I included two questions on the survey dealing with the respondent’s appearance in order to quantify a relationship between a) those who believe that others perceive them to be gay/lesbian (versus “straight”) and b) those who see themselves as conforming “a lot” (versus “a little” or “not at all”) to gay/lesbian stereotypes, and the levels of victimization experienced. The issue of self-perception and appearance may be important in another respect, namely that those lesbians and gay men who believe that others think they look lesbian or gay (and conform to stereotypes) may be less likely to report incidents out of a fear of secondary victimization. The extent to which one conforms to popular stereotypes of lesbians or gay men may also influence either the kind of treatment one might receive, or at least the kinds of treatment one may believe she or he might receive at the hands of (homophobic) police officers if she or he does report incidents.

In addition to the questions described above, respondents were asked for their views as to whether (or not) anti-gay/lesbian violence is increasing, decreasing or staying the same; whether she or he fears for her or his safety in Greater Vancouver; the likelihood that, in the future, she or he will be discriminated against, harassed, threatened with violence, physically attacked, and murdered. The final question on the survey asked respondents to indicate what she or he believes could be done to combat anti-gay/lesbian violence in the Lower Mainland.

Throughout the design of the survey, I attempted to include questions that went beyond simply a description or measurement of anti-gay/lesbian violence and victimization. Instead I included questions that would allow me both to test (quantify) my research hypotheses and questions, as well as to probe more deeply the issues in ways that ultimately allow for a more comprehensive understanding of homophobic violence.

3. Closed and Open-ended Questions

The majority of the survey questions involve close-ended responses, that is, the respondent is provided with alternatives in answering a particular question. These may involve simple, straight
forward responses such as “yes”, “no” or “don’t know”, or they may require the respondent to use a rating scale when responding. These may involve nominal (or categorical) responses (such as “male” or “female”, “gay”, “lesbian” or “bisexual”), or ordinal responses, where the respondent is asked to answer in a rank order (such as “did not complete high school” through to “university degree or more” for level of education achieved). Infrequently, respondents are offered category scales. For these questions, the respondent is asked to choose between a limited number of ordered responses (such as “never”, “sometimes” or “always” or “risen a lot”, “risen a little”, “stayed the same”, “decreased a little”, “decreased a lot”). These ordered categories are necessary when the response to a close-ended question aims at ascertaining some sort of degree.

While the majority of questions on the survey are closed, there are ten open-ended questions. Each of these questions allows respondents to elaborate on particular questions deemed to be either too important to restrict to a narrow (closed) choice, or where close-ended responses might unwisely presuppose typical responses to complex questions. The ten open-ended questions were as follows:

1. Why do you (or do you not) consider yourself to be a member of a gay/lesbian community?
2. To what type of gay/lesbian groups do you belong?
3. Describe your most recent experience in an anti-gay/lesbian incident.
4. Why have you never sought medical attention when you needed it?
5. Describe the victimization you experienced from teachers and school officials.
6. If you have experienced anti-gay violence, threats or harassment which could have been reported to the local police but have not reported them, why not?
7. If you have reported incidents to a gay/lesbian agency, describe the type of service you used.
8. Why are you more (or less) likely to seek assistance from a gay or lesbian service?
9. Why have you not told anyone until now that you have been physically attacked due to your sexual orientation?
10. What do you think would be most effective in combating anti-gay/lesbian violence in the Lower Mainland?

In order to analyze the data provided by these questions, the responses that appeared most frequently for each open-ended question were coded as the typical responses for that question. Those few responses that did not fit into one of the typical responses were coded as “other”.
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E. Data Measurement

The dependent variable in this analysis is the actual victimization that respondents have experienced. Victimization was broken down into two sections: discrimination, and harassment and violence.

Questions in the discrimination section were broken down into three sections: employment, school and housing.29 Those dealing with employment discrimination asked whether the respondent had been discriminated in terms of hiring, promotion, termination, performance/evaluation, and lost customers/clients. Here, respondents were asked whether they had been called anti-gay/lesbian names, been threatened with violence or been physically assaulted. In the housing section, respondents were asked if the had been discriminated against in terms of either the purchase or renting of a home. I also asked respondents whether they were afraid they might experience future discrimination related to employment, housing and custody of their children, and if so, the extent to which they concealed their sexual orientation as a result of this fear.

The section concerning harassment and violence asked respondents if they had ever experienced any of the following due to their sexual orientation: been verbally insulted; had their personal property damaged or stolen; been seriously harassed; been threatened with violence; had objects thrown at them; been chased or followed; been punched, hit, kicked or beaten (both sexually and non-sexually); been assaulted with a weapon (both sexually and non-sexually); been both harassed or beaten by police; and been blackmailed.

In both the sections on discrimination and forms of violence, I asked respondents to differentiate between incidents that had occurred within the past 12 months and those that had occurred prior to that time. I did this in order to get an indication of the level and types of

---

29 Actually, questions in the school section the questions were concerned less with discrimination and more with harassment and victimization
incidents that have occurred most recently in Greater Vancouver. In addition, asking respondents to specify victimization that has occurred in the past twelve months alone establishes a starting point for longitudinal studies aimed at comparing the amount of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Greater Vancouver over a period of time. It should be noted, however, that having the data separated into these two categories made it much more difficult for me to work with the results, especially in terms of testing hypotheses relating victimization to personal and lifestyle attributes such as outness, neighborhood of residence and the like. As a result, I have collapsed the two categories together so that each case represents all victimization experienced by that particular respondent.30

I also asked respondents to indicate how often these incidents had occurred. To indicate the number of times she or he experienced each incident, I asked respondents to mark a “zero” if she or he had never experienced this incident, a “one” if she or he had experienced this incident once, and a “two” if she or he had experienced this incident more than once in both the past twelve months and prior to that time. I also asked respondents to indicate where the incidents occurred as well as a number of questions concerning the perpetrators.

Respondents were also asked to indicate how often they go out in the evenings to lesbian/gay establishments (e.g., bars). Those who indicated that they never or very rarely go out to these places were assigned a rank of “low”, while those who claimed that they go out to bars and other establishments once to three times per week were ranked “medium” for this question; those who frequent gay/lesbian establishments four or more times per week received a “high” ranking for the question. In some instances respondents indicated the number of times per month, or how many times in a year they go out to gay/lesbian establishments. In these instances, I translated monthly or yearly responses into weekly equivalents in order to assign consistent low, medium, and high scores (i.e., “4 times per month = once per week = “low”).

30 For details as to how this was done please see sub-section ii, “Collapsing Victimization Data”, in Section F, “Data Analysis Techniques”, below.)
F. Data Analysis Techniques

In order to test my research hypotheses, I needed to quantify the relationship between the dependent variables relating to victimization, and the independent variables relating to where incidents occurred, who perpetrated them, which lifestyle or personal attributes (if any) caused some individuals to be especially prone to victimization, and whether incidents were reported to authorities and others. One of the key variables in the hypotheses relates to outness, or the extent to which one is out about her/his sexual orientation at work, to family and to friends. I believed that the answers 'yes' or 'no' to the question “Are you out” would allow me to quantify these relationships. As it happened, a full 90.9% or 380/420 respondents answered affirmatively to the question, making legitimate comparisons virtually impossible. In order to redress this statistical problem, I needed to create an “outness scale” based upon the respondents’ answers to the questions dealing with the extent to which she or he claimed to be out to at work, to family members, and to friends.

1. The Outness Scale

I created an outness score table with three discrete categories: work, family, and friends. The work category included respondents’ answers to the extent to which she or he is out to “supervisors” and “co-workers”; the family section included the answers to the extent to which she or he is out to “brothers”, “sisters” and “other relatives” (unfortunately, due to a typographical error, “parents” did not appear on the survey as a particular indicator; it was assumed that most respondents would include parents in the “other relatives” indicator). Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were out to “none”, “some” or “all” of the previous categories.
I assigned a numerical value of zero to “none”, one to “some” and two to “all”. If a respondent indicated “all” for both “supervisors” and “co-workers”, then she or he would be seen to be out to a significant degree at work and would be given two points for outness there. If the respondent answered “none” to both “supervisors” and “co-workers”, then she or he would be considered to be quite closeted at work and would receive zero points for outness at the workplace. If, however, the respondent answered “none” for supervisors and “all” to “co-workers”, (or vice versa), then she or he would be considered to be out to “some” extent at work and would receive one point on the outness scale. The same scenario pertains to the family categories. If one answered “all” to all three family indicators (“brother”, “sister”, “other relatives”) then she or he would be considered very out to family members and would receive two points for the family category. If the respondent was not out to any of these family members, then she or he would receive zero points for the family category. If the respondent indicated “some” for any of the three categories (even if the other(s) were “non” or “all”, then she or he would be considered to be out to “some” family members and would receive one point for the family category. There was only one possible indicator for friends (friends), so no calculation of indicators was necessary here; the respondent indicated “none”, “some” or “all” to the friends indicator and was assigned zero, one or two points for the friends category based on this response.

Point totals for the three categories ranged for a possible low of zero to a possible high of six. I totaled the respondent’s points totals for the three categories and if she or he scored zero or one point then she or he would be considered to be “low” on the outness scale, if she or he scored two or three points then she or he scored “medium” on the scale. If the respondent’s responses totaled five or six points then she or he was considered to be very out and scored “high” on the outness scale. The exceptions to this scoring occurred when respondents reported a “not-applicable” or if the response was “missing” for any one or two of the three categories, but she or he had answered for the other(s). In this case the missing or not-applicable category would be
ignored and the score would be pro-rated to reflect a high, medium or low score on the outness scale. The following examples illustrate this point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>NA.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Outness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(NA.)</td>
<td>(NA.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(NA.)</td>
<td>(NA.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this situation, the respondent would have scored “some” or one point for family since she or he is only out to some “other relatives”, and two points for friends since she or he is out to “all” friends. The respondent cannot be penalized for not having any applicable work situation and thus although she or he only scores three points here on the scale she or he would be considered to be “high” on the outness scale since she or he scored three out of a possible four points. Here is one further illustration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>NA.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Outness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(NA.)</td>
<td>(NA.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>some</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this case, the respondent would not be penalized for the missing information for the supervisor indicator, but would score “low” in the work category based on her/his response of “none” for “co-workers”. Similarly, she or he would not be penalized for not having any sisters, but would instead receive a score of one point for family since she or he is out to only “some” family members. Finally, the respondent would get one point for being out to “some” friends. This respondents’ total points score would be 2/6 for a “low” outness score.

When the outness variable was recoded in this manner, it was determined that a total of 44 or 10.5% of respondents actually scored “low”, 179 or 42.6% scored “medium”, and 195 or 46.4% scored “high”. These figures are broken down by gender in Table 2-1: Level of Outness Score, by Sex:

![Figure 2-1: Level of Outness Score, by Sex](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Outness&quot; Score</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the relatively low number of individuals in the “low” category (in relation to “medium” and “high”), I collapsed “low” and “medium” together to form a single “low/medium” category, and retained the responses in the “high” category for comparative purposes.

2. **Collapsing Victimization Data**

As I indicated above, I decided that it would be considerably easier to work with the victimization data if it was not separated into the two categories of “Since May 1993” and “Prior to that time”. Collapsing this data into single victimization variables, then, required the maintenance of a consistent formula, based on rather obvious guidelines. For example, if one had not experienced a particular type of victimization in the past year and had reported experiencing it
once prior to that time, then obviously, that person would be said to have experienced this once in
the single victimization category. Likewise, if the respondent had not experienced this form of
victimization prior to the past year, but had since May 1993, then she would again score “once” in
the new category. On the other hand, if she had experienced a form of victimization once in the
past year and more than once prior to that time, then she would maintain a “more than once”
score for that category in the new variable. While these are rather straightforward examples,
several are less so. These less obvious examples are summarized in the table below (the
victimization for each example is verbal insults):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization</th>
<th>Since May 1993</th>
<th>Prior to May 1993</th>
<th>New Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbally Insulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>more than once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one</td>
<td>more than once</td>
<td>more than once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>once</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>once</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. *Statistical Procedures for Data Analysis*

The principle means of statistical presentation and analysis is univariate and bivariate. More
specifically, I rely on univariate analysis to present demographic information and other descriptive
statistics, and bivariate analysis when cross-tabulating variables and when seeking to test
hypotheses. In terms of hypothesis-testing, the level of significance used in all instances is the
Chi-square value generated by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program (S.P.S.S.).
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G. Limitations of the Study

The primary limitations of the study center on the method of distribution, most notably the limitations inherent in the purposive sampling method. The survey may be viewed as a sample of what Harry terms “joiners” (Harry, 1990b: 355), that is individuals for whom sexuality constitutes both the basis of an identity and lifestyle. Entirely closeted individuals would be quite unlikely to frequent many of the venues where the surveys and boxes were located. They would also not likely be found in attendance at gay/lesbian festivals. Like other surveys of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals that use the purposive method, this survey under-represents youth under 19 years of age, and individuals 60 years and over (each category of which is 1.9% of respondents). Also, the survey is limited by the small geographical scope of distribution. The lack of presence in the suburbs of Greater Vancouver means that the survey is, in some respects, a survey about the City of Vancouver.

On the other hand, the survey did manage to fall into the hands of a number of individuals who reside in the suburbs (13.4%), and only 41.6% of respondents actually live in the Downtown/West End neighborhood. The survey also quite successfully captured a wide ranging distribution in terms of income, education, and occupations.31 There was also an interesting range of lifestyles represented including: those who are very active and integrated into the gay/lesbian communities and those who are not at all; those who often frequent gay/lesbian establishments and those who never do. All these data, while limited, represent the most comprehensive aggregation of data on the gay/lesbian communities in Greater Vancouver and provide an important if tentative profile of the lesbian/gay communities of Greater Vancouver.

31 For a detailed summary of demographic information, see Chapter 3, “Findings”, section B. “Demographic Characteristics of the Sample”.

