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ABSTRACT

This thesis is a case study of the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. The case study combines a comparative analysis of statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence collected in Toronto with those obtained in other Canadian and American anti-gay/lesbian violence studies including a critical analysis of the institutions which respond to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto such as police, the 519 Church Street Community Centre, the Wellesley Central Hospital, and the Metro Toronto Police Services Hate Crime Unit. An overview of the model of victim assistance developed by the volunteers and coordinator of the 519 Church Street Community Centre Community Response to Bashing Committee is given. A critique of the theoretical perspectives and the methodological approaches used to explain and create knowledge about anti-gay/lesbian violence is provided. The thesis ends with concluding remarks and policy recommendations to guide future research.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a case study of the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. The case study combines a comparative analysis of statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence collected in Toronto with those obtained in other Canadian and American anti-gay/lesbian violence studies. It includes a critical analysis of the institutions which respond to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto such as police, the 519 Church Street Community Centre, The Wellesley Central Hospital, and the Metro Toronto Police Services Hate Crime Unit. The data obtained from respondents attending Pride Day in Toronto provide a context by which to assess the scope and prevalence of anti-gay/lesbian violence experienced by the sexual minority population attending Pride Day. Analysis of institutional responses to victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence is done with a view to critically assessing the effectiveness of such programs.

This study is important because the scope and extent of anti-gay/lesbian violence has never been empirically researched in Toronto before. While there have been studies in Vancouver, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia on anti-gay/lesbian violence, the impact on individuals and the community has not been studied in Toronto.

The case study will add to the growing body of research on anti-gay/lesbian violence in North America. None of the Canadian studies has linked their findings with all of the other North American research to date. In this thesis I provide a comparison of my findings with studies done in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Vancouver, and American research comparing empirical data by Herek and Berrill (1992) and Comstock (1991). Secondly, the case study will provide a research base for future research on anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The aim of the research is to document the incidence and impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence on individuals and communities, and to compare the findings from the Toronto Pride Day survey distributed over a two year period with specific other North American research findings. The second aim of the research is to present information collected in a systematic way from Toronto based institutions, individuals, and communities that document the community response and history of organizing against anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. This study of Toronto based institutions and the empirical data collected from Pride Day respondents combines to present a case study of the institutional, individual, and community response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto.
The issue of subjectivity and objectivity is important in this research. My work as a feminist researcher who has been active in the lesbian feminist, gay, bisexual and queer community over the last fifteen years influenced my research approach and perspective. I was initially immersed in the feminist anti-violence movement as a counsellor of battered women and children, and a researcher of lesbian battering (Faulkner, 1991; Faulkner, 1998). My interest in anti-gay/lesbian violence evolved out of my interest in a variety of issues. First, as a requirement for fieldwork in sociology I became a volunteer at the 519 Church Street Community Centre. Out of that field placement I became aware of the community response to bashing in Toronto. As a woman I felt that anti-gay violence was a gay male problem. However, as I became more involved with the Victim Assistance Program I determined that the focus on gay male issues camouflaged the diverse experiences lesbians, gays, and bisexuals had with those who verbally and physically intimidated and attacked them. Secondly, aside from political matters, as a sociologist I was interested in community organizing and the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence. Thirdly, my volunteerism provided me with a place to go outside of the university to a space in which lesbian and gay issues were openly discussed and debated and where the diverse downtown community converged. As a graduate student at the University of Toronto I found the lack of a queer community alienating. My activism allowed me to combine research with a community with whom I held political ties, while at the same time affirming my belief in combining theory with practice. In this way I attempted to ground my research in my subjective world while at the same time objectively documenting and critiquing the social world around me.

Historically, killings of gay and lesbian persons have been legally sanctioned (Robson, 1992; Boswell, 1980). While excesses of violence based on religious and racial hatred have resulted in international legal protection of human rights for traditionally disadvantaged groups, irrational hatred of sexual minority persons has not, until recently, been perceived as warranting the same attention (Canadian Bar Association, 1995:1; Amnesty International, 1994). While laws proscribing death to those who practice homosexuality still exist in some countries, more recently in North American society moral and ethical values are utilized to facilitate the social control of sexual minority persons through harassment, detainment, intimidation, physical assault, murder, and denial of personhood (Harvard Law Review, 1989; Lahey, 1999; Brenner, 1995; Shilts, 1982).
In asking about the scope of the problem of anti-gay/lesbian violence people usually ask: is anti-gay/lesbian violence a problem? Is it an extensive problem? What is the context of the present research on anti-gay/lesbian violence in North America? Why does it deserve study? What is not known about this area of research that should be known?

In answering questions about the scope of the problem of anti-gay/lesbian violence we must turn to findings from surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence as well as national tracking programs affiliated with community-based anti-violence organizations in fourteen areas across the United States (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP), 1996). Researchers in the United States have done far more extensive research than Canadians, not only on hate crimes but also on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered issues in general. However, some of the research has followed the format developed by Gregory Herek (1992) and is therefore comparable. Statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence have been collected in conjunction with police services in Australia and the United Kingdom (Anti-Discrimination Board of New South Wales, June 1994). In Canada, community-based surveys distributed in Nova Scotia, (Smith, 1993) New Brunswick, (NBCHRR, 1990) Toronto, (Faulkner, 1997) and Vancouver (Samis, 1995) reveal that the incidents of lifetime victimization are generally consistent across the Canadian and American studies. American studies by the National Lesbian and Gay Task Force (now the NCAVP) and Philadelphia (Aurand et al., 1985) provide comparable findings. Over 80 percent of the respondents in all of the six studies (72 percent in Nova Scotia; 77.5 percent in Toronto) reported experiencing some form of verbal assault/harassment based on sexual orientation. Over 30 percent (54 percent in Vancouver; 50.8 percent in Toronto) of respondents had been threatened with violence. Over 30 percent (41 percent in Vancouver; 25 percent in Philadelphia) had been chased or followed. And, over 16 percent (32.6 percent in Vancouver; ten percent in Philadelphia) of respondents had been beaten or punched because of their sexual orientation. Over 20 percent in all the studies (18.5 percent in Nova Scotia; 18 percent in Vancouver) had been harassed by police. Over seven percent had been assaulted with a weapon (four percent in Philadelphia; 11.5 percent in Vancouver).

Averaging of percentages of lifetime victimization across the four Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence studies reveals that over 79 percent have been verbally threatened or harassed, 45 percent have been threatened with physical violence, 31 percent have been harassed or victimized in a school setting by students or teachers, 36 percent have been chased or
followed, 24 percent have had objects thrown at them, 22 percent have been punched, kicked or beaten, 21 percent have been sexually harassed, 20 percent have been harassed by police, 17 percent have had property damaged, 14 percent have been sexually assaulted, 12 percent have been spat upon, nine percent have been assaulted with a weapon, and four percent have been beaten or assaulted by police (Faulkner, 1997, Smith, 1993, Samis, 1995, NBCHRR, 1990).

In all of the Canadian and American studies gays and lesbians are most often victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Individuals with bisexual or heterosexual identities and transgendered persons can be victimized. The rate of victimization of non-lesbian and gay identified people is unknown since most of the previous Canadian and American studies have focused exclusively on lesbians and gay men. Bisexuals and heterosexuals are rarely studied in research on anti-gay/lesbian violence. In studies which did allow participants to self-identify their sexual orientation it was found that the perceived sexual orientation of the victim was the basis of targetting (Faulkner, 1997).

Research on anti-gay/lesbian violence reveal trends in violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, heterosexual, and transgendered persons. It does not purport to document the actual, or even approximate number of anti-gay/lesbian incidents that occur in North America. The diverse measures of anti-gay/lesbian violence used in different surveys make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions about the scope and prevalence of victimization patterns. However, many surveys use the same scale created by Dr. Gregory Herek to measure lifetime incidents of victimization which provides consistency across many of the North American studies. American research based on extensive empirical evidence shows that anti-gay/lesbian violence is vastly under-reported to the police. Roberts (1995) estimates that only one in ten hate crimes is ever reported to authorities, and that this number may be even less for gays and lesbians who fear secondary victimization. The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Program's NCAVP 1996 Annual Report states that dozens of prevalence surveys, academic studies and government-funded reports conducted over the last two decades in the United States show that gay men and lesbians are disproportionately the victims of hate motivated crime (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 1996:1). Lesbians and gay men and racial/ethnic groups are more likely to be victims of face-to-face altercations such as assault, harassment, and intimidation, compared to those who are targeted because of their religion and who are more likely to experience property crimes such as vandalism (Garofolo, 1997:139). Under-reporting, coupled with the fact that most areas of
Canada and the United States do not have local victim assistance or documentation programs means that a very large percentage of anti-gay/lesbian violence remains undocumented (NCAVP, 1996:1).