64
Chapter 3. Findings

A. Introduction

In the methods chapter we discussed why it is next to impossible to know with any certainty what a representative sample of the gay, lesbian and bisexual communities in Greater Vancouver would look like. The same factors that make a representative survey impossible also make it difficult to determine the actual extent and nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Vancouver (and elsewhere). Having acknowledged that, however, it is important to note that this survey on anti-gay/lesbian violence represents the largest Canadian survey to date concerned with the issue, and is one of the largest surveys of any kind of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals carried out in both Vancouver and Canada. Also, the survey results reveal interesting demographic, lifestyle, and victimization profiles of 420 more or less out lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in the metropolitan Vancouver region—profiles that are consistent with data that have been collected in other surveys on anti-gay/lesbian violence in both Canada and the United States. The results from this survey will be discussed in this chapter.

In section B, I present the socio-demographic composition of the sample and compare these demographic characteristics with those found in other surveys of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in both Canada and the United States. In section C, the extent of anti-lesbian/gay violence in Greater Vancouver is documented. In section D, I examine the nine research hypotheses by testing both the relationships between outness and conformity to stereotypes with the extent of victimization experienced and the relationships between lifestyle attributes (such as place of residence or integration into and involvement in lesbian and gay communities) and victimization. I correlate outness, conformity to stereotypes, and lifestyle attributes with the likelihood that incidents will be reported to authorities, as well as determine the primary reasons why respondents have not reported serious incidents to the police. Finally, section E presents an overall summary of the data.
B. Socio-Demographic Characteristics

This section illustrates the demographic composition of survey respondents and compares some of the key demographic data from this survey with data from three other surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence in both Canada and the United States. These comparisons allow us to evaluate the extent to which the demographic profile of this survey accords with other Canadian and American surveys that, for the most part, utilized a similar method of distribution. While these comparisons do not constitute representativeness, they do lend a measure of legitimacy to the findings of this thesis research by way of consistency. They also allow for a better understanding of the demographic features of our communities in Vancouver and other geographic locales.

1. Socio-Demographic Features of the Survey in Greater Vancouver

Socio-demographic data from this survey contain information concerning the following characteristics: sex; sexual orientation; age; race; education; income; occupation; marital status; same-sex relationships (including cohabitation, length of relationship); children and custody; city and neighborhood of residence; length of residence in Greater Vancouver; respondent's level of outness; conformity to gay and lesbian stereotypes; and activity in lesbian/gay communities, issues, groups and in Pride Day festivals ($N=420$).

- **SEX:** 71% (298) of the sample are male and 29% (122) are female.

---

32 These surveys are, in Canada, the Nova Scotia PIRG (1994), and the New Brunswick Human Rights Coalition surveys (1993); the U.S. data are taken from the PLGTF survey (1992).
SEXUAL ORIENTATION: 66.4% (279) of respondents refer to themselves as gay, while 24% (101) describe themselves as lesbian, and 9% (38) bisexual. Of the 38 bisexuals, 52.6% (20) are men and 47.4% (18) are women.

RACE: Overwhelmingly, the race of respondents is “White” 86.6% (368). Only 3.3% (14) of respondents are “Asian”, 2.4% (10) are “First Nations”, 0.7% (3) are “African-Canadian”, and 0.5% (2) are “Indo-Canadian”. In addition, 0.9% (4) describe themselves as “Mixed race” and 0.5% (2) claimed to be “Other”. Despite the uneasiness that many individuals have with respect to questions on race, this information is missing from two surveys only.

AGE: Harry, (1990) has noted that surveys of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals relying on non-probability sampling techniques tend to under-represent youth and the elderly, while over-representing respondents who are in their twenties and thirties.33 Predictably, Harry’s concern applies to this survey as well. For example, while youth and persons aged 60 and over represent only 1.9% (8) of the sample respectively, 32.6% (137) of respondents are 20 - 29 years of age, 39.9% (165) are between 30 - 39, 17.6% (74) are 40 - 49; and a total of 5.0% (21) of respondents are aged 50 - 59. There are 7 missing cases for age.

EDUCATION: As with many other surveys of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals, this survey reveals a high proportion of educated respondents. While only 86 or 20.4% of respondents have completed high school alone, 20% (84) have “some post secondary” education, 16.9% (71) have a “college or technical school diploma”, and 41.9% (176) have a “university degree or more”. Interestingly, women and men have similar levels of educational attendance.

INCOME: A total of 30.7% (129) of respondents report having an income of less than $15,000, 35.5% (149) have an income between $15,001 and 30,000, 19.8% (83) report an income level between $30,001 and 50,000, and only 12.6% (53) of the respondents report a personal income of $50,000 or more. These results are a foil to much right-wing, homophobic literature.

33 Harry argues that purposive samples of lesbian and gay communities are largely samples of what he termed “joiners” and that both youth and elderly persons tend not to be active “joiners”.
and rhetoric which suggests that since gay men, in particular, earn incomes well above the national average, they are neither discriminated against nor oppressed.34 Predictably, however, income disparities between men and women are quite significant (as Figure 3-1 illustrates):

![Figure 3-1: Income Levels by Sex](image)

- **OCCUPATION**: Respondents hold a wide variety of occupations, representing a diverse range of employment sectors in Greater Vancouver. Utilizing several of Statistics Canada’s employment sectors, we can see, for example, that the single largest category is "skilled white collar" work (16.7%). Other prominent sectors are: "Professional/Administrative" (9.5%); Art/Design/Literary Arts (7.9%); Clerical/Sales (5.7%); Hospitality/Service” (9.3); Medicine/Health (8.1%); Skilled Blue Collar (6.2%); and Teaching/Educational (5.7%). In addition, 9.5% of respondents are full-time students. There is a large number of missing cases (60 or 14.3%) for occupation.

---

34 The inflated income figures generally cited by the Right are often premised on data from surveys of gay men that use subscription lists from various publications as a means for locating respondents. Since, generally speaking, it is largely the educated and better off who subscribe to publications, one would expect incomes for these individuals would be relatively high.
MARITAL STATUS: In this thesis, the purpose of the marital status variable is to capture the legal marital status of respondents. Most respondents report themselves as “single” (72.4% or 304). Only 1.7% (7) are “married”; 7.9% (33) are “separated/divorced”; one respondent is “widowed”. Despite the fact that involvement in a same-sex relationship or being “partnered” was not an option on the survey for this category, 12.6% (53) of respondents wrote in “partnered”. There are 22 missing responses for marital status.

SAME-SEX RELATIONSHIPS: 45.7% (192) of respondents indicated that they are in a same-sex relationship compared to 53.1% (223) who are not. There were 5 missing responses for this category. Responses to a question on the length of these relationships challenge those who would argue that same-sex relationships are neither meaningful nor long-lasting (in comparison to heterosexual ones). For example, while 21.8% (43) of respondents are in relationships that are “less than one year old”, 39.6% (78) are involved in relationships of 1-4 years’ duration and 25.3% (50) are in relationships lasting 5 years or more. There are 26 missing responses to this question. Finally, of those who are in a relationship, 63.5% (127) are cohabiting. In most instances, individuals involved in relatively recent relationships are not (yet) cohabiting.

35 When I was distributing the survey at the Stonewall Festival, a number of individuals (primarily women) angrily challenged me as to why same-sex relationship was not an option here (I responded that the next question at the survey asks for this information). Those individuals who expressed this dissatisfaction were really, I believe, expressing their frustration that lesbian and gay relationships continue to be largely marginalized and de-legitimated throughout Canada (and North America).
CHILDREN AND CUSTODY: A total of 12.9% (54) of respondents report having children. Only 2 surveys are missing this information. Women (17.2%) (21) are more likely to report having children than are men (11.1%) (33). Of those with children, 12.3% (15) of the women and 2.0% (2) of the men have custody, while 1 woman and 2 men report having joint custody.

HIV/AIDS: A total of 10.7% (45) of respondents indicated that they are HIV+, compared with 76% (319) who claimed not to be, and 12.9% (54) who “don’t know”. Two surveys are missing responses to this question. When asked about AIDS, 2.4% (10) of respondents have AIDS, compared to 90% (378) who do not, and 6.7% (28) who “don’t know”. There are 4 missing responses to this question.

RESIDENCE: Respondents were asked to identify where they lived in the Greater Vancouver Area. Considering the difficulties involved in getting the survey into the suburbs, it is not surprising that the majority of respondents (81.9% or 344) live in the City of Vancouver. At the same time, however, 12.8% (54) reside in one of the major suburbs that surround Vancouver, and another 1.7% (7) live in the Fraser Valley. A total of 2.4% (10) people live in B.C., but outside of Greater Vancouver, and 0.7% (3) live in another province. Two respondents are U.S. residents living in Bellingham, but note that they spend time in the gay and lesbian communities in Vancouver.

NEIGHBORHOOD OF RESIDENCE: Despite the fact that the majority of survey drop sites were in the West End, and that the survey was inserted into 1,500 copies of a West End newspaper, a considerable number of respondents live in various other Vancouver neighborhoods. For example, while 40.5% (170) of respondents live in the West End, 21.0% (88) live in the Commercial Drive/East Vancouver area, 7.1% (30) live in Kitsilano or on the West Side of Vancouver, and 6.2% (26) live in Mount Pleasant. The distribution of neighborhood of residence and gender is represented in Figure 3-3. In the graph, one can observe the differences in the gender composition of the sample for both the West End (gay/male) and Commercial Drive (lesbian/female) enclaves.
BELONG TO A GAY OR LESBIAN COMMUNITY: The majority of respondents, both male and female, believe that they are members of a gay or lesbian community: 77% (94) of women and 79.5% (237) of men. In contrast, 6.6% (8) of the women and 6.4% (19) of the men didn’t know if they were part of a community based on sexual orientation. In terms of how feelings of belonging to a community vary by sexual orientation, the results indicate an important difference between lesbians and gay men, and bisexuals. While 81.2% (82/101) of females and 80.6% (225/279) of males in the sample believe they belong to a gay or lesbian community, bisexuals are more ambivalent, with only 63.2% (24/38) believing they are part of a community of individuals based on sexual orientation. Finally, only 5.0% (5/101) of lesbians and 6.1% (17/279) of gay men do not know if the are part of a gay or lesbian community, compared with 13.2% (5/38) of bisexuals. Many bisexuals feel they do not fit comfortably into either heterosexual society or gay/lesbian communities, since they challenge the pressure of mainstream society to be heterosexual on the one hand, and the pressure towards exclusive homosexuality in gay/lesbian subcultures on the other. These results underscore the difficult relationship between (some) bisexuals and lesbian/gay communities.

FREQUENT GAY/LESBIAN ESTABLISHMENTS: The results indicate that a slim majority of women (50.8% or 61/122) never or rarely go out to lesbian/gay establishments, and rate “low” in this category, compared to fewer men (29.2% or 87/298) who rate “low”. 60.1% (179/298) of males, and 47.5% (58/122) of females rate “medium”, and only 9.7% (29/298) of males, and
0.8% (1/122) of females rate “high” on the question concerning how often they frequent gay/lesbian establishments.\textsuperscript{36} Four surveys are missing information.

- **Activity in Lesbian/Gay Politics and Issues:** 48.4% of respondents are active in gay/lesbian politics and issues. One survey is missing this information. 12.4% (52/420) are “Very active”, 36.0% (151/420) are “Somewhat active”, 31.7% (133/420) are “Not too active”, and 19.8% (83/420) are “Not active at all” in gay/lesbian politics and issues. 11.6% (14/121) of female respondents are “Very” active in lesbian/gay issues, and 45.5% (55/298) are “Somewhat” active in lesbian/gay issues, compared to 12.8% (38/121) of males who are “Very”, and 32.2% (96/298) of males who are “Somewhat” active in gay/lesbian issues.

31.4% (38/121) of females, and 31.9% (95/298) of males describe themselves as “Not too” active, and 23.2% (69/298) of males and 11.6% (14/121) of females are “Not at all” active in lesbian/gay politics or issues. These results reveal a large number of politically active and issues-oriented persons in this sample, further supporting the belief that many lesbians and gay men believe they belong to an identifiable social minority with specific social, political, and cultural concerns.

- **Number and Type of Clubs, Groups, and Organizations:** In order to further address the extent to which respondents are active in and integrated into lesbian and gay communities, I asked two related questions concerning both the number and type of groups to which respondents belong. Excluding 29 missing responses, 62.9% (73/116) of female and 54.5% (150/275) of male respondents do not belong to any specifically lesbian/gay clubs groups or organizations, and 13.8% (16/116) of female and 21.5% (59/275) of male respondents belong to two or more lesbian/gay groups and organizations. 33.9% (59/174) belong to social or cultural groups, 16.9% (28/174) belong to recreational groups, 12.6% (28/174) are active in political groups, and 19.5% (34/174) belong to a combination of social/cultural/recreational or

\textsuperscript{36} On the survey, I asked respondents to indicate the number of times they go out in the evenings to lesbian/gay establishments (i.e. bars). I calculated a score of “low”, “medium” and “high” based on these responses (for an explanation of how this was done, see Chapter 2 “Methods”, section E, “Data Measurement”.)
political groups. 17.8% (31/174) of respondents belong to other types of groups (including workplace-oriented, self-help, educational and religious organizations).

PARTICIPATION IN PRIDE DAY PARADES: In gay/lesbian communities, “Pride Days” celebrate, among other things: the courage to come out in a largely unwelcoming society; the growth and scope of the gay/lesbian movement; the diversity of persons in the communities; and the affirmation of pride in who we are as individuals and communities in the face of continued social stigmatization, discrimination and rejection. Within the sample, 66.8% (199/298) of males, and 82.8% (101/122) of females have participated in Pride Day Parades. Excluding 33 missing responses, we find that of the men and women who have participated in these celebrations, 69.4% (127/183) of men and 60.6% (57/94) of women have done so 1 - 3 times, and 30.6% (56/183) of men, and 39.4% (37/94) of women have participated 4 or more times.

2. Comparing the Vancouver Data with Surveys in Canada and the United States

There are a number of consistencies between the demographic profile of respondents here and respondents in two Canadian surveys and one U.S. survey. Though exact comparisons for each category are not always possible, the NSPIRG survey at Dalhousie University (N=294), the survey by the New Brunswick Coalition for Human Rights Reform (N=176), and the survey by the Philadelphia and Pennsylvania by the Lesbian and Gay Task Force (N=2656), reveal interesting comparisons with the data found in the Vancouver survey. For example, 45% of respondents in Nova Scotia, 29% of respondents in New Brunswick, and 46% in Pennsylvania are female. Also, in the Nova Scotia survey, few males (2.8%) and females (5.6%) are under 19 years of age, and 0.8% of females and 6.3% of males are 50 years or older. In that survey, 21.5% of males and 18.2% of females are aged 20 - 29, 16.9% of males and females are 30 - 39, and 7.0% of males and 12.1% of females are 40 - 49 years of age. In the New Brunswick sample, 2% of the respondents are 20 years and younger, and 1% are 60 years of age or more. 43% are
21 to 30 years, 10% are 41 - 50 years, and 4% are 51 - 60. The median age of both men and women in the Pennsylvania survey is 33.

In terms of income, the results across surveys are also quite consistent. For example, 21.3% of males and 45% of females in the Nova Scotia survey earn annual incomes of less than $15,000, 30% of males and 18.4% of females earn $15,001 - 30,000, 1.3% of males and 16.7% of females earn $40,000 - 59,000, and only 4% of males and 2% of females in that study earn $60,000 or more. The median income for men and women in the Pennsylvania survey is $27,700 and $26,300, respectively.

In terms of level of education, the high level of education of respondents in the Vancouver survey dovetails with the sample data from New Brunswick; in that survey, 24% of respondents had up to a high school diploma, 19% had some university, and 57% had a university degree or more.

The Nova Scotia survey data reveal that 63.% of female and 56.5% of male respondents belong to a same-sex relationship. 29% of women and 39.8% of men in the Nova Scotia survey have been in a relationship for less than one year; 13% of women and 11.3% of men have been in a relationship for 1 - 3 years, and 6.4% of females and 8.3% of males have been in a relationship for more than 5 years (interestingly, an additional 6.4% of women, and 11.8% of men have been involved in the same relationship for 8 or more years). In the Pennsylvania survey, 71% of female and 47% of male respondents are involved in same-sex relationships, in which the median length is 5 years. While not inconsistent, the Nova Scotia results tend to suggest somewhat higher percentages of respondents in the lower categories, and lower numbers for the upper categories in comparison to the data from Vancouver.

In Nova Scotia, 20% of lesbian respondents, and 7.6% of gay male respondents have children. 77.8% of lesbians and none of the gay men have custody of their children. In the Pennsylvania sample, 15% of women and 10% of men have children. The data in both of these surveys coincides with the data in the Vancouver sample.
In sum, a comparison of the demographic characteristics of this survey in Greater Vancouver with the three other surveys reveals interesting parallels in the socio-demographic profiles of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals who have been surveyed through the purposive method in diverse geographical contexts. The general consistency of the data across surveys lends credibility and legitimacy to the research results in the Vancouver sample, and reveals some of the flaws inherent in the purposive sampling method. We now turn our attention to data that document the extent of anti-gay/lesbian victimization in Greater Vancouver.

C. Anti-Lesbian/Gay Violence in Greater Vancouver: The Results

Galtung has suggested (in Berk, 1990), that violence should be seen as anything that inhibits an individual from realizing her or his full potential. At the same time, both Garnets (1990) and Ehrlich (1990) argue that forms of discrimination and harassment are often as devastating psychologically as acute physical abuse. By including a number of variables that go beyond physical violence or “gay-bashing”, these considerations have been incorporated into the design of this survey on anti-gay/lesbian violence. The actual data are presented in five categories: 1) Discrimination; 2) Harassment; 3) Bashing (or actual physical assault),\(^{37}\) and 4) Most Recent Incident\(^{38}\). Several of the variables in each category are broken down by gender to reflect, separately, homophobic violence directed at women and men.

\(^{37}\) I have decided to use the rather informal term “bashing” here since it represents an entrenched and well recognized euphemism for “physical assault” in the gay and lesbian lexicon.

\(^{38}\) Short, descriptive statements for the Most Recent Incident variable were provided by respondents. A sample of these are included at the end of the Most Recent Incident section.
1. **Discrimination**

EMPLOYMENT: Respondents were asked to indicate ("Yes", "No" or "Not Applicable") whether they had experienced the following forms of discrimination at work: "Hiring"; "Promotion"; "Termination (Fired)"; "Performance/Evaluation"; and "Lost Customers/ Clients". If we exclude "Not Applicable", and "Missing" responses and include only those who answered "Yes" or "No" to each type of discrimination, we find that: 21.4% (72/336) of respondents believe they have not been hired due to their sexual orientation; 20.1% (61/304) believe they have been passed over for promotion; 20.5% (63/307) believe they have been fired; 22.8% (74/324) claim to have suffered performance discrimination; and 11.8% (35/297) believe they have lost clients or customers because they are gay, lesbian or bisexual. The results indicate that women seem to face slightly more discrimination than men in each of the categories (see Table 3-4).

Table 3-4: Anti-Gay/Lesbian Discrimination at Work, by Sex and Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DISCRIMINATION EXPERIENCED AT WORK</th>
<th>MEN (% YES)</th>
<th>WOMEN (% YES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIRING</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTION</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCRIMINATION</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOST CUSTOMERS</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to actual workplace discrimination, there appears to be an overwhelming concern amongst respondents that they will face employment-related discrimination in the future. For example, when asked "Are you afraid you could experience employment discrimination because you are lesbian, gay or bisexual?", 62.6% (159/254) of males and 79.8% (87/109) of females answered "Yes", and 75.3% (143/190) of male and 73.4% (69/94) of female respondents who answered yes to the question "Sometimes" or "Always" conceal their sexual orientation in employment situations.
HOUSING: 4.5% (11/244) of respondents have experienced discrimination related to purchasing a house, and 25.3% (87/344) have experienced rental-related discrimination. 27.7% (26/94) of females have faced rental discrimination due to sexual orientation, compared to 24.4% (61/250) of male respondents. A total of 43.7% (115/263) of males and 63.6% (68/107) of females believe they could experience housing discrimination in the future due to their sexual orientation. 57.2% (87/152) of males and 57.2% (87/152) of females who believe they could experience housing discrimination either “Sometimes” or “Always” conceal their sexual orientation when looking for housing.

FUTURE DISCRIMINATION: Overall, 76.8% (307/400) of respondents believed it was either “Very” or “Somewhat” likely they will be discriminated against in the future due to their sexual orientation, 16.5% (66/400) thought this was “Not too” likely, and 6.8% (27/400) thought it was “Not at all” likely that they would be discriminated against in the future. Table 3-5 summarizes how both male and female respondents answered this question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE DISCRIMINATION</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LIKELY</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETHAT LIKELY</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT TOO LIKELY</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT LIKELY AT ALL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Harassment

a) Overview of Harassment

There are five categories of harassment on the survey: verbal harassment; chased or followed; objects thrown at you; seriously harassed; threatened with physical violence. I asked respondents to indicate whether they had experienced each of these “Once”, “More than once” or “Never”. Tables 3-6 and 3-7 provide full summaries of these forms of harassment for both women and men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>TYPE OF HARASSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERBAL ABUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHASED/ FOLLOWED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBJECTS THROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERIOUSLY HARASSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THREAT W/ ASSAULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCE</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCE</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 On the survey itself, respondents were asked to differentiate between harassment they had experienced in the past year, and harassment that occurred prior to that time. This format was consistent with the Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force Surveys and may well provide the starting point for future longitudinal studies on anti-gay/lesbian violence in Vancouver. In order to present the data more easily here, however, I have collapsed these categories into a single category for each variable.
The tables above reveal that a large percentage of respondents have experienced these various forms of harassment (particularly verbal abuse). Also the fact that the data remain quite consistent across gender tends to belie the myth that gay men face more harassment than lesbians. In fact, a close examination of both tables reveals that, in total, marginally more women have been verbally harassed and seriously harassed than men.

b) Contexts of Harassment

While it is important to understand the extent of anti-gay/lesbian harassment, the survey also documents the various social contexts in which harassment occurs, including: by family; at work and school; and by police.

- HARASSMENT BY FAMILY MEMBERS: 39.8% (145/398) of respondents have been harassed by family members, including 34.6% (99/286) of males and 41.1% (46/112) of females. When asked to identify who in their families harassed them, respondents implicated mothers in 35.2% (51/145) of instances, fathers in 40.7% (59/145) of instances, brothers in 49.0% (71/145) of instances,
instances, sisters in 17.2% (25/145) of instances, and “other” relatives in 17.2% (25/145) of instances.\textsuperscript{40}

- **HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE:** 36.0% (134/372) of respondents report having been harassed by supervisors or work mates because they are gay, lesbian or bisexual, including 34.3% (91/265) of males and 40.2% (43/372) of females. 18.6% of respondents (64/344) indicate that they have experienced some form of victimization at work, including 18.8% (45/240) of males and 18.3% (19/104) of females.

- **HARASSMENT AT SCHOOL:** 61.8% (202/327) of respondents have been called anti-gay/lesbian names at school, and 39.4% (123/312) have been threatened with assault at school. A total of 23.6% (99/380) of respondents indicate that they have received either “A lot” or “A little” harassment from school teachers/officials (24.2% or 94/380 were not “out” at school).

- **HARASSED BY POLICE:** 13.8% (54/392) of respondents indicate they have been harassed by police once, while 6.6% (26/392) have been harassed by police more than once. In other words, a total of 18.0% (70/392) of respondents have been harassed by police because of their sexual orientation, including 20.9% (59/282) of males, and 19.1% (21/110) of females.

The data on harassment in this sample are consistent with data gleaned from other surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence in both Canada and the United States (see Chapter 1, Section C, “Literature Review” for an overview of these results from other surveys).

c) **Future Harassment**

Overall, 43.7% (175/403) of respondents indicate that it is “Very likely” they will be harassed in future, 37.4% (151/403) believe it is “Somewhat likely”, 14.4% (58/403) believe it is “Not too likely” that this will occur, and 4.7% (19/403) believe it is “Not likely at all”. In addition, 29.2% (118/404) of respondents believe it is “Very likely” they will be threatened with physical violence

\textsuperscript{40} Note that in this classification, numbers add up to more than 145, and percentages are more than 100%, due to multiple reporting by respondents)
in the future, 33.9% (137/404) believe it is “Somewhat likely”, 28.0% (113/404) believe it is “Not too likely”, and 8.9% (36/404) believe it is “Not at all” likely they will be threatened with violence in the future.

3. **Bashing**

a) **Overview of Bashing**

Respondents were asked to indicate if they have experienced the following *types* of bashing, “Never”, “Once”, or “More than once”.

- **BASHED (NON-SEXUAL):** 15.0% (61/408) of respondents indicate having been victims of gay bashing (that did not also include sexual assault) once, and 15.2% (62/408) have been bashed more than once. In other words, 30.2% (123/408) of all respondents have been involved in non-sexual physical assaults, including 32.9% (95/292) of males and 23.3% (27/116) of females.

- **BASHED (SEXUAL):** 4.2% (17/407) of all respondents report having been bashed once in instances that involved sexual assault, and 5.2% (21/407) report having been bashed *and* sexually assaulted more than once. In other words, a total of 9.4% of respondents have experienced bashings that also involved sexual assault, including 9.6% (28/292) of males and 8.7% (10/115) of females.

- **ASSAULTED WITH A WEAPON (NON-SEXUAL AND SEXUAL):** 11.3% (46/408) of respondents report having been assaulted with a weapon once in a non-sexual assault, and 4.7% (19/408) report this happening more than once, including 19.5% (57/292) of males, and 6.9% (8/116) of females. At the same time, 2.7% (11/407) of respondents report having been assaulted with a weapon once in a sexual assault, and 2.5% (10/407) report this happening more than once, including 5.1% (15/292) of males and 5.2% (6/115) of females.
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE BEEN BASHED: Overall, a total of 32.6% of respondents have been bashed, including 34.9% of males (102/292) and 26.7% (31/116) of females.

When we look at these instances of physical assault in terms of the gender of the victim we find that both males and females have been the victims of these various sorts of physical assaults (See Table 3-8 and Table 3-9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>NON-SEX. ASSAULT</th>
<th>SEXUAL ASSAULT</th>
<th>W/ WEAPON (NON-SEX.)</th>
<th>W/ WEAPON (SEXUAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCE</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>NON-SEX. ASSAULT</th>
<th>SEXUAL ASSAULT</th>
<th>W/ WEAPON (NON-SEX.)</th>
<th>W/ WEAPON (SEXUAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCE</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) **Contexts of Bashings**

I asked respondents to indicate if bashings have occurred from family members, at work, at school, and by police.

- **BASHED BY FAMILY MEMBERS:** 9.8% (39/399) of respondents report having been attacked by family members, including 11.5% (33/286) of males, and 5.3% (5/106) of females.

  Respondents implicate mothers in 20.0% (8/40) of incidents, fathers in 50% (20/40) of incidents, brothers in 30% (12/40) of incidents, sisters in 10% (4/40) of incidents, and “other” relatives in 20.0% (8/40) of instances of attacks by family members.

- **BASHED IN THE WORKPLACE:** 4.8% (20/372) of respondents report having been physically attacked by supervisors and/or workmates due to their sexual orientation, including 5.6% (15/266) of males, and 4.7% (5/106) of females.

- **BASHED AT SCHOOL:** 22.4% (68/303) of respondents have been physically attacked at school, including 25.5% (56/220) of males, and 13.4% (11/82) of females.

- **POLICE AS PERPETRATORS:** 5.7% (22/389) of respondents indicate having been beaten by police due to their sexual orientation. 63.6% (14/22) have been beaten once and 36.4% (8/22) have been beaten more than once. 6.0% (17/281) of males and 4.6% (5/108) of females have been beaten by police because they are gay, lesbian or bisexual.

c) **Violence in Public Places**

The survey listed a number of places where anti-lesbian/gay incidents might have occurred. Many of these contexts were in more or less public spaces, including: on public transit; in a restaurant/bar/hotel; in other recreational facilities; in a “cruising” area; and outside or near a gay business (e.g., a bar). It should be noted that respondents were asked to specify where incidents
occurred but not the type of incident that occurred in each setting. Thus it is impossible to determine the relationship between type of incident and the context in which it occurs.\textsuperscript{41}

- **TRANSIT:** 28.4\% (97/342) of respondents have been victimized in a transit area or on public transit vehicles, including 26.7\% (64/240) of males and 32.4\% (33/102) of females.