The present context of research on anti-gay/lesbian violence in North America lies in the shadow of decades of intolerance and hostility towards lesbians, gay men, and their communities. Present research is situated within the context of HIV/AIDS activism and resistance to progress gays and lesbians have made in gaining equal rights. Mobilization of a gay and lesbian politic has promoted the notion of equal rights for lesbian and gay persons similar to those granted to heterosexual persons. Equality provisions challenge discriminatory laws and influence notions of social justice, while at the same time altering the public view of lesbians and gay men and their lower status within the social milieu. No longer willing to hide their sexuality, many lesbian and gay victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence have chosen to ask for the same protections given to heterosexual victims of crime (Herman, 1994). The advancement of same-sex political rights has influenced the need to improve the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence. Along with this has come the recognition that documentation of anti-gay/lesbian victimization is essential in ensuring increased rights, adequate protection, advocacy, and referral for individuals and communities. Counter to the equal rights position is anti-assimilationism which purports that gay equal rights politics shroud the inequalities existing between men and women in the queer community (Phelan, 1989). This approach calls for an examination of how heterosexism, sexism and racism impact on homophobia. As well, it suggests there is a need to reevaluate existing social institutions rather than wholeheartedly embracing their belief systems (Robson, 1992).

More recently, national attention has been drawn to the issue of gay bashing through the murder of Matthew Shepard, a gay man who was beaten to death and robbed by two men who were offended by a sexual pass he allegedly made toward one of them. The murder has renewed calls for a national standard law on hate crimes in the United States making it easier for federal prosecution of hate crimes (Associated Press, 1998:A17). Wyoming, the state in which Matthew Shepard was murdered, is one of nine States with no hate crime law (Associated Press and New York Times, 1998:A17). Religious Right Family Values groups protested the "evil" nature of homosexuality at Shepard's funeral, and Republicans are rejecting calls for increased protections through federal hate crime legislation.
In Toronto, the 519 Victim Assistance Programme and Metro Toronto's Hate Crime Unit note an increase of reports of hate-motivated crimes and the violence associated with attacks on gay men (Sarick, 1998:117). The Toronto Hate Crime Unit reports that hate crimes against gays are reported to be especially brutal, with damage often inflicted on the victim's face (Sarick, 1998:117). Despite enhanced sentencing provisions in Federal hate-crime sentencing regulations whereby judges may impose heavier sentences on offenders, and police diligence about identifying hate-motivated crimes, victim assistant advocates suggest that perpetrators are rarely found, and motivation can be difficult to prove in court (Sarrick, 1998:117). In Canada the effectiveness of the enhanced sentencing law is still unknown. It is only two years old, which is insufficient time for criminal cases to work through the system (Yeung, 1998:25). While enhanced sentencing provisions may be a deterrent, the director of B'nai Brith's League for Human Rights believes that hate crime is presently on the rise in Toronto (Sarick, 1998:A17). In the Fall of 1998 a downtown Jewish Community Centre experienced a strange fire during the Jewish holiday season (Di Matteo, 1998a:23). At the same time, conservatives in Ontario's education system are slowly eroding advances in curriculum policy documents by removing mandatory anti-discrimination and anti-violence training (Di Matteo, 1998b:24). It is in this present context of economic uncertainty and right-wing backlash that lesbians and gay men struggle for increased visibility, equality, and protection.

Anti-gay/lesbian violence deserves study in Canada and Toronto because the trends in Canadian studies have never been compared to American statistics. Up until 1995, when I first organized the distribution of a survey with the 519 Church Street Community Centre, no survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence had been distributed in Toronto. Therefore incidents of victimization on a large scale had not been tracked in Toronto, and no comparison had been made between incident rates in Toronto and the rest of Canada or the United States. There has been no examination of the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto and no critical analysis of the data collection services in operation in downtown Toronto through the 519 Centre and the Toronto Police Services Hate Crime Unit. The response by hospitals, the community, and community police services has not been studied. However, there had been a report written at the University of Toronto in the early 1990's documenting the lesbian and gay positive Safe Space Campaign (Dr. David Rayside, personal communication). In the Canadian context, little is known about the effect of anti-gay/lesbian violence on victims, the levels of fear engendered in
potential victims, and how fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence leads lesbians and gay men to modify their behaviour. As well, trends in the perpetrator population and locations of anti-gay/lesbian violence have not been documented in Toronto. The reporting patterns of victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence have not been studied and little is known about their experience in seeking medical treatment and police protection. While Pride Day respondents represent a diverse population who live both in and outside Toronto, they also represent a cross-section of the gay and lesbian community in Ontario.

In Chapter Two I examine the theoretical frameworks that have been used to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence in order to show the gaps in the literature. In Chapter Three I discuss the methodology used in this study and the demographics obtained from the 1995-1996 survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence. I also provide a comparison of the Pride Day demographic data with demographics found in other Canadian surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence (New Brunswick, 1990, Nova Scotia, 1993. Samis, 1995, Faulkner, 1997). Chapter Four provides an overview of the model of victim assistance developed by the Community Response to Bashing Committee at Toronto's 519 Church Street Community Centre. In Chapter Five, I focus on responses to two questions asked of Pride Day respondents regarding whether their fear of anti-gay harassment or assault affects how they act or behave, and secondly how many people they know of personally who have been victimized. In Chapter Six, I report on the incidences of victimization reported by Toronto Pride Day respondents. In Chapter Seven, I present findings on the perpetrators and locations of anti-gay/lesbian violence reported by Toronto Pride Day respondents. Chapter Eight analyzes statistics on reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence to the 519 Church Street Community Centre Bashing Reporting Line between 1990 and 1995, reports by Pride Day survey respondents to police, hospitals, and the Bashing Reporting Line between 1995 to 1996, as well as reports to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Hate Crime Unit since 1993. Finally, Chapter Nine provides policy recommendations that arise from the findings from each chapter in the thesis. Chapter Ten provides brief concluding remarks.
CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS AND PSYCHO-SOCIAL DYNAMICS:
EXPLAINING ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE

2.1 Introduction
Sociological investigations into anti-gay/lesbian violence ask questions grounded in structural functionalist, symbolic interactionist, and conflict frameworks. Structural functionalists ask about the relationship between the individual and society. Symbolic interactionists ask whether the most important determinants of social behaviour are cultural or economic. And conflict theorists inquire into the bases of social inequality. Research on anti-gay/lesbian violence is guided by one or more of these classical theoretical frameworks. In this chapter I will discuss the sociology of knowledge created about anti-gay/lesbian violence and its political effect. I will provide an overview of the ways in which theorists utilize structural functionalist, symbolic interactionist and conflict frameworks to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence. Drawing upon deconstructionist critiques of criminology I will assess the ability of each theory to deal with difference, and point out the limitations of all prominent theories and their influences on the construction of knowledge about anti-gay/lesbian violence.

My aim in examining empiricism, standpointism, and deconstructivism is to show the disjuncture between theories promoting the emancipation of minorities espoused by feminist researchers and the present North American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence. Lack of analysis of difference on the part of the male-dominated criminology discipline means that, while violence against gays and lesbians is theorized through the lens of homophobia, the structural inequalities supporting heterosexism lack analysis. Gay victimization is conceptualized along a continuum with male-on-male violence which excludes lesbians and analyses of hate crimes against women. Lack of analysis of gender, race and ethnicity helps to retain the foothold of positivism, and hence supports a commitment to scientific research grounded in objective social science methods using male dominated theories of criminology. This theoretical exclusion blinds North American research on anti-gay and lesbian violence to the influence of misogyny, racism and heterosexism in the social construction of gay bashing.

The feminist empiricist approach of "adding gender" to existing research reveals that the existing feminist frameworks continue to perpetuate dichotomies that situate women at the
periphery of criminological theory. North American researchers such as Herek and Berrill (1992) also "add-on" chapters about lesbians as if this afterthought helps to make up for the lack of consideration of women, and women as lesbians in the research on violence against gay men and lesbians. Feminist standpointism asks women to research lesbians from their own subjective understanding of lesbian oppression, creating a new referent point by which to sustain the dominance of North American white lesbians and their experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The subject/object split is thus retained in North American feminist research. A positive aspect of feminist standpointism is its attempt to make linkages between violence against heterosexual women generally and anti-lesbian violence. Differences among women based on race, class, gender, are little explored in such approaches; however, standpointism has reinforced the importance of making research about lesbians by and for lesbians while also making the intersections between race, class, and sexuality.