- **RESTAURANT/BAR:** 21.2\% (73/344) of those surveyed have been victimized in a restaurant or bar, including an almost identical percentage of males (21.3\% or 51/240) and females (21.2\% or 22/104).

- **RECREATIONAL AREAS:** 15.1\% of all respondents indicate they have been victimized in a recreation area, including 15.0\% (36/240) of males and 15.4\% (16/104) of females.

- **CRUISING AREA:** 16.3\% of those surveyed indicate they have been victimized in a cruising area, including 22.1\% (53/240) of males, and 2.9\% (3/104) of females.

- **NEAR A LESBIAN/GAY BUSINESS:** 40.1\% of respondents report having been victimized near a lesbian/gay business, including 47.9\% (115/240) of males, and 22.1\% (23/104) of females. This supports Harry's (1990) argument that perpetrators seek out known gay/lesbian enclaves for victims, and underscores the reality that for large numbers of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals, danger exists in or near those places that are supposed to be an oasis from homophobia.

- **GAY/LESBIAN AND NON-GAY/LESBIAN NEIGHBORHOODS:** 59.5\% (203/341) of respondents have been victimized in gay/lesbian-identified areas, including 67.2\% (160/238) of males, and 21.2\% (43/103) of females. 51.2\% (174/340) of respondents indicate having been victimized in a non-gay Vancouver neighborhood, including 49.2\% (117/238) of males, and 55.9\% (57/102) of females. Finally, 35.9\% (122/340) of respondents have been victimized in a suburban, small town or rural area, including 35.3\% (84/238) of males, and 37.3\% (38/102) of females. The results indicate that, as Harry (1990) suggests, more homophobic violence

\textsuperscript{41} Since it is impossible to determine the exact types of incidents that have occurred in public places, we will use the data from this category to apply to instances of both harassment and physical violence.
occurs in gay/lesbian-identified areas than non-gay/lesbian-identified areas (but also that a considerable amount of homophobic violence occurs in non-gay/lesbian-identified areas).

d) Future Bashing

- BASHED: 20.6% (83/404) of respondents believe it is “Very likely” they could be bashed in the future, 29.2% (118/404) believe it is “Somewhat likely”, 38.6% (156/404) believe it is “Not too likely”, and 11.6% (47/404) believe it is “Not at all” likely. A total of 49.8% of males, and 49.6% (58/117) of females believe it is “Very” or “Somewhat” likely they could be bashed in future due to their sexual orientation.

- MURDERED: 7.0% (28/398) of respondents believe it is “Very likely” they could be murdered because they are gay, lesbian or bisexual, 12.8% (51/398) believe it “Somewhat likely”, 43.0% (171/398) believe it is “Not too likely”, and 37.2% (148/398) believe it is “Not at all” likely they could be murdered in the future due to their sexual orientation. A total of 19.4% (55/283) of males, and 20.5% (24/117) of females believe it is “Very” or “Somewhat” likely they could be murdered in future due to their sexual orientation.

- LEVEL OF ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE IN THE PAST THREE YEARS: 29.1% (116/399) of respondents believe that in the past three years, anti-lesbian-gay violence has increased “a lot”, 31.8% (127/399) believe it has increased “a little”, 15.0% (60/399) believe that it has stayed the same, 5.8% (23/399) of respondents believe it has “decreased a little”, just one person believes it has “decreased a lot”, and 17.1% of respondents (72/399) state that they “don’t know”. In terms of gender, 62.0% (72/116) of women and 60.4% (171/283) of men believe that anti-gay/lesbian violence has risen “a lot” or “a little”, 10.3% (12/116) of women and 17.0% (48/283) of men believe it has remained the same, and 3.5% (4/116) of women, and 7.1% (20/283) of men believe it has decreased.
e) **Most Recent Incident**

Respondents were asked to describe the most recent incident they had experienced. Overall, 276 respondents reported some form of victimization for this write in question (108 surveys were missing this information, and 36 surveys indicate that the respondent has never been victimized). 41.0% respondents have been verbally abused in their most recent anti-lesbian/gay incident, including 15.6% (43/276) from individuals in passing vehicles and 25.4% (70/276) from individuals on the street. 13.4% (37/276) of respondents report having been seriously harassed, 4.0% (11/276) indicate they have been chased or followed; and 10.5% (29/276) have been threatened with assault. 14.3% (60/312) of respondents indicate having been bashed in the most recent incident they have experienced. This compares with only 8.6% (36/312) who have never experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence. There is much cause for concern from the fact that *physical assault* represents the second largest response category of all the forms of violence experienced by respondents in their most recent incident. Respondents were also asked if, in their most recent incident, they knew the person who victimized them, as well as the perpetrator’s gender and age. In the most recent incident: 17.9% (41/229) of male respondents have known the offender, compared to 27.5% (28/102) of females; 92.2% (2314/232) of males have been victimized by males, 4.7% (11/232) of males have been victimized by females, and 3.0% (7/232) of males have been victimized by males and females. 89.0% (89/100) of female respondents indicate having been victimized by males, while 10.0% (10/100) have been victimized by females, and 1.0% (1/100) has been victimized by both males and females in her most recent incident. Finally, male respondents report that 18.8% (42/224) of offenders have been 18 years of age or younger, while 67.4% (151/224) have been 19 - 29, and 13.8% (31/224) of perpetrators have been 30 years or older. Female respondents indicate that 13.3% (13/98) of perpetrators have been 18 years or younger, while 53.1% (52/98) have been 19 - 29, and 33.7% (33/98) have been 30 years of age and older. Figures 3-10 and 3-11 present a graphic depiction, by gender, of the most recent incidents respondents have experienced.
The following represent a selection of actual descriptions of the most recent incident respondents have experienced:

**Verbal Harassment**

“We always get called anti-homosexual names on the street and near our ‘gay neighborhood’”. (23 year old male)

“Driver of passing car yelled faggots as I sat in a park talking to another male yesterday”. (35 year old West-End male)

“My mother called me ‘abnormal’, ‘ill’, ‘irregular’”. (22 year old male)

“A client, unaware that I am gay, stated that “all homosexuals should be shot. I’d love to sit here with my gun and pick them off. Open season on homosexuals!” (30 year old male)
“Walking down Davie Street at 2 pm, two angry straight men holding viscous-looking dogs yelled ‘faggot’ at me”. (32 year old male)

“Just name-calling. But not stopping”. (33 year old male)

“Walking down Denman Street when a car full of people started screaming ‘fag’, ‘queer’ etc.”. (28 year old male)

“My friend and I were on the bus and this disgusting man started making totally inappropriate sexual comments about what we do in bed”. (20 year old female)

**Serious Harassment**

“A student who knew I was the Queer instructor logged a serious complaint about my attitude and setting the wrong image for instructors”. (53 year old female).

“5 to 7 males were confronting another male. I got the feeling it was gay bashing. I called for help and then was chased by one or two of those”. (44 year old male).

“Called fag/cocksucker in Mall [and] Spat upon on Granville street”. (47 year old male)

“Beer bottle thrown at me from a moving car near my home”. (29 year old West-End male)

“Walking down ‘the Drive’ my friend and I were cornered when we didn’t stop holding hands”. (43 year old Commercial Drive female)

“Drunks harassing ‘fags’ along Davie Street. Police attended quickly and arrested offenders”. (39 year old Male)

“I was riding my bike when a mini van of men yelled ‘move you fat dyke’ at me. They then followed and chased me till I lost them by winding through school-yards, alleyways, and yards”. (26 year old female)

“Had eggs thrown at us outside the New York Theater by young guys”. (21 year old female)

**Threatened with Physical Assault**

“Approached by a man on the street called a ‘fag’. Told me he’s be watching me and would ‘get you later’”. (34 year old male)

“Man appeared at my door with a stick- said he killed fags- I slammed door- he banged door/door frame and I called police”. (29 year old West-End male)
“Fired employee harassed me with threats of violence and verbal insults about being gay”. (36 year old male)

“Some straight males said they wanted to beat me up and kill me. They never got the chance”. (22 year old male)

“I always get verbally harassed and threatened when on Q-Patrol”. (18 year old female)

Three evenings ago: Verbally harassed and threatened by four males on the Seawall (not in a ‘cruising’ area; I was simply trying to have a pleasant summer walk by myself. I was taunted by ‘faggot’ and told I’d be pushed over the wall and into the water”. (46 year old male)

“My son’s father verbally harassed me, then threatened to beat me up”. (24 year old female)

“The tenant next door to my lover’s home was screaming ‘I’ll kill you bitch, cunt, dyke’”. (23 year old female)

Lesbian/Gay Bashing

“Attacked by male youth after saying ‘hi’ outside bank”. (29 year old male)

“Almost killed by two thugs who supposedly wanted cigarettes at Denman and Beach at 9 pm. No doubt fag-bashing”. (44 year old male)

“Leaving a gay bar- beaten by 4 young men”. (46 year old male)

“Attacked by a group of teenagers while waiting for a bus. Consider this gay bashing because of the obscenities that were shouted at me”. (24 year old male)

“As I was leaving work, two men raped me and taunted me with ‘lesbo’ insults”. (27 year old woman)

“I have been sexually assaulted outside a gay bar”. (38 year old woman)

“I had my face kicked in at Pit Lake on a canoe trip” (46 year old male)

“I intervened in an assault in 1989; This year I escorted a victim to St. Paul’s [Hospital]. He had a broken jaw”. (47 year old male)

“I was pulled from a chair in a friends’ home and punched in the nose. I ran for my life as the person had a gun”. (33 year old male)

“I was punched by a man who recognized me as a lesbian spokesperson from TV.”. (31 year old female)
“Three guys raped me at English Bay”. (26 year old male)

“Pushed over from behind resulting in serious facial scars”. (35 year old male)

“I picked up a ‘straight’. He took me to a place where someone was waiting. They attempted to kill me and rob me; than god they only robbed me and kicked out my teeth” (36 year old male)

“Punched with a fist and hospitalized while I was trying to protect my dogs from being killed”. (33 year old male)

“I was assaulted by a twenty something male at UBC”. (25 year old female)

**Victimized by Police**

“The police attacked me and my lover at a bus stop on Commercial Drive. We had guns pointed at our heads, had to lay on the pavement, and be handcuffed. We were not under arrest, but all our rights were violated. We never got an apology and we were traumatized”. (34 year old female).

“Police asked for I.D. at the entrance to the Dufferin Hotel then threw my wallet on the sidewalk”. (47 year old male)

“After reporting an attempted bashing, one of the police officers said: ‘well what do you expect wearing that scarf’”. (31 year old male)

“A police officer used anti-gay words towards myself and my friend who was in custody i.e. ‘fags’, ‘queers’”. (29 year old male)

**D. Testing Hypotheses**

1. **Harassment and Bashing**

*Hypothesis #1*

*The more one is out, the more one is likely to experience anti-gay/lesbian violence.*

In order to test this hypothesis, I cross-tabulate level of outness taken from the outness score variable42 with the following victimization variables: a) verbal harassment; b) seriously harassed;

---

42 For a summary of how the outness score was determined, see Chapter 2, “Methods”, section F. “Data Analysis Techniques”.
c) threatened with verbal assault; d) bashed; and e) experienced victimization reportable to police.

I also cross-tabulate level of outness with harassment and physical violence at work to determine if there is a relationship between being out at work and experiencing violence from supervisors/workmates. The following tables illustrate each of the various cross-tabulations noted above.

| Table 3-12: Verbal Abuse, by Level of Outness |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| **VIOLENCE** | **OUTNESS SCORE** |
| VERBAL | LOW/MED. | HIGH |
| NO | 33 | 15 |
| | 15.3 | 7.9 |
| YES | 182 | 175 |
| | 84.7 | 92.1 |
| Total | 215 | 190 |
| | 100.0 | 100.0 |

# Missing: 15

Chi Sq. Significance: .02 *

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: 90.8% (118/130) of males who score “high” on outness have been verbally harassed, compared to 85.0% (136/160) of males who score “low/medium”. Likewise, 95% (57/60) of females in this sample who score “high” on outness have been verbally harassed, compared to 83.6% (46/55) who score “low/medium” on outness.

| Table 3-13: Seriously Harassed, by Outness |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| **VIOLENCE** | **OUTNESS SCORE** |
| HARASSED | LOW/MED | HIGH |
| NO | 137 | 99 |
| | 63.7 | 51.8 |
| YES | 78 | 92 |
| | 36.3 | 48.2 |
| Total | 215 | 191 |
| | 100.0 | 100.0 |

# Missing: 14

Chi Sq. Significance: .01 **

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: 47.7% (62/130) of males who score “high” on outness have been seriously harassed, compared to 36.9% (59/160) of those who score “low/medium”. Similarly, 49.2% (30/61) of females who score “high” on outness have been seriously harassed, compared to 34.5% (19/55) of those who score “low/medium”.
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Table 3-14: Threats of Violence, by Outness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>OUTNESS SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW/MED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 14

Chi Sq. Significance: .24 NS

Table 3-15: Bashed, by Level of Outness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>OUTNESS SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW/MED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASHED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 14

Chi Sq. Significance: .17 NS

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: 63.1% (82/130) of males who score “high” on outness have been threatened with physical violence, compared to 55.0% (88/160) who score “low/medium”. For women, 52.5% (32/61) of those who score “high” on outness have been threatened with violence, compared to 50.9% (28/55) who score “low/medium”.

Discussion:

39.2% (51/130) of males who score “high” have been bashed, compared to 31.9% (51/160) of those who score “low/medium”. Similarly, 29.5% (18/61) of females who score “high” on outness have been bashed, compared to 23.6% (13/55) of those who score “low/medium”.

Tables 3-12 through 3-15 indicate that for each type of victimization examined, those who score high on outness are more often victimized than those who score “low/medium”. This holds for both males and females in each type of victimization. Given these data, it is conceivable to accept hypothesis #1. Before doing so, however, we should examine the other possible tests of the relationship: namely that those who are most out at work will have experienced more victimization there; and that those who are most out will have reported more victimization to police.
Table 3-16: Harassment at Work, by Outness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>OUTNESS SCORE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW/MED.</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARASSED NO</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 50

Chi Sq. Significance: .09 NS

Table 3-17: Reportable Violence, by Outness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COULD</th>
<th>OUTNESS SCORE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPORT</td>
<td>LOW/MED.</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 21

Chi Sq. Significance: .44 NS

**CONCLUSION:** In each of the tests of the hypothesis concerning the relationship between outness and victimization, those who are most “out” about being gay, lesbian or bisexual are most likely to be victimized. We can accept our initial hypothesis; in so doing we are also able to point to the very real and very dangerous consequences of societal homophobia for “out” lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in Greater Vancouver.

In addition to the results presented in the tables above, the data also reveal that those in the sample who are most out are also most severely hurt in bashing incidents. For example, 16% of respondents (29/181) who scored “low/medium” on the outness scale required medical attention after an incident, compared to 26.0% (45/173) of respondents who scored high on this scale. These data are significant because they point towards a positive relationship suggested in the literature (Comstock, 1991; Berrill, 1990; Harry, 1990a, 1982; Herek, 1990) between being “out” as a gay, lesbian or bisexual person and suffering more severe forms of victimization as a result of being “out”.
Hypothesis #2:
The more one conforms to popular, homophobic, gay or lesbian stereotypes, the more he or she will experience homophobic victimization.

Harry (1990, 1982) argues that much anti-gay/lesbian violence is committed by activists, that is to say, by individuals who seek out targets in order to perpetrate violence against them. Harry terms this kind of victimization “cultural victimization” and suggests that activists often rely on popular stereotypes of what gay men and lesbians respectively should look, act, or be like (i.e., gay men as either hyper-masculine or effeminate, and lesbians as very masculine). In many respects, Harry’s argument is not unlike Becker’s notion that a deviant “master status” serves to both identify and marginalize individuals, and Goffman’s belief that signs of obvious stigma create uneasy social situations, and a proneness to victimization for those who possess them. I attempt to explore the issue of appearance and victimization by examining the relationship between one’s conformity to (“deviant” or “stigmatized”) stereotypes and one’s proneness to victimization. Testing this relationship, I treat conformity to stereotypes as the independent variable in cross-tabulations with: a) verbal abuse; b) seriously harassed; c) threatened with violence; and d) bashed. I also cross-tabulate the conformity to stereotypes variable with victimization reportable to police, and with the extent to which respondents fear for their safety in the future. These results are presented in Tables 3-18 to 3-23:
### Table 3-18: Verbal Abuse, by Conforming to Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>CONFORM TO STEREOTYPES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A LOT</td>
<td>A LITTLE</td>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 24

Significance: .008 **

### Table 3-19: Serious Harassment, by Conforming to Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>CONFORM TO STEREOTYPES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A LOT</td>
<td>A LITTLE</td>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 23

Significance: .16 NS

### Table 3-20: Threatened with Violence, by Conformity to Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>CONFORM TO STEREOTYPES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A LOT</td>
<td>A LITTLE</td>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 23

Significance: .001 ***

### Table 3-21: Bashing, by Conformity to Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>CONFORM TO STEREOTYPES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A LOT</td>
<td>A LITTLE</td>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 23

Significance: .42 NS
Table 3-22: Violence Reportable to Police, by Conformity to Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COULD REPORT</th>
<th>COULD CONFORM TO STEREOTYPES</th>
<th>CONFORM TO STEREOTYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>A LOT</td>
<td>A LITTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 31
Significance: .39 NS

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: In cross-tabulating experienced victimization that could be reported to police by stereotypes, and controlling for sex, some significantly different results between women and men emerge for this relationship. For women, 33.3% of those who conform “a lot” to stereotypes have experienced victimization reportable to police, compared to 33.3% of those who conform “a little”, and 37.9% for those who do “not at all” conform. At the same time there is a different relationship for males. For example, 60.0% of those males who conform “a lot” to stereotypes have experienced victimization reportable to police, compared to 44.9% of those who conform “a little”, and 36.8% amongst those who do “not at all” conform.

Table 3-23: Violence Reportable to Police, by Conformity to Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEAR</th>
<th>CONFORM TO STEREOTYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>A LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 42
Significance: .03 *

CONCLUSION: While the data presented in the tables suggest that, in this sample, there is indeed a relationship between the extent to which one conforms to gay/lesbian stereotypes, and the amount of homophobic violence one experiences in everyday life, there remains the issue of whether those who conform most to stereotypes also experience more severe homophobic violence. When we cross-tabulate conformity to stereotypes with whether respondents have required medical attention after an incident, we find that 32.5% (13/40) of those who conform “a
lot” to stereotypes have required medical attention, compared to 18.0% (55/305) of those who conform either “a little” or “not at all”. Further, when we control for gender in this instance, we find a significantly stronger relationship for men than women: for example, 17.6% (3/17) of women in the sample who conform “a lot” to stereotypes have required medical attention after an incident, compared to 12.0% (10/83) of those who conform “a little” or “not at all”. Meanwhile for males, 43.5% (10/23) of those who conform “a lot” to stereotypes have required medical attention, compared to 20.2% (45/222) of those who conform “a little” or “not at all”. In view of all of these findings, we are able to accept our second hypothesis that those who conform most to gay/lesbian stereotypes experience both the most, and the most severe forms, of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

2. Lifestyle Attributes and Victimization

In this sub-section we examine hypotheses numbers three, four and five; all of which pertain to the relationship between various lifestyle attributes and forms of victimization experienced by respondents. The lifestyle data are gleaned from the following characteristics: a) where respondents live (particularly whether they live in gay/lesbian or non-gay/lesbian identified neighborhoods); b) whether they consider themselves to be part of gay or lesbian communities; and c) the extent to which they are active in and integrated into gay or lesbian communities.

Hypothesis #3:

The incidence of anti-lesbian/gay violence will be higher in identified lesbian or gay areas than in non-lesbian or gay areas.

In order to examine our third hypothesis, that the incidence of homophobic violence will be greater in gay/lesbian-identified areas than in non-gay/lesbian area, I cross-tabulate “victimized in

43 It should be noted that in order to determine relationships between neighborhood of residence and victimization I recoded neighborhood into gay and non-gay identified areas (I considered both the West End/Downtown and the Commercial Drive Areas as gay-identified areas and all other parts of Vancouver as non-gay areas).
a gay neighborhood”, “victimized in a non-gay neighborhood”, and “victimized in a suburban/town/rural area” by sex. The results summarized in Tables 3-24 through 3-26, will allow us to accept or reject hypothesis #3.

Table 3-24: Victimization in Gay/Lesbian Neighborhoods, by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICTIMIZED</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 79

Significance: .000 ***

Table 3-25: Victimization in Non-Gay/Lesbian Neighborhoods, by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICTIMIZED</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 80

Significance: .26 NS

Table 3-26: Victimization in Suburban/Towns/Rural Areas, by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICTIMIZED</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 80

Significance: .73 NS

Discussion:

From the tables we can observe that many more male respondents have been victimized in gay/lesbian areas than in the other two non-gay/lesbian contexts. For example, while 67.2% of males have been victimized in a gay/lesbian-identified area, 49.2% have been victimized in other, non-gay/lesbian Vancouver neighborhoods, and 35.3% have been victimized in suburbs, towns, or rural contexts. The figures for females, however, are quite different. For example, while 41.7% of females have been victimized in gay/lesbian neighborhoods, a total of
55.9% of female respondents have been victimized in non-gay/lesbian Vancouver neighborhoods, and finally, 37.3% of females have been victimized in suburbs, towns, or rural areas. So how do we account for this discrepancy? One could point to the fact that the West End is widely known to be not only Vancouver’s “most gay” neighborhood, it is largely known as a gay male enclave. At the same time, while the Commercial Drive Area is the heart of Vancouver’s lesbian community, this is probably not as widely known. Thus the Commercial Drive area is probably less identified with lesbians than the West End is with gay men. As a result, those “activists” (Harry, 1982) who seek out victims in gay areas are probably more likely to go to the West End in search of male targets.

CONCLUSION: In view of the findings, we can easily accept hypothesis #3 for male respondents. If we collapse the data from tables 3-25 and 3-26 into one (“non-gay/lesbian areas”) table, we find that 53.4% of female respondents have not been victimized, compared to 46.6% who have. These figures indicate that more women have been victimized in non-lesbian/gay-identified areas than in specifically lesbian/gay-identified ones (46.6% versus 41.7%) respectively. Therefore the hypothesis must be rejected for female respondents.

Hypothesis #4:

Those individuals who live in identified lesbian or gay areas will have experienced more homophobic violence than those individuals who do not live in lesbian or gay-identified areas.

Figure 3-27 reveals that 59.5% (244/410) of respondents, live in a gay/lesbian-identified area, compared to 22.9% (94/410) who live in another non-gay/lesbian Vancouver neighborhood, and a further 17.6% (72/410) who live in either a suburb of Greater Vancouver, a small town, or a rural area in B.C. More males than females in the sample live in gay/lesbian neighborhoods.
In order to quantify the relationship between residence in gay/lesbian or non-gay/lesbian-identified neighborhoods and the extent of homophobic violence experienced, I use the same four victimization variables: a) verbal abuse; b) seriously harassed; c) threatened with violence; and d) bashed. Tables 3-28 to 3-31 present the results of these cross-tabulations:

Table 3-28: Verbal Abuse, by Type of Neighborhood of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERBAL ABUSE</th>
<th>GAY/LESBIAN NEIGHBORHOODS</th>
<th>NON-GAY AREAS-VANCOUVER</th>
<th>SUBURBS/TOWNS/RURAL AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 21

Significance: .19 NS

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: Controlling for sex for this table illustrates some important differences between male and female experience. For example, the number of male respondents who have been verbally insulted decreases in order as we move from those who live in a gay/lesbian-identified area (90.0% or 162/180), to those who live in a non-gay/lesbian-identified Vancouver neighborhood (84.7% or 50/59), to those who live in a suburban/small town/rural setting (78.3% or 36/46). The significance level for males in this instance is p< .09 NS. For female respondents there is no corresponding order of descent. For example, 90.0% (54/60) of female respondents who live in lesbian/gay-identified areas have been verbally insulted, compared to 87.5% (28/32) of those who live in a...
non-lesbian/gay-identified Vancouver neighborhood, and 90.9% (20/22) of those who live in a suburban/small town/rural area. The level of statistical significance for females in this instance is $p = .86 \text{ NS}$.

Table 3-29: Seriously Harassed, by Type of Neighborhood of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERIOUSLY HARASSED</th>
<th>GAY/LESBIAN NEIGHBORHOODS</th>
<th>NON-GAY AREAS-VANCOUVER</th>
<th>SUBURBS/TOWNS/RURAL AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 20
Significance: .308 NS

Table 3-30: Threatened with Violence, by Type of Neighborhood of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THREATENED WITH VIOLENCE</th>
<th>GAY/LESBIAN NEIGHBORHOODS</th>
<th>NON-GAY AREAS-VANCOUVER</th>
<th>SUBURBS/TOWNS/RURAL AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 20
Significance: .02 *

CONTROLLING FOR SEX:

Controlling for sex, again there are discrepancies between the experiences of males and females in the relationship between being threatened with violence and neighborhood of residence (this discrepancy did not exist to any significant extent in the previous table). For example, 62.8% (113/180) of males who live in gay/lesbian-identified areas have been threatened with violence, compared to 49.5% of those men in the sample who live in non-gay/lesbian-identified areas. However for women, 51.7% (31/60) of those who live in gay/lesbian areas have been
threatened with violence, compared to 49.1% (28/55) who live in non-gay/lesbian areas. The statistical significance for males is $p \leq .01 = **$, while for females it is $p \leq .98 = NS$.

Table 3-31: Bashed, by Type of Neighborhood of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASHED</th>
<th>GAY/LESBIAN NEIGHBORHOODS</th>
<th>NON-GAY AREAS-VANCOUVER</th>
<th>SUBURBS/TOWNS/RURAL AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 20
Significance: .88 NS

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: In this instance we find a striking difference between male and female respondents in terms of the relationship between living in gay/lesbian or non-gay/lesbian areas and having been bashed. For example, if we recode the table into gay/lesbian and non-gay/lesbian areas, we find that 37.2% (67/180) of males who live in gay/lesbian-identified areas have been bashed, compared to 30.5% (32/105) of those who live in non-gay/lesbian areas. For women the opposite is true: 18.3% (11/60) of female respondents who live in gay/lesbian-identified areas have been bashed, compared to 36.4% (20/55) of female respondents who live in non-gay/lesbian areas.

CONCLUSION: Based on the data from this sample, we can accept the hypothesis that living in a gay/lesbian area makes one more prone to anti-gay/lesbian violence for males only. In the case of female respondents, the data suggest that lesbian and bisexual women who live in non-gay/lesbian-identified areas are victimized more often than those who live in gay/lesbian-identified areas.
Hypothesis #5:

The more an individual is active in and integrated into lesbian/gay communities, the more likely is she or he to experience anti-lesbian/gay violence.

Harry (1982, 1990) argues that the more one goes to lesbian or gay establishments, and is active and integrated in the lesbian or gay communities, the greater the likelihood that one will experience homophobic violence. In order to determine the extent to which this relationship exists for gay, lesbian and bisexual respondents in this survey, I asked respondents the following questions: How often do you go out in the evening to lesbian/gay bars, or similar establishments?; How active are you in gay/lesbian politics, issues etc.?; Do you consider yourself to be part of a gay or lesbian community?; Do you belong to any gay or lesbian groups and organizations?; and finally, Have you ever marched or participated in a lesbian/gay Pride Day Parade? Several of these questions serve as a means for testing research hypothesis number five.