The feminist deconstructionist project asks lesbians to go beyond empiricist standpoint frameworks to question the foundations of knowledge production, while at the same time incorporating difference in the deconstruction of existing theoretical approaches used to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence. Deconstructionists also remind lesbians to combine both qualitative and quantitative research approaches in their attempt to surpass the limitations of positivism (Mertens, 1998). The deconstructionist approach includes questioning how anti-violence projects and researchers of those projects deal or do not deal with difference.

Existing anti-gay/lesbian violence research studies are all North-American-based, written by men, rely on objectivist research approaches, assume there are "truths" about anti-gay/lesbian violence which can be uncovered using scientific methods, and in their empiricist approach, claim to deal with the categories of sexual orientation, while at the same time disregarding the negligence of sexuality in all the existing major criminological schools of crime. Hence their empiricist approach is to "add and stir" sexual orientation into pre-existing criminological frameworks influenced by strain-subcultural, symbolic interactionist, and control theories. North American researchers attempt to explain undifferentiated heterosexual male violence through the lenses of relative deprivation, the reactive hypothesis, labeling theory, identity theory, differential association theory, situational theory, power-control theory, resource theory, cultural and psychological heterosexism, the opportunity-structure hypothesis, masculine hegemony and
alienation (Comstock, 1991; Herek, 1992; Berrill, 1992; Wertheimer, 1992; Ehlrich, 1992; Samis, 1995).

Gregory Herek, (1992) David Comstock, (1991) Kevin Berrill, (1992) and Stephen Samis (1995) collect numerous statistics on violence against gay men and lesbian women that reveal different incidences of victimization by race/ethnicity, gender, class, and sexual orientation: nevertheless, they do not provide a theory which helps to explain different experiences of anti-gay and lesbian violence. Instead, they focus on theories of masculinity and crime which have been applied to all male-centric research on male crime since the beginning of academic crime research. At the same time, the gendered nature of previous criminological research on men is never acknowledged. As a result, anti-gay violence research does not consider how violence impacts on women as women and as lesbian women; nor does it consider how race/ethnicity deeply impacts on the experience of violence. While most of the research contrasts statistical data between anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys, American researchers tend to let the statistics on race/ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation, speak for themselves, while at the same time expanding on the experience of gay men, with the assumption that to do so speaks for everyone in the sample. For example, Berrill suggests that sexism is the cause of anti-gay/lesbian violence, yet does not expand on this proposition in his presentation of social statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence (Berrill, 1986). The deconstruction of this trend lies in feminist examinations of the androcentric nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence research (Jenness & Broad 1994; Wolf & Copeland, 1994).

2.2 The Effect of Political Organizing on the Development of Theoretical Frameworks

The political context in which knowledge about anti-gay/lesbian violence is produced influences the ways in which we think about bias-motivated crime (Jenness & Broad, 1994).

The negligible analysis of gender and race in anti-gay/lesbian violence activism supports the denial of the most pervasive form of anti-woman violence in North America, as well as the reality of patriarchal and sexist oppression. Hence, the legal dominance of men is supported by the United States Federal Hate Crime Statistics Act (1990), which protects men and male superiority over women by excluding "sex" and "gender" from the hate crime legislation. Even worse, this exclusion was supported by the male dominated National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (Jenness & Broad, 1994:418-419).
Lobbying to include sexual orientation (changed to heterosexuality and homosexuality) in the Hate Crimes Statistics Act (1990), and the inclusion of sexual orientation in the enhanced sentencing provisions of the Canadian Criminal Code's Bill C-41, send a message that hate motivated crime based on sexual orientation is to be monitored and taken seriously by police and criminologists. Within this political context, the exclusion of gender from the definition of hate crime in the Hate Crimes Statistics Act diminishes the seriousness of crimes against women (Jenness & Broad, 1994:412). While the Toronto Hate Crime Unit includes gender as a category in need of protection, there have been no documented cases in which gender has been seen to be the primary motive for a hate motivated crime. The promotion of sexual orientation, and the focus on crimes against gay men rather than crimes against lesbians, suggest that women are not considered to be victims of serious hate motivated crime simply because they are women, and, if they are victims of crime, the intimate nature of the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim lessens the seriousness of the crime in the eyes of the law and public (Wolfe & Copeland, 1994:205-206). For these very reasons the category of gender was excluded from the Hate Crimes Statistics Act.

In a patriarchal and misogynistic culture the continuum of hatred toward women is expressed in forms ranging from sexist language and harassment, to explosions of violence such as rape, assault, and battery and murder. Although such violence is traditionally seen as intimate and personal, it is systemically reproduced through mainstream institutions which reinforce sexism. The omission of gender in the definition of a bias-motivated hate crime reflects the fact that even when violence against women is understood to be a pervasive form of hate violence, it remains ill-defined and often invisible except in feminist analyses. It is this definitional exclusion which affects the ways in which gender-based murder is conceptualized or not conceptualized as hate crime. Only a few of the states include gender or sex in their hate crime provisions. The exclusion of female gender as well as racial and ethnic difference in the anti-gay/lesbian violence literature supports this conceptual exclusion (Jenness & Broad, 1994:419). This theoretical exclusion runs through most of the anti-gay/lesbian violence research to date. The gaps in the existing research needs to be reassessed to consider the implications of the exclusion of crimes motivated by gender hatred in the analysis of women's experience of bias-motivated hate crime.

The structural framework that is utilized by the anti-gay/lesbian violence movement contains a "violence over" thesis, explaining that institutionalized violence endorses
predator/prey relationships. In this framework all lesbians and gay men are considered to be likely victims. While anti-gay/lesbian violence initiatives stress the randomness of gay violence so that anyone could be a victim, they differ from a feminist analysis of violence against women because they lack a critique of patriarchy and the gender relations that sustain and reflect it (Jenness & Broad, 1994:416-419). In this analysis, lesbian women are excluded, and the gender of men as men exists as the foundation of the anti-gay violence analysis. The neglect of female gender as a unit of analysis means that anti-gay violence initiatives focus on homophobia rather than institutionalized heterosexism (Jenness & Broad, 1994:419). Even the categorical definition "anti-gay/lesbian violence" used by American community-based organizations conflates lesbian women's experience of crime with that of gay men. The omission of a gendered analysis of violent rape against women as lesbian women, while at the same time framing anti-gay and lesbian violence as a form of sexual terrorism, reduces the credibility of this movement.

The anti-gay violence movement's treatment of ethnicity is no better. While there is an attempt by American lesbian and gay anti-violence groups to build a coalition with ethnic minorities, absent are analyses of how ethnicity and race structure violence against gay men and lesbian women (Jenness & Broad, 1994:407). Analysis of violence against lesbians from diverse ethnic groups is almost invisible in the literature produced by the American anti-gay violence movement, and no analysis of the similarities and differences in the experience of violence of lesbian ethnic minorities is provided (Jenness & Broad, 1994:419).

For all of the above reasons Jenness and Broad conclude that while anti-gay/lesbian violence initiatives focus on educative measures that seem to support both gay men and lesbian women, their lack of analysis of sexism and racism supports the maintenance of male-centric knowledge, and promotes divisions between groups.

2.3 Feminist Perspectives in Criminology

North American feminist critiques of androcentric research resulted in the feminist empiricist, feminist standpoint, and feminist deconstructionist perspectives. All of these perspectives have implications for the theories that are produced about anti-gay/lesbian violence. Feminist critiques of androcentric criminology help to show how existing research on anti-gay/lesbian violence is inherently biased toward androcentric science (Gelsthorpe, 1997).
The empiricist approach "adds and stirs" data on anti-gay/lesbian violence into existing theories and methods. However, a problem arises when the theories used to explain male-on-male violence cannot be generalized to explain violence against lesbian women and gay men. The second problem with the empiricist approach is the question of whether scientific research concerned with reliability and validity can measure the distinct nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The sexual orientation ratio problem arises with the issue of representation in anti-gay/lesbian violence research. Lesbian and gay researchers ask how it is possible to obtain a representative lesbian and gay sample population when many sexual minorities are closeted. As well, the ethnocentric and sexist nature of much criminology forces researchers to question existing criminological theories and methods. The answer is to question how knowledge about gays and lesbians is produced in criminology and sociology as well as to consider the political and social underpinnings of mainstream theories. But, while a gay and lesbian empiricism leads gay researchers to ask questions which alter their research approaches, their treatment of sexuality remains isolated within criminology and sociology. Heterocentric paradigms do not adequately explain sexual minority experience of crime, and the wrong questions continue to be asked. Differences are not accounted for. Likewise, while feminist empiricism led women to ask questions which altered their research approaches, their treatment of gender remained isolated within criminology. Even now, many of the androcentric paradigms do not adequately explain women's experience of crime: the wrong questions continue to be asked; and there continues to be a need to focus on new policy agendas by which to examine difference and the gendered nature of crime (Heidensohn, 1997:791).