In examining the relationship between activity/integration in gay/lesbian communities and victimization, I cross-tabulate a) verbal abuse, by how often respondents frequent gay/lesbian establishments, b) threatened with bashing, by level of activity in gay/lesbian politics and issues, c) threatened with bashing, by belonging to gay/lesbian groups and organizations, and finally d) bashed, by belonging to lesbian/gay groups and organizations. These cross-tabulations represent a cross-section of types of victimization, as well as several of the more important indicators of activity/integration in lesbian/gay communities.

Overall, when we cross-tabulate these variables, we find instances of significant relationships, as well as instances of rather negligible relationships at work in the sample data. At the same time, however, it should be noted that in no instance do we find an inverse relationship - that is to say that even if some of the data do not show a significant relationship, none of the data actually contradict our expectations. Tables 3-32 to 3-35, illustrate some of the most significant relationships for hypothesis #5:

44 This is particularly evident with respect to the relationship between being active/integrated in lesbian/gay communities and being bashed.
CONTROLLING FOR SEX: When we control for sex, we find few differences along gender lines. For example, 89.2% (182/204) of those males who most often frequent gay/lesbian establishments have been verbally harassed, compared to 81.2% (69/85) of males who rarely go out in the evening to gay/lesbian establishments. 92.9% (52/56) of women who often go out to lesbian/gay establishments have been verbally abused, compared to 86.2% (50/58) of those who rarely do so.

Table 3-32: Verbal Abuse, by How Often Respondent Frequents Lesbian/Gay Establishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>FREQUENT LESBIAN/GAY ESTABLISHMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM/HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 17
Significance: .04 *

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: When we control for sex, we find a very important difference in this relationship. For example, 70.2% (92/131) of males who are very active in gay/lesbian issues have been threatened with gay-bashing, compared to 48.4% (78/161) of those who are not so active. The statistical significance for males in this relationship is an extremely strong $p < .000$. For females, however, we see very little relationship between activity...
in lesbian/gay issues and being threatened with lesbian-bashing. For example, 52.2% (35167) of those women who are very active in lesbian/gay issues have been threatened with violence, compared to 50.0% of those women who are not (p ≤ .81).

Table 3-34: Threatened with Bashing, by Belong to Lesbian/Gay Groups and Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>BELONG TO LESBIAN/GAY GROUPS &amp; ORGANIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THREATS</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 15
Significance: .06 NS

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: We find little difference in terms of gender for this relationship. For example, 62.5% (95/152) of males who belong to gay/lesbian groups or organizations have been threatened with bashing, compared to 54.0% (74/137) of males who do not belong to any groups. 57.1% (28/49) of females who belong to lesbian/gay groups or organizations have been threatened with bashing, compared to 47.8% (32/67) of those who do not belong to lesbian/gay groups.

Table 3-35: Bashed, by Belong to Lesbian/Gay Groups and Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
<th>BELONG TO LESBIAN/GAY GROUPS &amp; ORGANIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASHED</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 15
Significance: .59 NS
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CONTROLLING FOR SEX: Again there is a difference between the experiences of males and females. For example, 36.2% (55/152) of male respondents who belong to groups have been bashed, compared to 33.6% (46/137) who have been bashed but belong to no groups. 26.5% (13/49) of female respondents who belong to groups have been bashed, compared to 26.9% (18/67) of females who do not belong to groups.

CONCLUSION: The tables suggest that, overall, there is a relationship between being active and integrated in lesbian/gay communities and being a victim of anti-lesbian/gay violence. However, this is not the case for both males and females. In fact, some of the data suggest that for females in the survey, there is little evidence of relationship at all. In conclusion, then, while we may cautiously accept the hypothesis, the data suggest that the relationship is much more applicable to males than to females.

3. Reporting Incidents to Police

The literature suggests that most anti-gay/lesbian incidents are never reported to police. This is due in part to the often adversarial relationship between the lesbian/gay communities and police across North America (Gross, 1992; Comstock, 1991; Berrill and Herek, 1990). In the City of Vancouver, some progress has been made in improving the relationship between the gay/lesbian communities and the city's police force. Some of this improvement has been generated by the Gay/Lesbian Community Relations Task Force, which has sought to examine relations and establish dialogue between the lesbian/gay communities and the police. The Task Force was partly responsible for the decision by the Vancouver City Police to begin recording hate crimes for statistical purposes (including hate crimes motivated by a hostility toward sexual orientation). Despite the improved dialogue between the local City police and the lesbian/gay communities, the same cannot be said for relations with the R.C.M.P. (who police the suburbs of Greater
Vancouver). The R.C.M.P. has neither established gay/lesbian community relations units, nor committed themselves to record hate crimes of any sort.

In spite of the efforts aimed at improving relations between the Vancouver police and the gay/lesbian communities, the surveys reveal that a large number of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in Vancouver remain suspicious and distrustful of their local police. At the same time, however, there is reason to believe that relations between our communities and the Vancouver police are improving. For example, in June 1995, the Vancouver police issued a public statement and warning—carried by all gay and mainstream media—to the gay community, concerning the identity of a man who murdered a gay man in the victim’s West End apartment. This is believed to be the first time that the Vancouver police have issued such a public warning to the gay community.

The survey results illustrate that 44.2% (38/86) of respondents who have reported anti-gay/lesbian violence to the police, rate the performance of the police positive, and 59.5% (50/84) rate the attitude of the police positive. At the same time, however, when we examine how respondents rate the attitude of the police by how much the respondent conforms to gay/lesbian stereotypes, we observe that much work needs to be done to improve relations between police and the gay/lesbian communities. For example, 38.5% (5/13) of those who have reported incidents to police and who conform “a lot” to gay/lesbian stereotypes report that the attitude of the police officers involved was positive, compared to 64.7% (44/68) of respondents who either conform “a little” or who do “not at all conform” to stereotypes.

Given the fact that lesbians and gay men do not generally report incidents to the police, we need to turn to an examination of the remaining hypotheses, all of which, in one way or another, address the issue of reporting incidents to police.45

45 The data on reporting are restricted to bashing-related incidents only. This should not be viewed as a diminution of the importance of the other forms of violence, but rather as reflecting the views of the vast majority of respondents who indicate that bashings represent both the most serious form of anti-gay/lesbian violence, and the most important one to report to authorities.
Hypothesis #6:

The number of anti-lesbian/gay hate crimes reported to police in Vancouver will be considerably lower than those reported on the survey.

I asked respondents to indicate whether they have reported incidents to police. Excluding 28 missing cases and the 241 respondents who claimed not to have experienced victimization reportable to police, we find that a total of 52.3% (79/151) of those who could have reported incidents to police actually did, while 47.7% (72/151) did not. Given the fact that almost half of the serious incidents reported in this sample have not been reported to police, we can accept our sixth hypothesis that official statistics under-represent the actual instances of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Greater Vancouver. It is important to note, however, that we cannot examine the actual hate crime data of the Vancouver police, who, unlike their Toronto and Ottawa counterparts, do not make their hate crimes data public for any purpose, including academic research.

Hypothesis #7:

The more one is out, the more likely one will be to report anti-gay/lesbian victimization to authorities.

I cross-tabulated whether respondents reported to police by their score on the outness scale. This data is illustrated by Table 3-36 below:
Table 3-36: Reported incidents to Police, by Respondents' Level of Outness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENCE REPORTED</th>
<th>LEVEL OF OUTNESS (ON OUTNESS SCALE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW/MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Missing: 269
Significance: .22 NS

CONTROLLING FOR SEX: This relationship is stronger for males than for females, but in both cases those who are most out are also most likely to report victimization to police. For example, 65.5% (36/55) of those males who have experienced reportable incidents and who are most out actually did report to police, compared to 50.8% (31/61) of males who score “low/medium” on outness and who did not report serious violence. 36.4% (8/22) of female respondents who rate “high” on outness actually reported, compared to 30.8% (4/13) of those who rate “low/medium” on outness.

CONCLUSION: Given that the data reveal a relationship, although not a significant one, between outness and the likelihood that incidents will be reported to police, we can cautiously accept hypothesis #7.

Hypothesis #8:

The more one is active in and integrated into the lesbian and gay communities, the more likely she or he will be in reporting anti-gay/lesbian violence to authorities.

Just as one assumes a positive relationship between the extent to which a respondent is “out” and her or his likelihood of reporting anti-gay/lesbian violence to police, one would expect to discern the same relationship at work amongst those who are most active and integrated in the lesbian/gay communities. In order to test this relationship, I cross-tabulated whether incidents
were reported to police with the following: a) whether respondents consider themselves to be part of the lesbian/gay communities; b) how often respondents frequent gay/lesbian establishments; c) whether they belong to gay/lesbian groups and organizations; and d) activity in gay/lesbian issues and politics. The results to these cross-tabulations follow:

a) COMMUNITY: Overall, there appears to be a relationship between belonging to a gay/lesbian community and reporting victimization to police. For example, 53.0% (61/115) of those who have experienced reportable incidents and believe they are part of a gay/lesbian community actually reported to police, compared to 41.7% (10/24) of those who reported but who do not. In terms of gender, however, we see that the relationship holds for males only: 59.1% (52/88) of males who believe they are part of a gay community reported incidents, compared to 41.2% (7/17) of males who do not believe they are part of a gay community. But 33.3% (9/27) of females who consider themselves to be part of a lesbian community actually reported, compared to 42.9% (3/7) of those who state they are not part of a lesbian community but who reported incidents.

b) FREQUENT GAY/LESBIAN ESTABLISHMENTS: Overall 56.0% (28/50) of those who have experienced reportable incidents and who rarely go out to gay/lesbian establishments actually reported, compared to only 50.0% (49/98) of those who reported and who go out to these establishments more often. For both females and males, those who very rarely or never go out to gay/lesbian establishments are more likely to report than those who go out much more frequently. For example, 44.4% of females (8/18) and 62.5% of males (20/32) who rarely go out have reported incidents, compared to 55.6% of females (45/81) and 23.5% of males who go out more often to gay/lesbian establishments.

c) GROUPS: A total of 58.9% of those who belong to gay/lesbian groups have reported incidents, compared to only 44.7% (34/76) of those who do not belong to gay/lesbian groups. The
A relationship holds for both males and females (although more strongly for males). For example, 64.9% (37/57) of males who belong to groups have reported incidents to police, compared to 49.1% (28/57) of those who have reported incidents but who do not belong to any gay/lesbian groups or organizations. Likewise, 37.5% (6/16) of females who belong to groups have reported incidents to police, compared to 31.6% (6/19) of women who have reported incidents but belong to no lesbian/gay groups or organizations.

d) ISSUES AND POLITICS: A total of 50.0% (41/82) of those who score "high" on activity in gay/lesbian politics actually have reported incidents. This compares to 54.4% (37/68) of those who score low on this scale of activity but who have reported incidents. In terms of gender, 56.7% (34/60) of males surveyed who claimed to be "very" or "somewhat" active in gay/lesbian issues and politics claim to have reported incidents, compared to 58.9% (33/56) who are "not too active" or "not at all" active. 31.8% (7/22) of females who claim to be "very" or "somewhat" active have reported, compared to 33.3% (4/12) of those who are "not too active" or "not active at all".

CONCLUSION: In view of the contradictory findings for both males and females, it is difficult to say with any real certainty whether there is a relationship between the extent to which one is active in and integrated into lesbian and gay communities and the likelihood that she or he will report incidents. In fact, when we control for gender, we see that the results are even more ambiguous and contradictory. At the same time, the data do not entirely discount the hypothesis. However, since we are dealing with relatively small frequencies, conclusions are difficult. Thus this hypothesis is neither confirmed nor rejected.
Hypothesis #9:

The fear of secondary victimization from police, family, friends, workmates and others, keeps people from reporting victimization to authorities.

I asked respondents to write in an explanation as to why they have not reported serious incidents to the police. When I excluded missing responses (39), those surveys where no response was given because respondents had reported all serious incidents to police (68), those who claimed that the incidents they had experienced were not serious enough to warrant reporting (176), and those who claimed to have been neither victimized nor witness to victimization (42), I was left with 95 applicable responses. These responses adduce a wide range of reasons why individuals do not, or feel they cannot, report incidents to the police. Some of the more frequently noted responses were: “police won’t take anti-gay/lesbian hate crimes seriously”; “not confident about the police response/can’t trust the police”; and “fear of disclosing sexual orientation”. In addition, “other” responses indicate that respondents would rather deal with the situation alone, or with help from friends, or that they were too upset/scared to deal with what had happened. After aggregating the data into categories, we are left with the following distribution of why incidents are not reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary victimization</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. victimization by police</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police disregard anti-gay crime</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION: The responses from the survey clearly reveal that the majority of respondents (75.8%) who have experienced serious anti-gay/lesbian violence in Greater Vancouver do not report these incidents to police out of a fear of secondary victimization, while others (11.6%)
believe that since police give little priority to these crimes they are not worth reporting. The seriousness of the problem of under-reporting—which is rooted in homophobia and the stigmatization and marginalization of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in our society—cannot be overstated and requires immediate consideration by law enforcement authorities and legislators across the country. This hypothesis is accepted.