The empiricist approach is reflected in most criminological textbooks, which attempt to incorporate gender and feminist theory, yet continue to exclude sexual orientation from consideration (Maguire, Morgan, Reiner, 1997). And, in discussions of men and male violence, scant attention is given to male aggression against gay men and the systemic heterosexism in institutions which influence homophobic attitudes (Jefferson, 1997). For example, Ngaire Naffine notes that the British based Oxford Handbook of Criminology (1997) deals with gender and feminist theory neatly in two distinct chapters. Yet, no mention is made of anti-gay/lesbian violence in the extensive examination of violent crime, masculinities and crime, and victims of crime (Gelsthorpe, 1997; Heidensohn, 1997; Levi, 1997; Zedner, 1997; Jefferson, 1997). Similarly, Americans Gregory Herek and Kevin Berrill's (1992) anthology of hate crimes against
lesbian women and gay men "adds on" a chapter about lesbian women, yet disregards analyses of
utilizes power-control theory to explain women's low criminal behaviour relative to men. He
conceptualizes women in relationship to their role within families, neatly disregarding female
violence based on his argument that women's roles as mothers, sisters, aunts -- essentially
caretakers -- provide them with little opportunity to access institutional power that would enable
them to commit violent acts.

A criminology on, by and for gay and lesbian persons is the second theoretical
advancement (Stanley & Wise, 1988:17). The feminist standpoint suggests that gay researchers
must acknowledge the context of discovery, ask who defines research problems, and participate
in research that follows emancipatory objectives with gays and lesbians at the centre rather than
the periphery of investigation (Harding, 1987:184-185). The objective is to support research by
and for gays and lesbians as well as situate gays and lesbians as knowing subjects rather than
objects (Carlen, 1992). However, while standpointism supports research by and for gays and
lesbians, it also acts to exclude sexual minorities who do not have a voice in academic research.
The sexual-centric approach of some gay researchers of anti-gay/lesbian violence privileges sex
over class and race/ethnicity, and therefore risks isolating research on sexual minorities. There is
a need therefore to support gay and lesbian researchers in linking theoretical struggles with
political struggles, to link politics with practice (Carlen, 1992). Naffine thinks that gay and
lesbian experience of crime should attempt to link a gay ontology with gay epistemology through
the process of reflexivity, deconstruction, and reconstruction (Naffine, 1997).

Deconstructionists propose a third theoretical position that questions the male-centred
American crime research on gays and the objective and subjective split within scientific research
approaches (Naffine, 1997). Deconstructionists question the existence of a universal, objective,
and scientific approach to studying anti-gay/lesbian violence. Because criminologists and
sociologists tend to box research on gays into distinct corners of research, they think that it is
enough to deal with the gay question distinct from the lesbian question. The conceptualization of
difference tends to exclude experiences that do not fit the conceptual frameworks already in
existence within sociology and criminology. Thus, an examination of anti-gay/lesbian violence
must consider how existing criminological frameworks generate questions and methodologies in
relation to a heterosexed existence that historically denies the realities of lesbian women and gay
men, while at the same time avoiding the intersections of race/ethnicity, class, gender and sexual orientation. While some feminists attempt to "add and stir" difference into their theoretical frameworks, their method assumes the workability of existing categorical frameworks.

There is a need to go beyond empiricists' "add and stir" method, and the standpointists' Eurocentrism, to include the critical tendencies of deconstructionism in order to re-theorize the problematic relation between criminology and justice for sexual minorities (Naffine, 1997:98-119). Thus, an examination of anti-gay/lesbian violence must consider how existing criminogenic frameworks generate questions and methodologies in relation to a heterosexed existence that historically denies the realities of lesbian women and gay men, and ignores the intersections of race/ethnicity, class, gender, and sexual orientation.

Despite feminist critiques of North American male-centred science, the work of North American male theorists of anti-gay/lesbian violence still relies heavily on empiricist research methods. All the major North American researchers in this field are men, and, while they claim to care about patriarchy, gender, and race, they exclude these from their analysis utilizing criminological theories generated out of men's research of male violence. The bias and subjectivity of the male researcher are unexplored in this research, and the methodologies which are chosen preserve the subjective and objective split between the researcher and researched. There is no acknowledgment of the influence of previous male-centric research on men as criminals. The theoretical frameworks that are used focus on previous class-based theories pointing to the effects of poverty on lower class men, "natural" male aggression and how to socially control it; identity formation in the family unit and the impact of sex role socialization on male behaviour; the involvement of men in male subcultures of violence as a result of conflicting definitions of law; and fear of loss of male status and material resources. Such theories as Cohen's (1955) conception of status deprivation, Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) opportunity theory, Merton's (1957) theory of anomie, and Miller's (1958) theory of gang delinquency presuppose that there is a certain segment of society that commits crime. The segment focused upon is largely composed of men -- either delinquent youth or adult men. In contrast, Hirschi's (1969) social control theory stresses the importance of causal variables in determining the locus of crime by focusing upon attachment to family, perceptions of sanctions, and attitudes toward authority rather than immigrant status, gender, or class. In mixing structural, strain, symbolic interactionist and control approaches to anti-gay/lesbian violence researchers
focus on the effect of patriarchy and capitalism in the production of cultural heterosexism and the role of symbolism in the social construction of masculinities, while at the same time ignoring the specificities of misogyny, gender, and race/ethnicity.

2.4 Criminological Frameworks Used in the Explanation of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

Criminology archetypically may be divided into four frameworks: subcultural, structural, symbolic-interactionist, and control. The subcultural and structural approaches provide sociological explanations of criminality while the symbolic-interactionist and control approaches encompass socio-psychological explanations. This section will outline these four paradigms to understand possible explanations for anti-gay/lesbian violence. Many of these theoretical approaches overlap. None adequately explains anti-gay and lesbian violence; yet, they provide a starting point for theory construction. The strain and subcultural, the interactionist, the social control and critical perspectives used in social science set the stage for the theoretical and methodological approaches used in research on anti-gay and anti-lesbian violence. All of the following individual-level and social-level approaches fail to explore the intersections between gender, class, race, and sexuality in their focus on men and anti-gay crime. They assume that crime means male crime without stating so, and thus ignore other perpetrators and victims of crime promoting a racist and sexist and heterosexist social science which enhances social divisions and maintains male domination over the construction of knowledge created about anti-gay/lesbian violence.

2.4(a) Structural Functionalism

Theorists who use a structural functionalist approach ask about the relationship between victims and perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence and society because they are concerned with how social patterns influence individual behaviour. Because they view the social whole to be greater than the sum of its individual parts, structural functionalists ask what social forces influence people to gay bash, rather than what individual psychology or pathology influences them to engage in criminal activity. The study of "social facts" about anti-gay/lesbian violence is the focus of such investigations. The concept of social solidarity is used to determine the degree to which people are integrated in social groups, and how lack of social integration affects rules of conduct.
Comstock (1991) utilizes the structural functionalist framework through power-control theory. He uses the concept of "alienation" to explain how lesbians and gays are excluded from participation in the institution of the family in a capitalist and patriarchal system. A measure of "social solidarity" is used to explain the gay bashig behaviours of male youth who bash because they have minimal social status. Young men justify attacking lower status gays and lesbians because sexual minorities have no affiliations affording them institutional status. Hatred of gays and lesbians is underplayed in his conceptual framework. The functionality of "in" and "out" groups in maintaining a moral order is stressed over an individualistic examination of male psychology or pathology. Comstock's solution to gay bashing is to assign lesbians and gays familial social status heterosexuals now enjoy. Comstock reasons that when it is no longer functional to gay bash, anti-gay/lesbian violence will disappear.

Comstock's power-control theory is influenced by various strain-subcultural theories used to explain male delinquency. The Opportunity-Structure thesis is traditionally used to explain why male youth and other lower status men would vent their anger toward others. There are, however, flaws in its framework.

Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) Delinquency and Opportunity Theory proposes that delinquency is adaptive because it is instrumental in the achievement of the things deprived people want. Cloward and Ohlin suggest that a criminal pattern of gang behaviour is basically an economic response to strain (Deutschmann, 1994:217). It is also reactive because it is generated by a sense of injustice at being deprived of material goods and social status. The cultural determinant is society which imposes its standards upon male youth leading them to react to stressors beyond their control. This approach is problematic because it sets up social structure as an overdetermining social force and people as victims without agency.

Secondly, the Opportunity-Structure theory supports the notion that the gap between what youth want and what adult men have is greater than the discrepancy between aspirations of the middle class man and his legitimate opportunities. The key concept of "aspiration" assumes that all male youth aspire toward the same ideal influenced by masculine hegemony. The concept of "opportunity" suggests that only those who have access to opportunities to attain male status will refrain from gay bashing without an examination of the effect of class and ethnicity. Those who characterize gay bashing to be the result of men's opportunity to do so and as a result of "aspiration" suggest that men feel compelled to assert themselves against other less powerful
men and women in order to assert their manliness. This assumes that gay bashing happens because some men, namely undifferentiated male youth, have less social power. A more likely case is that it may be easier to catch and prosecute male youth than other gay bashers.

Thirdly, the Opportunity-Structure theory supports the notion that male youth who gay bash internalize the goals of masculine culture and that the avenues to the goals are structurally limited. For example, the goals of attaining status through employment, marriage, fatherhood, and community affiliations require that men compete against one another for power knowing that some have more access to status-markers than others. This approach assumes that undifferentiated male youth gay bash because of a sense of injustice. By arguing that juvenile delinquents see unfairness in the hierarchical male system, social scientists may be confusing a justification for gay bashing -- lower male status -- with the causes of delinquency. This approach does not consider that men with social opportunity and social aspiration also engage in anti-gay/lesbian violence (Comstock, 1991). The Opportunity-Structure hypothesis assumes that those who commit anti-gay crimes differ from non-delinquent men only because of "legitimate opportunities" to advance themselves. It does not consider the characteristics of those who do not gay bash. The theory assumes that all men are basically equal in their aspirations and vary only in their means of obtaining these goals. In this hierarchical masculine pageant play, those who gay bash do so because they have "legitimate" opportunities to do so. What this ignores is the different experience of crime between classes. It also conveniently ignores the statistical reality that most men, of all social classes -- for whatever reasons -- do not directly engage in violence.

Fourthly, the "frustration aggression" hypothesis supports the claim that youth would not wish to rebel against the values of heterosexual hegemony assuming that the gap between male aspiration to be "normal" heterosexual adults and fulfillment of that dream is so great that young men will explode in intense frustration, which in turn may lead to anti-social homophobic conduct. The Opportunity-Structure hypothesis does not describe how delinquents are produced. Subcultural theorists stress the importance of male heterosexual values that may lead to anti-gay criminal behaviour as a result of the influence of patriarchy and capitalist social structures. The theory assumes that male propensity to gay bash is adaptive and a consequence of sexism and that all men will adapt similarly to low masculine social status; however, this measure of frustration is subjective.
Fifthly, the Opportunity-Structure hypothesis assumes that gay bashing is a result of weakening social controls. The recommendation is usually to provide male youth with legitimate opportunities to satisfy their aspirations with the rationale that they would resort less frequently to gay bashing. Or, that if lesbians and gays could openly assimilate into social institutions heterosexuals would be forced to grant them equal status. This approach does not address the problems in male and female socialization that support misogyny and reinforce male hierarchies of social status via heterosexism.

Comstock argues that, for the purpose of creating equilibrium, it is the social structure that must change to meet the needs of men whose aggression is destructively channeled. True to Parsonian functionalist approaches such as strain theory, anomie, and status frustration. Comstock claims that male youth are most likely to attack gays and lesbians as a result of social and psychological factors such as underemployment, lack of social status, and male socialization. Comstock explains that because society is hierarchically organized, and because social roles are fixed in the family and overlap into the economy, the lack of civil marital status given to lesbian women and gay men denies them access to the very social institutions which would grant them public acceptance. As aliens, lesbians and gays remain outside the familial domain, discriminated against in employment, and targets for resentful adolescent men who perceive themselves to be unfairly treated.

Comstock's theory of alienation encompasses a focus on gay bashing as a recreational sport, an extension of male bonding, and a reflection of social alienation and vulnerability (Comstock, 1991:105). Thus, thrill seeking is an extension of normal adolescent behaviour. Like other adolescents who commit petty crime. Comstock notes that "perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence do not typically have criminal records, do not exhibit the traits of the criminal population, and are not anti-social" (Comstock, 1991:105). He assumes there is a male hierarchy of power in patriarchal capitalism, and that consumer society requires normative heterosexuality. As a result, gay bashing serves to unite men in their heterosexual brotherhood by constructing an "in" and "out" group, alienating gays from access to power-structures heterosexuals take for granted (Comstock, 1991:114). Comstock's analysis gives a great deal of agency and rationality to male-bashing activities (almost naturalizing it within the male hierarchy) while he virtually silences women. The only analysis of women's engagement with anti-gay activities comes when he states that women are less likely to engage in anti-gay/lesbian violence because they are more
socially controlled in the family, thus more likely to be targets of male aggression (Comstock, 1991:107), a common thread in most power-control research (Hagan, 1993).

Comstock’s theory suggests that gay bashing is a means by which men acquire the skills to be men, allow them to gain access to women, and to distance themselves from other men who may be considered to be unmanly. Men who do not wish to participate in masculine activities such as gay-bashing or woman-degrading, are considered to be abnormal and therefore targeted for not acting like "real men". Lesbians, those who do not act the way men perceive women should act, are also punished, although Comstock suggests that women are more likely to be punished by other women and male intimates such as ex-boyfriends, brothers, and fathers who oppose their lesbianism. He also asserts that lesbians are more likely to be attacked in private locations by people they know. Comstock explains that women are more often punished for suspected lesbianism because they are perceived to refuse to participate in reproduction and traditional gender roles (Comstock, 1991:106-107). Violence against lesbians is also explained to be the result of men's perceived threat to their sexual access to women and lesbians’ choice of another female as a sexual partner over them. That men empathize with this fear of abandonment is seen in legal cases where men are given light sentences or acquittals for attacking lesbian women and gay men based on the perceived threat on the part of the male perpetrator that his sexuality and social status are somehow threatened (Canadian Bar Association, 1995).

While Comstock provides some compelling and thought-provoking theories about anti-gay/lesbian violence, there are some problems with the assumptions he uses as the basis for his research. Comstock uses statistics gathered by lesbian and gay organizations to bolster his theoretical claims that gay bashing is a male dominated-recreational sport. Little critical analysis is given to the political nature of these statistics to ask whether they truly reflect the range and degree of anti-gay/lesbian violence experienced by representative populations. Since most survey research on anti-gay/lesbian violence is focused on the gay mens’ experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence, the findings are skewed to represent intra-male violence. Despite this bias, Comstock assumes that the empirical survey data represent the true face of anti-gay/lesbian violence in North America.

Comstock talks about undifferentiated men as if he is talking about all men. No mention is given of which men he speaks of other than the victims and perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. As well, there is no analysis of cultural difference. Comstock thinks that patriarchy is
important but he only considers some men within the patriarchal system with little explanation of women as perpetrators and victims. In his structural theoretical model Comstock uses a "power over" approach presuming that overdetermining structural forces influence men to become gay bashers. While Comstock claims that men have agency to assert their masculinity through gay bashing, he also claims they are victims of masculine gender role socialization. Nevertheless, the structuralist approach tends to take responsibility away from perpetrators, placing responsibility instead on society. This has the limitation of taking responsibility away from perpetrators and placing it on the state, which in turn, reinforces social control mechanisms, which unfortunately do nothing to transform the very structures which support homophobia and heterosexism.

Comstock provides a short discussion of race differences in incidences of anti-gay/lesbian violence in the chapter on empirical data on victims (Comstock, 1995: 40-45). While there is evidence of concern for race in Comstock's discussion of statistics on race/ethnicity, race and class are absent from the theory of male alienation he uses to explain anti-gay violence. Readers are left wondering if he is talking about white men's experience of alienation, and how the distinct nature of visible minority alienation might impact on perpetrators and victims? Neither does Comstock comment on how gender and race interconnect to structure anti-gay/lesbian violence.

2.4(b) Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionists are concerned with the interaction between culture and economics. Critical of exclusively economic explanations of anti-gay/lesbian violence, symbolic interactionists instead suggest that both economic conditions and moral values must be considered when explaining the phenomenon of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Arguing that anti-gay/lesbian violence cannot be reduced to economic developments, symbolic interactionists suggest instead that moral values about lesbians and gays do have economic consequences. Symbolic interactionists apply equal weight to economic and social forces although their work is sometimes criticized as culturally deterministic.