The following represent a sample of respondent’s reasons for not reporting incidents to police:

Don’t Trust Police/ Police Won’t Help

“Fear of more attacks, fear more police harassment, mockery and disbelief”. (19 year old female)

“The police had my lover and I under illegal surveillance because we were planning to sue them as a result of [an assault against us by police at a Commercial Drive Bus Stop]. They had our phone tapped, illegally entered our apartment when we were out, and constantly followed us for 6 months. We have no criminal records”. (34 year old West-End female)

“The harassment was from a stranger, it was not repeated, and the police really wouldn’t do anything anyway, would they”. (24 year old female)

“It’s like reporting anti-Jewish violence to Hitler”. (32 year old male)

“Fear of harassment; believed the police would dismiss the situation”. (41 year old male)

“They couldn’t care less, and they seem too hostile”. (37 year old male)

Crimes are Not a Criminal Offense

“I don’t believe the incidents to be a criminal offence (in the Criminal Code of Canada)”. (36 year old female)

Personal Reasons

“Fear of jeopardizing my career; lack of personal support network or advocate”. (39 year old male)

“I felt humiliated, embarrassed and I didn’t think [the police] could help much”. (24 year old male)
“Felt too ashamed at that time; felt my name would go on a Black list at Police HQ, and also might impact my job”. (38 year old male)

“Emotional hurt was greater. Wanted safety of my bed”. (35 year old male)

**Outness**

“Most commonly the incidents involved name-calling, mild assaults from strangers who then left the scene and would be difficult to locate. I would be more likely to report incidents now that I am more ‘out’, and now that I know our police force has a Bias Crimes Unit”. (29 yr. old male)

**E. Summary of Findings**

**1. Overview**

In many respects one of the most interesting (and satisfying) aspects of the results of the research is the quantification of what we already know, namely that lesbian, gay and bisexual persons live in all areas of the Greater Vancouver region, from the downtown core to the Fraser Valley; that we represent a cross-section of age, racial, occupational, educational, and class backgrounds; that many of us are engaged in committed, long-lasting and legitimate relationships and families; that an overwhelming number of us consider ourselves to constitute a particular community of individuals due to our sexual orientation; and that many of us participate in the political, cultural, economic, social, and recreational structures that we have created, and that continue to shape and define our communities.

At the same time, the survey results reveal how the considerable homophobic violence in Greater Vancouver affects virtually every facet of our lives and causes large numbers of us to fear for our personal safety. As a result, large numbers of gay, lesbian and bisexual persons routinely hide their sexual orientation from others in order to avoid discrimination, harassment and physical assault, while an increased sense of insecurity, discomfort and ultimately danger, is experienced by those who refuse to remain “closeted” and ashamed of who they are. The data indicate, for
example, that being “out” about being gay, lesbian or bisexual creates an increased proneness to victimization at school, in employment situations, in familial contexts, on the streets of cities, suburbs, small towns and rural areas, and in other everyday public places and situations throughout the region. While the survey results reveal that anti-gay/lesbian victimization is not confined to any particular part of Greater Vancouver, they also suggest that considerable homophobic violence occurs, paradoxically, in areas where many lesbians, gay men and bisexuals feel most welcome and secure—in and near the various commercial and institutional establishments of the West End and Commercial Drive neighborhoods of Vancouver. In order to present a more thorough summary of the overall results of the survey, we turn to an examination of the data pertinent to the main research hypotheses that informed the research.

2. Research Hypotheses

In terms of the nine hypotheses that guide this thesis, we can make the following summary conclusions. First, the data suggest a positive relationship between both the extent to which gay men, lesbians and bisexuals are “out” about their sexual orientation and the extent to which they conform to gay/lesbian stereotypes, and the amount of anti-gay/lesbian victimization they experience in everyday life. Second, the results indicate that those who are most out and who most conform to gay/lesbian stereotypes experience not only more victimization, but also more severe forms of victimization due to their sexual orientation.

Third, the survey data suggest that more homophobic victimization occurs in gay/lesbian-identified areas than in non-gay/lesbian areas. But while male respondents experience increased victimization in gay/lesbian enclaves (especially those who live in them), female respondents are more likely to be victimized in non-lesbian/gay contexts. Fourth, the results indicate that gay and bisexual men who are most active in gay/lesbian issues, and who more often frequent gay/lesbian establishments, tend to be confronted with more homophobic violence than those who are less so. At the same time, we were not able to find a corresponding relationship for those lesbian and
bisexual women who are most active and integrated into their community. Fifth, while the responses of the sampled gay men, lesbians and bisexuals indicate that relations between gays, lesbians and bisexuals and the Vancouver police appear to be improving, much work remains to be done. For example, while large numbers of survey respondents indicate that they have enjoyed positive experiences with the Vancouver police, we find that those who most conform to gay/lesbian stereotypes are 26% less likely to give the police response a positive rating than those who either conform a little or do not at all conform to gay/lesbian stereotypes. The survey results also suggest that a majority of respondents who have experienced serious victimization did not report it to police because they either fear the police, or they believe that anti-gay/lesbian violence is neither taken seriously nor given the priority it deserves by either the Vancouver force or the R.C.M.P.

Seventh, while the results of the survey indicate that increased outness brings increased levels of victimization for respondents, the data also suggest that for both male and female respondents, those who are most out are most likely to report incidents to police, compared to those who remain closeted. At the same time, in view of the contradictory nature of the findings, and the low cell frequencies observed, we are not able to conclude that those respondents who are most active in and integrated into gay/lesbian communities, will be most likely to report incidents to police. Finally, overall more male respondents have reported incidents to police than have female respondents.
Chapter 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Introduction

In lieu of official statistical information concerning gay/lesbian communities in Canada, the survey data presented in this thesis provide an opportunity to learn more about the defining features of the largely submerged (and officially invisible) gay/lesbian communities in Vancouver. The data also allow for a better understanding of the extent and nature of anti-lesbian/gay violence in Greater Vancouver than is evidenced by existing statistics. Finally, by documenting the disturbing ways in which pervasive homophobia and heterosexism become manifest in the lives of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals, the data underscore the important work of activists and others who are engaged in the struggle to address the marginalization and de-legitimation of gay/lesbian life in institutional and other social contexts throughout Canadian society.

Since this thesis represents the first survey on anti-lesbian/gay violence conducted in one of Canada’s large urban centers, it reveals important descriptive information concerning the demographic characteristics, lifestyle attributes, and victimization experiences of individuals in the gay/lesbian communities in a “big city” setting. In the context of Greater Vancouver, the results challenge officials in the Vancouver police who argue that anti-gay/lesbian violence is much more prevalent “back east” (in Toronto, Montreal or Ottawa) that it is in Vancouver. More importantly, the pervasive homophobic violence captured here accords with other Canadian surveys on anti-gay/lesbian violence, as well as data collected by individuals and organizations in the United States. But while this consistency lends credibility to these findings, it also highlights

46 In a conversation with a member of the Vancouver police’s Community Relations Unit (July 11, 1995), I was informed that while a special Vancouver police unit dealing with interpersonal violence is in the developmental stage, this new unit will be concerned initially with conjugal violence only. The officer informed me that this unit may accept hate crimes as part of its mandate in future, but not now. He noted that hate crimes will not be included as part of the unit’s initial mandate since they are “not that prevalent here in Vancouver, not like they are ‘back east’ in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa”. The officer commented that our more “tolerant, laid back” nature here on the west coast makes a focus on hate crimes unnecessary.
the fact that much of what we know about anti-gay/lesbian violence is obscured by the purposive sampling method of distribution.

Harry (1990) has argued that there is an urgent need to initiate large-scale probability samples in order to achieve a more representative sample of the lesbian/gay population (in terms of age, outness, integration into gay/lesbian communities, and area of residence), and hence a more comprehensive picture of the full extent and nature of anti-lesbian/gay victimization. Despite the methodological limitations of the purposive method and the need for data procured through probability sampling, the data captured in this thesis contribute to our general understanding of several important issues raised in the emerging literature concerned with the stigmatization, marginalization and victimization of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals.

B. Substantive Issues and Concerns

This study of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Greater Vancouver contributes to our understanding of three important issues raised in the literature: i) Harry’s (1982) conceptualization of “cultural” and “opportunistic” victimization, and the sociological contexts in which these occur; ii) Berrill and Herek’s (1990) notion of the dual (“primary” and “secondary”) nature of anti-gay/lesbian victimization; and iii) the discrepancy between Harry (1982) and Comstock’s versus Miller and Humphreys’ (1980) findings concerning the relationship between “outness” and victimization. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

1. Opportunistic and Cultural Victimization

Harry (1990, 1982) has argued that up to 40% of homophobic incidents against gay men are “opportunistic” in nature. In other words, they are acts committed by individuals who have come to possess knowledge of the victim’s sexual orientation (i.e., family, friends, co-workers, caregivers, etc.). Harry contends that opportunistic victimization tends to characterize the type of
anti-gay violence that occurs in small towns and other areas where there is an absence of identifiably gay/lesbian areas, institutions, and businesses. He uses the term "cultural" victimization to characterize violence against those who live in gay-identified areas, who are most active in the gay community, or who conform most to stereotypes of gay men.

Harry (1982: 555) found that: gay men who live in gay-identified areas are 7% more likely to be victimized than those who do not; those whose friends were "mostly or all" gay are 8% more likely to be victimized than those whose friends are "half, mostly or all straight"; and that gay men who conform most to stereotypes experienced 22% more victimization than those who conform the least. While Harry's conceptualizations are instructive, his data are limited by the omission of women in his sample. This omission limits our understanding of the extent to which "opportunistic" and "cultural" victimization vary by sex amongst homosexual persons. This becomes all the more problematic in relation to Stermac and Sheridan's (1993: 35) (unsupported) contention that lesbians are more likely to be victimized by known persons, compared to gay men who are more likely to be victimized by strangers. While there are scattered data in the literature that adduce the nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence there has yet to be a study that systematically seeks to examine the issue of "opportunistic" and "cultural" victimization per se.

In this study of anti-gay/lesbian violence, I asked respondents to indicate whether they knew the offender in their most recent incident. The data indicate that females are 10% more likely than males to have known the person who most recently perpetrated violence against them. This statistic alone does not necessarily mean that lesbian or bisexual females are more likely to know their victimizers than are gay or bisexual men. In fact, the data suggest that both males and females in this survey report a large amount of "opportunistic" victimization. Given that lesbians,

---

47 For example, Comstock (1991) finds that 59% of all the victimization in his survey occurred in gay/lesbian-identified neighborhoods, affecting 66% of male and 45% of female respondents. The Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force's 1992 study data indicate that: 31% of male respondents have been abused at work, compared with 34% of females; that an average of 58% of male and 30% of female respondents have been victimized at school by classmates or teachers; and that an average of 31% of male and 33% of female respondents have been victimized by family members due to their sexual orientation. These results do not necessarily corroborate Stermac and Sheridan's claim.
gay men and bisexuals seem to be much more prone to “opportunistic” victimization (in which assailants are known by their victims) than are ethno-cultural minorities (Berk, 1990), it is apparent that more research needs to be done to determine why this is the case. This research would need to focus more specifically on perpetrators and the contexts of victimization, as well as explore the extent to which results vary by gender.

While more research on the contexts of anti-gay/lesbian victimization is required, our Vancouver data reveal significant discrepancies along gender lines, especially in relation to several of the nine research hypotheses. In other words, it appears that Harry’s results (and concomitant conclusions) concerning the relationship between the geographical contexts of victimization, the extent to which one is active and integrated in gay communities, and the ways in which personal and lifestyle attributes affect one’s likelihood of reporting incidents do not necessarily hold for both males and females. This finding indicates that generalizations concerning the nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence are problematic if they do not account for variations in male and female experience.

2. **Primary and Secondary Victimization**

According to Berrill and Herek (1990), lesbians, gay men and bisexuals are victimized in two related ways. They use the term “primary victimization” to denote the various forms of discrimination, harassment and physical assault that are perpetrated against individuals simply because they are lesbian, gay or bisexual. The second type of victimization, “secondary” victimization describes the prejudice, social estrangement, discrimination, harassment and physical assault that often confronts lesbian, gay and bisexual persons who attempt to report victimization to family, friends, caregivers, police and others. Berrill and Herek note that while the latter form of victimization is often less obvious, it is arguably just as egregious as the former. They maintain that both forms of anti-lesbian/gay victimization are a direct result of rampant social homophobia and heterosexism.
The existing American and Canadian data illustrate that up to 80% of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals routinely conceal their sexual orientation in order to avoid discrimination, harassment or physical assault. We find that approximately three quarters of Vancouver respondents “sometimes” or “always” conceal their sexual orientation in employment situations, and about 60% “sometimes” or “always” do so when looking for rental housing accommodation. In addition, the social forces that cause individuals to conceal the fact they are lesbian, gay or bisexual in these situations also cause them to avoid seeking assistance after incidents or reporting incidents to police. When Vancouver respondents were asked to explain why they did not report victimization to police, the majority indicated that they did not report because of fear of facing (secondary) victimization by police or in other social contexts upon disclosing their sexual orientation.

While existing data reveal that the majority of anti-lesbian/gay bias crimes go unreported, there appears to be an assumption in the literature that reporting is linked to the extent to which the victim is “out” (those who are most out are assumed to be most likely to report incidents since they are presumed to be able to deal with the consequences of disclosure that comes with reporting). When I quantified the relationship between outness and reporting I found that overall, those who score “high” on outness are 10.0% more likely to report incidents than those who score “low/medium”. We find that the relationship is stronger for male (14.7%) than for female (5.6%) respondents. Given the findings in this thesis, we can conclude that survivors’ experiences (and fears) of secondary victimization are related to outness. At the same time, however, much more needs to be done to determine the extent to which secondary victimization affects both the likelihood that survivors will seek psychological and other assistance, and the kinds of assistance that gay, lesbian and bisexual persons will seek out in order to cope with ongoing homophobic violence. It is also important that future research more thoroughly addresses

48 It is important to note that while these data suggest a significant relationship we are dealing with about 35 frequencies per cell category only (i.e., yes, no, “low/medium”, “high”). Thus there is no observed statistical significance for the overall relationship (p= .22), nor is there by sex: (males = p= .11; females = p= .74).
the issue of why some incidents are reported to police while others are not, including an analysis of who tends to report and who does not. This information is vital. It is only through reporting that law enforcement authorities will be made to appreciate both the real nature and extent of anti-gay/lesbian violence, as well as the ways in which police officers can be more effective in their response to homophobic violence in public places.

3. Outness and Victimization

The discrepancy in the literature between Harry (1982) and Comstock's (1991) data and Miller and Humphreys' (1980) findings led me to quantify the relationship between outness and integration into and activity in gay/lesbian communities with the levels of victimization experienced by respondents. The data to date indicate that out lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals experience more victimization than those who are less out. At the same time, in the absence of probability sampling, it is almost impossible to obtain data from the kinds of individuals who Humphreys interviewed in “tearooms” and other cruising environments (since these individuals are highly unlikely to contribute to a survey distributed to the gay/lesbian communities through the purposive method technique). Perhaps future probability samples will be able to access the experiences of both males and females who are severely closeted and/or covert concerning disclosure of their sexual orientation, or activity in the social structures of gay and lesbian communities.