Focusing on the complex social hierarchies in society, symbolic interactionists attempt to understand anti-gay/lesbian violence and analyze how non-economic sources of inequality affect the life-chances of sexual minorities. The power to assign status and to reward or punish those who abide by or reject socially sanctioned rules, enables some to hold power over others. One's
social position is therefore determined not only by economic status but also by social status. The low social status given to lesbians and gays and others who reject strict gender role scripting places them in a disadvantaged position. Therefore, no matter how rich or powerful gays or lesbians are, the social stigma of their sexual orientation ranks them lower on the social status hierarchy.

Like gender, race, class, and ability, sexual orientation is a basis of social inequality. While it is difficult to determine the true extent of economic social stratification affecting lesbians and gays, the degree and extent of anti-gay/lesbian violence suggest that cultural values underlie harassment, intimidation, discrimination, direct physical assault, and murder.

Gregory Herek (1992) utilizes symbolic interactionism to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence. He stresses both the economic and social control apparatuses in Western culture in the construction of gays and lesbians as deviants. Utilizing psychological measures of values, Herek attempts to uncover the social psychology of anti-gay/lesbian violence through investigation of both the cultural and psychological functions of heterosexism. Herek proposes that perpetrators are acting out of peer pressure or situational factors which are not the result of individual bigotry (Herek, 1992:164). Key in Herek's argument is the fact that lesbians and gays are symbolic of something larger. Gays and lesbians represent the immoral within the moral order. Culturally, anti-gay/lesbian violence is maintained through the exclusion of lesbians and gays from kinship networks in an industrial-based society and the medical/psychological classification of sexuality. Socioerotic identity classification results in two problematic outcomes. First, although sexuality has a public identity, it is considered to be a private decision. Secondly, since society views homosexuality negatively, its identity is stigmatized because it is non-reproductive by definition and non-marital by statute (Herek, 1992:96).

Herek measures the psychological functions of anti-gay/lesbian violence through violence serving evaluative functions and violence serving expressive functions. Value-expressive violence, social-expressive violence, and ego-defensive violence are measured through examining attitudes.

Herek's functional approach to attitudes assumes that "people hold and express certain attitudes because they get some sort of psychological benefit from doing so" (Herek, 1992:151). Herek reasons that if a person's attitudes and opinions serve psychological functions for the
person who holds them, an individual's attitudes are more likely to change when they stop being functional and actually become dysfunctional.

Herek hypothesizes that psychological heterosexism -- the manifestation of heterosexism in individuals' actions and behaviour -- has a role in violence against lesbians and gay men (Herek, 1992:151).

Value-expressive functions enable people to affirm their belief in adherence to important values which are closely related to their self-concepts. For example, gays and lesbians may be perceived as immoral in the context of religious values. The important factor is that homosexuality is a symbol for what is immoral (Herek, 1992:153-154).

Social-expressive functions allow individuals to express values which strengthen belonging to a group and help them to gain acceptance and approval. When socially expressive attitudes are negative, gays and lesbians are perceived as outsiders. When socially expressive functions are positive, lesbians and gays are accepted by the group (Herek, 1992:154).

Ego-defensive functions are found in attitudes which lower a person's anxiety resulting from the unconscious psychological conflicts around sexuality or gender (Herek, 1992:155). Such is the defense given to those who express anti-gay/lesbian violence out of fear that they may be latent homosexuals.

The link between psychological and cultural heterosexism is that "psychological heterosexism can serve these functions only when an individual's psychological needs converge with the culture's ideology" (Herek, 1992:156). Thus the victimization of gays as deviants can only exist as long as they are culturally defined in a way that links them with an individual's own psychological conflicts (Herek, 1992:156). If people no longer gain benefits from their attitudes toward lesbians and gays, Herek reasons, anti-gay/lesbian violence will cease to exist.

Functional explanations for anti-gay/lesbian violence help to explain the motivations for individual attitudes and actions and also suggest strategies for combatting anti-gay/lesbian violence. Herek's answer is to make what is functional (gay bashing) dysfunctional. Negative attitudes toward lesbians and gays can be made dysfunctional through preventing anti-gay attitudes or actions from fulfilling that psychological need, or by showing people how to meet the same need in other less destructive ways (Herek, 1992:165). Ultimately, a shift must be made from viewing sexual minorities in symbolic terms to viewing them as real people. Herek's solution to combat cultural and psychological heterosexism is directed at lesbian and gay persons.
who, he suggests, should use coming out as a strategy to combat psychological heterosexism and anti-gay/lesbian violence (Herek, 1992:166).

Herek borrows from differential association theory in his explanation of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Differential-association theory stresses the importance of differing interpretations of right and wrong and how they affect motivations to participate in deviant behaviour such as anti-gay/lesbian violence. Within this framework criminal behaviour is learned behaviour. Perpetrators' self-ascribed definitions justifying illegal or morally unacceptable behaviour involve selective balancing among definitions. These definitional objectifications are constituted by attitudes or evaluations motivating people to engage in or resist criminal or antisocial conduct. The corpus of this constitution either reinforces or challenges acceptable action. Criminology, thus defined, becomes the breach of a moral bond affecting the larger moral community. In the end, "social behaviour is guided by belief, but behaviour and belief are acquired together" (Nettler, 1974:201).

Applied to the explanation of gay bashing the differential-association theory helps to explain that socialization to reject homosexuality influences different associations about the rightness and wrongness of engaging in same-sex activity. Negative stereotyping, in turn, affects choices to engage or not engage in behaviours harmful to sexual minorities. From the misogynist's frame, homophobia negates the negative. With harsh labels ascribed, those who gay-bash may not sense their breach of a moral bond, but contrastingly reinforce the status quo of heterosexist morality. If homosexuality is profane -- hence immoral -- such zealots may believe that gay bashing is less likely to be punished. Morality is best countered by counter morality. Therefore, showing that attacking gays is morally unacceptable to the community is important, as is rethinking the framing about gender socialization. The "construction of reality" on the part of the person who gay-bashes is supported by a homophobic and misogynist culture. Hatred towards "uppity" women and gays is symbolically reflected in social relations, institutions, values, and beliefs. It is therefore no great leap to see the connection between social silence and rejection of same-sex relations and the perceptions on the part of those engaging in anti-gay behaviour that their actions will be either ignored or openly supported by the "moral community." How people rationalize gay-bashing is therefore tied in with socialization and cultural endorsement of heterosexism.
Critics of the differential-association hypothesis argue against its over dependence on the effect of attitudes or beliefs. Since it is difficult to attribute causality to belief systems, or separate thoughts from actions, it is suggested that it may be speculative to presume that personal calculation of the likelihood one will get away with an anti-gay attack is a primary variable predicting choices to gay-bash. However, research on male sexual assault of women has actually asked men the question of whether they would sexually assault if they thought they could get away with it, obtaining significant positive responses (DeKeseredy, 1993). The differential-association hypothesis is also criticized for not explaining how anti-gay/lesbian violence is motivated, what conditions foster increases or decreases in incidences of anti-gay/lesbian violence, and what can be done about increases in gay-bashing incidents. The hypothesis suggests that beliefs guide actions. However, critics argue that exploring how definitions of gay and lesbian existence cause gay bashing behaviours leaves the behaviour itself unexplained. The sources of the different heterosexist definitions are left unspecified in such an account. Sceptics argue that changing homophobic attitudes will not affect gay-bashing. How can conduct be changed through education? Worse, focusing on changing beliefs may obscure the conditions under which anti-gay/lesbian violence increases or decreases. Control theorists suggest tighter control and sanctions against gay-bashing (rather than education) to alter attitudes and beliefs, and suggest that instead of focusing on the different interpretations of gay bashers it is necessary first to reduce the causes of and opportunities for anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Although Herek attempts to link cultural heterosexism with psychological heterosexism through evaluating its manifestation in societal norms and institutions, he ends up reproducing a psychological model by focusing on individual explanations about why some people might attack lesbians and gay men without explaining who those people are. Herek's functional approach to attitudes assumes that some people, presumably heterosexual people, benefit from particular attitudes. While Herek includes an analysis of psychological heterosexism, he contributes to pathologizing perpetrators rather than criminalizing them, and perpetuates a mental illness model by ignoring the wider social and historical context of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Gregory Herek does not consider gender or race in his research although he claims that by focusing on men he deals with "the gender issue." Herek talks about heterosexuals as if they are all the same and pits them against gay men and lesbian women in his discussion of cultural heterosexism and psychological heterosexism. Herek divides lesbians and gays against
heterosexuals instead of discussing the similarities between the groups. At times, Herek totally focuses on heterosexual justifications for anti-gay violence without explicitly acknowledging that the perpetrators he speaks of are men. Herek calls heterosexuals "offenders," "assailants," and "perpetrators."

Herek also examines male cultures of violence as defined by "masculine" characteristics explained by identity formation theory and suggests that people, (presumably heterosexuals) may have multiple motives for their anti-gay attacks from socially imposed or individual expectations about appropriate behaviour (Herek, 1992:162). Herek concludes that many psychological and sociological factors may impact multiply on a heterosexual person's motive for anti-gay attacks, but these may not be based in personal prejudice, but rather may reflect attitudes or beliefs, or be a result of circumstances rather than specific likes or dislikes (Herek, 1992:163). Similar to subcultural theorists, Herek agrees that perpetrators may be acting out of peer pressure or situational factors which are not the result of individual bigotry (Herek, 1992:164). Herek claims that cultural heterosexism sets people up as suitable targets to serve psychological needs, such as constructing an "in" and "out" group, and that this is functional for the social structure.

A discussion of race is absent from Herek's examination of the symbols and attitudes that influence heterosexual persons to gay-bash. Herek explores cultural heterosexism and subcultures of male violence but he does not comment on differences and how they might impact on men's choices to attack lesbians and gay men. It is as if Herek assumes his analysis can be applied to all people from all races/ethnicities and that the undifferentiated male gender experience of "cultural heterosexism" imposed upon men through patriarchal institutions can explain all anti-gay violence.

Canadian researcher Stephen Samis (1995) uses symbolic interactionism to show that deviance is a social construction applied to particular groups in particular historical contexts (Samis, 1995:124-125). Samis suggests that the social construction of deviancy at the micro-level and the reinforcement of social and cultural norms at the institutional level work together to ensure that lesbian and gay existence is deviant. In this way the activities of anti-gay/lesbian violence can be understood as a mechanism of social control ensuring the continuation of deviant statuses and the continual construction of normative heterosexual standards. Using labelling theory, Samis explains that sexualizing gay and lesbian existence has led to the production of negative categorizations which contribute to their lower social status and resulting victimization.
However, while labelling theory helps to explain the maintenance of homophobic ideologies, it has low predictive value when applied to the understanding of individual behaviour. While labelling theory questions categories and definitions about gay bashing, it does not ask what causes anti-gay/lesbian violence, what accounts for fluctuations in anti-gay/lesbian violence, and how gay bashing can be decreased. While Samis stresses the mediation between dominant ideals about homosexuality and social structure, the tendency in such an approach is to point to social institutions, rather than the people in them, as sources for social change.

Another problem lies in Samis's treatment of race and gender. In his examination of the gendered nature of social control Samis focuses on how women and men are constrained by the norms and values supporting gender differentiation, yet stops there in his discussion of women and anti-gay/lesbian violence (Samis, 1995:7-10). Samis pays little attention to the intersection of sexual orientation, class, and race in the labelling process. While Samis reports on the race of his Vancouver respondents, he does not develop any analysis of how race structures anti-gay/lesbian violence.

2.4(c) Conflict Theory

Conflict theorists are concerned with how subjective social actions and objective social constraints affect the prevalence of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Within this framework, external determinants of behaviour consist of economic, political, and cultural forces and the concept of class is used to explain power differentials between groups in society. The concept of "sex-class" is utilized by feminists to explain the process by which men hold economic, cultural and political power over women in most cultures. Ownership of the means of production as well as the right to determine the lives of women and children through patrilineal descent, have allowed men to solidify their social, political, and economic power through most social institutions. The right to ownership of women's bodies, sexuality, labour, reproduction, emotional energy, has meant both economic and psychological consequences for women as a sex class.

The institution of heterosexuality is an extension of the oppressive social relations imposed on both women and men. What is deemed to be "natural" heterosexuality has been deconstructed to show how many justifications for male dominance are firmly embedded in values of male ownership and possession of women. Male dominance is the conceptual key in conflict theorists' analysis of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Heterosexuality is one more stone in the
foundation of male supremacy. While some criticize the focus on overdetermining social structures and male socialization as the crux of anti-gay/lesbian violence, others see this framework as a means by which to delineate the heterosexism in racist, classist, sexist, and ableist social structures. The issues of power, social stratification, and social inequality, is central to this analytical process.

Within the Conflict framework "resource theory" postulates that the strong and powerful dominate the weak and less powerful. In gender relations men historically hold power over women through generally greater physical strength; laws sanctioning wife beating; numerous norms, folkways, and values reinforcing men's right to abuse, humiliate and subordinate women. Increased violence against women since the seventies in North America has been attributed to the struggle for power between men and women for resources in the labour force. With increased participation in the labour force, women have had more economic resources and therefore somewhat more choice about whether to marry or remain in abusive relationships with men.

Rosemary Gartner (1992) relates women's struggle to gain equality in the home and labour force with men's use of violence in attempting to maintain their dominant position. Sexual harassment in the workplace and physical assault in the home are all battlefronts in this ideational struggle for justice or control.

This is the common thread running through much Canadian and American research on sociocultural and institutional responses to anti-gay/lesbian violence. The argument is that violence against lesbians and gays results from competition over limited material or symbolic resources (Ehrlich, 1992; Wertheimer, 1992; Berrill, 1992; Herek, 1992; Mock, 1995; Segrest, 1995; Green, Glaser, Rich. 1998). Herek (1992) argues that anti-gay/lesbian violence is partially the result of competition over limited resources in an industrial consumer society. Mock (1995) suggests that increased hate crime activity in Toronto can be explained by economic recession and competition over limited resources. Ehrlich (1992) explains homophobia to be the result of competition over resources and space, and suggests that generalized violence is exacerbated by men's psychological fears about loss of social, economic, and political status as well as fears about losing domination over the patriarchal family unit. Wertheimer (1992) suggests that systemic homophobia as well as competition over limited resources nourish anti-gay/lesbian violence. Berrill (1992) uses the concept of ethnoviolence to explain how anti-gay/lesbian violence reflects the struggle between groups for limited resources. As gays and lesbians obtain
legal protections and social acceptance they have more power to demand socioeconomic benefits previously given to heterosexuals. Thus, resistance toward equity measures is reflected in a variety of forms ranging from sexual and verbal harassment to outright physical attack and murder.

A second conflict perspective places the concepts of sexism and heterosexism at the helm of anti-gay/lesbian violence analysis. One exception to the androcentric trend in anti-gay/lesbian violence research is the research emerging from Australia which places the issue of gender centrally within the research rather than at the periphery. The research by Mason and Ruthchild explores the specific effect gender difference has in women's experience of anti-lesbian violence (Mason, 1997; Ruthchild, 1997).

Throughout the articles written by and for women is a move away from the pathology or psychology of the perpetrator to a focus on the elements supporting systemic hatred of lesbians. In particular, the specificity of lesbian experience of anti-lesbian violence is analyzed. Rather than stressing the symbolism that underpins homophobic behaviour, feminists point to systemic issues that support anti-gay/lesbian violence. Ruthchild (1997) contends that "violence against gay men and lesbians is a systemic issue" (Ruthchild, 1997:1). Ruthchild believes that while violence against lesbians and gay men is often the result of individual choice, these choices are supported "in response to signals which exist throughout society and which are universally understood. Such signals suggest that lesbians and gay men do not deserve the same degree of respect as heterosexual members of the community" (Ruthchild, 1997:1). Ruthchild deconstructs the systemic biases at work in society which uphold and sanction gay-bashing in its many forms through law, heterosexual privilege, patriarchal origins of society and the centrality of procreative marriage, resistance and backlash in the media, and acts of gay and lesbian bashing and murders.

Mason (1997) relies heavily on feminist frameworks to explain the phenomenon of what she terms, "heterosexual violence." She sees both similarities and differences between violence against gay men and lesbians and violence experienced by heterosexual women and lesbian women. She stresses the importance of locating violence against lesbians within the conceptual framework used to explain violence against women in general. Mason asks what 'heterosexualized violence' looks like by exploring the typicality and specificity of anti-lesbian violence, uncovering ambiguities in the stories victims have to tell. Following the research of Smith (1993) and Faulkner (1997), many of the women she interviews stress difficulty in assessing whether
they are victims due to their gender or their sexuality. She therefore thinks that violence against lesbians must be examined in a "wider contextual framework than that offered by the notion of anti-homosexual violence" (Mason, 1997:22).

Mason conceptualizes anti-lesbian violence along a continuum of violence against women in general (Mason, 1997:23). She thinks that lesbians as homosexuals and women constitute a "double" positioning occupying a distinctive place within a heterosexed culture so that violence against lesbians is a reaction to a woman's femaleness as well as her suspected lesbianism. Mason stresses the necessity of separating lesbianism from the same framework used to explain male homosexuality because "heterosexism (or homophobia) is a gendered hegemony" (Mason, 1997:23).