C. Recommendations

The theoretical orientation of this thesis focuses upon the sociological basis of the pervasive homophobia and homophobic violence that occur throughout Canadian society. The symbolic interactionist approach of Becker and Goffman has been utilized to assert first, that stigmatization and deviance are not phenomena that inhere innately in the stigmatized. Rather, they are social
constructions which, as Becker suggests, are applied to particular groups of people, in particular times, and in particular social contexts. In addition, we have seen considerable evidence that supports Goffman's astute views concerning the relationship between stigmatization and victimization. This theoretical foundation, complemented by Wilson's feminist reading of the (often dangerous) ways in which social mores and institutionalized inequalities become manifest in everyday life, is an important basis for the study of anti-gay/lesbian violence, because it shifts responsibility for one’s victimization away from the “lifestyle” of the victim and to the social, political and cultural institutions that directly give rise to it. In other words, when marginalization and inequality are institutionalized as acceptable practice, it is the institutional structures and practices themselves that are directly implicated in the violence that is perpetrated against the marginalized persons.

It is with this theoretical context in mind, that I present the following summary recommendations. These recommendations are not my own, but rather come from the survey respondents themselves. They will be listed in order, beginning with those most often cited by survey respondents. They are aimed at eradicating not only anti-gay/lesbian violence, but also the marginalization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual persons in Canadian society—for as we have just discussed, marginalization and victimization are not mutually exclusive, but rather very much interdependent.

**COMBATING VIOLENCE AGAINST LESBIANS, GAY MEN AND BISEXUALS IN CANADA**

**MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 337 SURVEY RESPONDENTS IN GREATER VANCOUVER:**

1. The heterosexual public needs to be educated (by governments, by the educational system and by other mainstream institutions) that homosexuality is natural and that lesbians and gay men represent individuals of all races, all ages, and are individuals who exist in all walks of life.

2. Inclusion of positive discussions of homosexuality in school curricula, and encourage lesbian/gay tolerance in the public school system.

3. An increase in society’s awareness of the problem of anti-gay/lesbian violence, and more reporting of incidents to police.
4. More community-oriented street patrols by police in known danger areas (such as the West End), and at known dangerous times (especially late nights).

5. A more sensitive and effective police response to anti-gay/lesbian violence by the Vancouver Police, including the recruitment of more “out” lesbian and gay officers.

6. More lesbian/gay “Q-Patrol” style guardians on the streets of known lesbian/gay areas.

7. More severe punishment for perpetrators of hate-crimes violence.

8. An overall increase in gay/lesbian visibility in all areas of society.

9. Public support for lesbians, gay men and bisexuals by mainstream politicians, churches and other organizations.

10. Immediate legislation for lesbian and gay equality in all aspects of Canadian life.

11. More pro-active government support for anti-hate crimes campaigns.

12. Continued organizing in the gay and lesbian communities, including an increase in lesbian/gay pride.

13. Self-defense courses for lesbians, gay men and bisexuals

14. Members of the lesbian and gay communities “looking out” for each other’s safety.
# Appendix 1. Survey Questionnaire

## SURVEY ON ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE IN THE VANCOUVER AREA

The purpose of this survey is to collect data on the incidence and nature of anti-lesbian/gay violence in Greater Vancouver. It is the first major survey of its kind in Canada and is the basis for research toward a M.A. degree in Sociology at Simon Fraser University. Results of the survey may be obtained by writing to Stephen Samis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, SFU, Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6.

Completion of this survey is voluntary and your responses are completely anonymous. If you wish to make more detailed comments, please write them on a separate page and fold it into the questionnaire. All personal information will be kept strictly confidential. Please place your questionnaire into the box provided or mail it to: Box 183, 125A Denman St., Vancouver, BC, V6G 2M6, or fax it to 687-5434 (faxes accepted until August 25 only). Thank you for completing the survey—your responses are very important! Should you require information, or have concerns or comments about any aspect of the survey, please contact Dr. Ellen Gee, Chair, Department of Sociology/Anthropology at SFU at 291-3146.

### Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Residence</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What neighborhood do you live in (i.e. West End, Commercial Drive, Coquitlam etc.) -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long have you lived in the Lower Mainland?</th>
<th>months or years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Year of Birth Sex: Male [ ] Female [ ]

Racial/Ethnic Origin: White [ ] Black [ ] Asian [ ] Indo-Canadian [ ] Native/Aboriginal [ ] Other [ ]

Education: Did not finish High School [ ] High School [ ] Some Post-secondary[ ] College/Technical School Diploma [ ] University Degree or more [ ]

Annual Personal Income: Under $15,000 [ ] 15,001 to 30,000 [ ] 30,001 to 50,000 [ ] 50,001 or more [ ]

Sexual Orientation (Check only one): Gay [ ] Lesbian [ ] Bisexual (Primarily Gay/Lesbian) [ ]

Are you "out"? Yes [ ] No [ ] How long have you been "out"? months or years

Are you: HIV+ Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know [ ]

Do you have AIDS?: Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know [ ]

Marital Status (check one): married [ ] single [ ] separated [ ] divorced/separated [ ]

Are you part of a lesbian or gay couple? Yes [ ] No [ ] How long? ________ Do you live together? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Do you have children? Yes [ ] No [ ] Do you have custody? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Occupation Are you Employed [ ] Unemployed [ ] Student [ ]

1. What portion of each of the following groups is aware you are lesbian or gay?
2. How frequently do you go out in the evening to lesbian/gay bars, or similar establishments? (please answer only one response) _______ time(s) per week _______ time(s) per year _______ time(s) per month _______ never

3. How active are you in gay/lesbian politics, issues, etc. _______ Very Active _______ Somewhat Active _______ Not Too Active _______ Not Active At All

4. Do you consider yourself to be part of a gay or lesbian community? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know Why or Why not?

5. Do you belong to any gay or lesbian clubs, groups, organizations? [ ] Yes [ ] No (If yes, please indicate number and types) ______________________________________________________

6. Have you ever marched or participated in a lesbian/gay Pride Day Parade? [ ] Yes [ ] No (If yes, how many times?) _______ times

Anti-lesbian/gay Discrimination, Harassment and Violence

This section deals with anti-gay/lesbian discrimination only. It should not be confused with discrimination based on race/ethnicity, religion, or gender. Please specify separately anti-gay/lesbian discrimination which occurred in the past year and discrimination which occurred prior to that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Discrimination Because of Your Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Since May 1993</th>
<th>Prior to May 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination (Fired)</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Evaluation</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Clients/Customer</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination at School Because of Your Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Since May 1993</th>
<th>Prior to May 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Called anti-gay/lesbian names</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened you with violence</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically assaulted you</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since May 1993  |  Prior to May 1993
---|---
Yes | Yes | N.A. | Yes | Yes | N.A.

### Housing Discrimination

**Because of Your Sexual Orientation**

- **Purchase**
  - [ ] [ ] [ ]
  - [ ] [ ] [ ]

- **Rental**
  - [ ] [ ] [ ]
  - [ ] [ ] [ ]

Are you afraid you could experience employment discrimination because you are lesbian, gay or bisexual? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Applicable

If "Yes", do you conceal your sexual orientation because of this fear?

- [ ] Never [ ] Sometimes [ ] Always

Are you afraid you could experience housing discrimination because you are lesbian, gay or bisexual?

- [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Applicable

If yes, do you conceal your sexual orientation because of this fear?

- [ ] Never [ ] Sometimes [ ] Always

Are you afraid you could experience the loss of custody of your children because you are gay, lesbian or bisexual? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Applicable

If yes, do you conceal your sexual orientation because of this fear?

- [ ] Never [ ] Sometimes [ ] Always

*This section of the deals with anti-lesbian/gay harassment, violence and victimization. Since anti-gay/lesbian victimization is often related to stereotypes based on appearance, mannerisms etc. it is important to know how you think strangers and others perceive you.*

Please describe how you believe others perceive you by answering the following: "Most people I meet think I am": [ ] lesbian/gay [ ] straight [ ]

To what extent do you see yourself as conforming to stereotypes concerning the appearance of lesbians or gay men? [ ] a lot [ ] a little [ ] not at all [ ]

*Please indicate incidents which have occurred in the past year and prior to that time. Please indicate how frequently each of these incidents occurred using the following scale: 0=Never  1=Once  2=More Than Once*

Since May 1993  |  Prior to May 1993
---|---

**Had verbal insults directed at you?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Had your personal property damaged or stolen?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been threatened with physical violence?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Had objects thrown at you?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been chased or followed?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been punched, hit, kicked or beaten (non-sexual)?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been punched, hit, kicked or beaten (sexual)?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been assaulted with a weapon (non-sexual)?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been assaulted with a weapon (sexual)?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been seriously harassed (without assault)?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been harassed by police (without assault)?**

- [ ] [ ]

**Been beaten by police?**

- [ ] [ ]
Been blackmailed? [ ] [ ]

Please indicate where the incidents occurred. (You may check more than one)
- In a gay neighborhood [ ]
- In a non-gay neighborhood [ ]
- In a rural/suburban area [ ]
- In your home [ ]
- In your parent's home [ ]
- In somebody else's home [ ]
- On public transit [ ]
- In police custody [ ]
- At work [ ]
- In a restaurant/bar/hotel [ ]
- Other recreational facilities [ ]
- In a "cruising" area [ ]
- Outside or near a gay business (e.g. a bar) [ ]

In the most recent incident, did you know the person who victimized you? Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know [ ]

Please describe this incident

In the most recent incident, was the person who victimized you: Male [ ] or Female [ ]

Was he or she: Under 18 years of age [ ]
Between 19-29 [ ]
30 years and over [ ]

Have you ever needed medical attention after an incident? Yes [ ] No [ ] If yes, how often? ___ times

Have you ever needed medical attention after an incident, but not sought it out? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, why did you not seek medical attention?

Have you been harassed by members of your family because they knew or suspected you are gay/lesbian or bisexual? (check as many as necessary) Father [ ] Mother [ ] Brother [ ] Sister [ ] Other [ ]

Have you ever been physically attacked (punched, kicked, raped) by members of your family because they knew or suspected you are gay/lesbian or bisexual? (check as many as necessary) Father [ ] Mother [ ] Brother [ ] Sister [ ] Other [ ]

Have you ever been harassed by supervisors and/or work mates because they knew or suspected you are gay/lesbian or bisexual? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Have you ever been physically attacked by supervisors and/or work mates because they knew or suspected you are gay/lesbian or bisexual? Yes [ ] No [ ]

How may other lesbians, gay men or bisexuals in the Lower Mainland do you know who have been (place a number in each box): harassed [ ] physically attacked [ ] murdered [ ] because of their sexual orientation? Approximately what percent is this of the lesbians, gay men and bisexuals that you know here ____%

How much harassment did you experience from teachers and school officials because they knew or thought you were lesbian/gay/bisexual? [ ] A lot [ ] A little [ ] None at all

Please explain

Police

Have you ever experienced anti-gay violence, threats or harassment which could have been reported to the local police? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, how many of these incidents did you in fact report to the police? None [ ] Some [ ] All [ ]

If you have reported incidents to the police, when was the last one?
If you have never reported anti-gay/lesbian incidents to police why not? ____________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

If you did report incidents to the police:

Was this reported to the Vancouver police? Yes [ ] No [ ] If no, what was the police force/agency? ________________

Did they know that you were gay, lesbian or bisexual? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know

In your most recent report, how would you rate the overall performance of the police? Excellent [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ]

How would you describe the attitude of the police? Sensitive [ ] Supportive [ ] Hostile [ ] Professional [ ] Un-Professional [ ] Homophobic [ ] What police force/agency? ________________

What is your local police force? (Please check one) Vancouver Police [ ] RCMP [ ] Other [ ] ________________

Does this police force record hate crimes as a separate crime category? Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know [ ]

Have you ever reported an anti-lesbian/gay incident to a community Lesbian/Gay agency? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, which agency ____________________________ Please describe the type of service ____________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Are you more likely to seek assistance from a gay/lesbian center or agency than a non-gay/lesbian service? Yes [ ] No [ ] Why or why not? ____________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Have you been physically attacked (non-sexual) due to your sexual orientation and not told anyone till now? Yes [ ] No [ ] If yes, why did you not tell anyone ____________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Do you fear for your safety in the Lower Mainland because of anti-gay/lesbian violence? Yes [ ] No [ ]

In the future, how likely do you believe it is that you could experience the following due to your sexual orientation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Too Likely</th>
<th>Not Likely at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discriminated against</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened with violence</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically attacked</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdered</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past three years, do you believe that anti-gay/lesbian violence and harassment has: risen a lot [ ] risen a little [ ] remained the same [ ] decreased a little [ ] decreased a lot [ ] don't know [ ]

What do you think would be most effective in combating anti-lesbian/gay violence in the Lower Mainland? ____________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 2. Survey Box Locations (Commercial Drive)

1. Stonewall Festival *(Grandview Park)*
3. La Quena Coffee House
5. Vancouver Lesbian Centre
9. Book Mantel Bookstore
Appendix 3. Survey Box Locations (West End)

2. Pride Festival *(Sunset Beach)*
6. Gay/Lesbian Centre of Vancouver
7. Little Sisters Gay/Lesbian Bookstore
8. YWCA (Downtown Vancouver)
11. Otooz Fresh Juice Bar
12. Delany’s Coffee House
13. The Edge Coffee House
14. Denman Station
21. Heritage House Hotel
23. Pacific Cinematheque

*Not Shown*

4. Mailed-in Questionnaires
10. Out on Screen Questionnaires
15. Angles Drawer
16. Angles Mailed In
17. Angles Faxed In
18. SFU Women’s Centre
19. Lotus Club
20. Survey Faxed In
22. Personal Request
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