Classification of violence into discrete categories becomes problematic when the diversity of lesbian experiences cannot be fully explained using a framework that fits male experience of anti-gay violence. A gender-specific knowledge of heterosexism is necessary in order to separate the male experience of heterosexed violence from the female, while at the same time considering similarities (Mason, 1997:24). Secondly, the ethnocentric nature of most anti-gay theory and research also needs to be addressed by the concept of specificity. Mason criticizes the notion of a unified subjectivity that makes anti-gay violence seem like a white male phenomenon. She stresses that the interconnections between race, sexuality, and gender need to be explored in order to uncover the specificity of heterosexed violence. Thirdly, Mason focuses on the effects of violence as an ambiguous territory where lesbians who are victimized learn to fear for their safety. Mason sees violence against lesbians as an attempt to intimidate them into staying in the closet and remaining silent (Mason, 1997:26). Lesbians tell her that their fear is based in their "sense of vulnerability due to sexual preference and an awareness of a continuum of violence against women" (Mason, 1997:26).

Mason thinks that constant fear of anti-lesbian violence stops women from openly expressing their sexuality. The effect of heterosexed hostility is that lesbians attempt to make themselves invisible in order to prevent victimization. Mason believes that the effect of violence is to "mark its subject and expose him or her to a 'trap of invisibility'; to borrow from Foucault, lesbians are "simultaneously invisible, yet marked as other" (Mason, 1997:28). This form of public branding, as it were, marks lesbians in situations not of their choosing. The "symbolic stamp", as Mason calls it, leads to an obscuration of anything other than sexuality. The lesbian
becomes only lesbian, leaving insignificant other characteristics about her in the frame of public marking. Using the work of Iris Marion Young, Mason suggests that this marking is one of cultural imperialism in which violent marking imposes sexual desire "as the determining essence of the individual" (Mason, 1997:31). Ultimately, then, the closet is an ambiguous place, a place of hiding, but also a place in which one cannot hide when one is branded lesbian. Because sexuality is so heavily focused upon in Western culture, Mason thinks that attacks on lesbian sexuality should be a concern for all who value their freedom and wish to fight repression in its many forms.

2.5 Conclusions

While Herek, Comstock, and Samis point to social structures as potential mechanisms of social change, their individual level focus on psychological heterosexism and alienation suggests that change can also be effected at the micro-level through transforming the way people are gender-socialized. Hence, the units of analysis used by Herek and Comstock expressed as "power-control," "cultural heterosexism," and "heterosexual hegemony," suggest that individuals are not responsible for their heterosexist attitudes and resultant violent gay-bashing because these are either products of pathological masculinist psychological factors, or products of patriarchal culture and therefore beyond control. Individual responsibility on the part of the perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence tends to elude Herek and Comstock in their work. Moreover, little political analysis of power and control, other than psychological and symbolic, is preferred to contextualize why perpetrators might harm lesbian women and gay men. Instead, as in the measurement of social interaction and individual explanations of behaviour, the perpetrator ends up having a pathological condition (Dobash & Dobash, 1990). Comstock's contextual analysis of anti-gay/lesbian violence is helpful in understanding some of the basis for the violence gays and lesbians experience; however, it lacks analysis of how difference impacts on men's choices to gay bash. The mythical gay-bashing man has no specificity so that it is difficult to assess class, race, sexual orientation, and age differences. As well, it is difficult to determine women's role in anti-gay violence when the focus of Comstock, Herek, and Samis's theory is men. When women are discussed they appear as victims rather than potential agents of anti-lesbian or gay violence. Rather than broadening his analysis, Comstock focuses on male alienation which leads to blaming families, male youth, and gay and lesbian people not open enough about their sexual
orientation. Feminist critiques of criminology provide a starting point for envisioning alternative theoretical and methodological approaches to studying anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Four central themes emerge from this discussion of current anti-gay/lesbian violence theory and point out its limitations. It is centrally important to understand acts of violence against the lesbian/gay community from their frame of reference and to share this understanding with the larger community. Secondly, it is important that the gay/lesbian community devise strategies to deal internally/externally with violence with a view to keeping their own values and safety intact. Thirdly, theories of delinquency/criminology need to be rethought (and critiqued) in terms of the priorities, experiences, impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence on the gay/lesbian community. Fourthly, strategies -- legal sanctions, education, community support, etc. -- must be devised and implemented to combat anti-gay and lesbian violence.

There is a need for more strenuous examination of the epistemological underpinnings supporting knowledge created about anti-gay and lesbian violence. Social and political issues influencing anti-gay and lesbian research need to be reassessed so that the theories and research methodologies do not recreate exclusionary categories. There is a need to begin first by reflecting upon the lack of concern about sexism, racism, classism, and heterosexism in existing research. Secondly, researchers need to question whether "adding-in" difference to existing explanatory frameworks adequately helps to contextualize the particulars of violence against sexual minorities.

While all theorists who write about anti-gay and lesbian violence research add to the exploration of why men might bash gay men, none of them explore the demographics of lesbian and gay life or the structural and ideological forces that impact on gay and lesbian existence. Most of the research focuses on explaining why heterosexual men have such a huge problem with gay people. And most of the research on gay and lesbian victims ends up explaining the gay male experience of anti-gay violence. Little is known for example, about how fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence impacts on the lives of sexual minorities. While American studies provide consistent data on the incidences of anti-gay/lesbian violence, little is known about the specific experiences of Canadian lesbian women and gay men or their location in our socially stratified society (Faulkner, 1998).

Equally problematic is the tendency in the research to conflate male experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence with that of women, as well as to consider the Caucasian experience to
stand for the experience of the whole lesbian and gay community. Other problems lie with the methodological approaches used to study anti-gay/lesbian violence which I will deal with in the following chapter.

2.6 Theoretical frameworks used in this thesis

The theoretical frameworks used in this thesis are influenced by phenomenological and deconstructionist approaches. The aim of the research investigation is to apply a critical analysis to the investigation and production of knowledge about anti-gay/lesbian violence, while at the same time contributing to the growing body of research on this subject developing in North America. The research is also intended to avoid and overcome the shortcomings of previous theoretical frameworks.

Phenomenologists criticize the mechanistic and deterministic influences of structural functionalism. Phenomenologists attempt to step back from the acceptance of social facts at face value to ask about the subjective meanings people attach to social facts and the ways people actively create social facts. Thus, phenomenologists consider the facts which are created about anti-gay/lesbian violence, police statistics, victim assistance statistics, reporting rates, and community organizing against anti-gay/lesbian violence, to ask how individuals and groups interpret social facts, and how this interpretation influences knowledge produced about anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Deconstructionists are critical of the notion that social scientists can study anti-gay/lesbian violence. The means by which anti-gay/lesbian violence is conceptualized, the definitions which are utilized, the positioning of identity, the assumption of community, motive, and intent, in anti-gay violence research, are all deeply scrutinized by deconstructionists who ask how social scientists can ground any knowledge about anti-gay/lesbian violence. Presumptions about social order and disorder are the focus of deconstructionists who challenge the modernist notion of scientific objectivity and subjectivity. Deconstructionists question social facts about anti-gay/lesbian violence arguing that numbers about victimization are meaningless in the face of political and social value systems which underpin the theories and methodologies of empiricist and positivist paradigms. Deconstructionists ask how we can know anything about violence against gays and lesbians when all definitions, methods, and theories are positively anchored in scientific investigations which assume the existence of a unitary subject and an objective position
from which to research social facts. Deconstructionists suggest that researchers should consider the political agendas that influence the formation of policy. Ultimately, deconstructionists want to dislocate the notion of subjectivity as well as question the basis upon which objective science knows anything about lesbians and gays.

In the chapters on fear of violence (Chapter Five), incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Chapter Six), the perpetrators and locations of violence (Chapter Seven), and the reporting behaviours of victims (Chapter Eight), I treat statistics as social facts; however, I do not accept them at face value in the sense that they reflect an actual truth about anti-gay/lesbian violence. Social facts must be situated within their social context. While researchers of anti-gay/lesbian violence assume the factuality of statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence, I stand back from the data in order to provide a critical interpretivist analysis. The statistics in this thesis provide information about the diversity within the sample population. The statistics disrupt many preconceived notions about trends in anti-gay/lesbian violence research, suggesting instead, that there are variations over time and space in such sample populations.

Emerging from much of the data and analysis is the finding that women fear anti-gay/lesbian violence more than men, that women experience higher percentages of victimization in female dominated crime categories such as sexual harassment. Women are shown to be attacked in private locations by people they are more likely to know. And women take greater pains to modify their behaviour to avoid anti-lesbian violence. While women are at the forefront of many initiatives to counter anti-gay/lesbian violence, the male face of the movement is still evident.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHICS

3.1 Introduction

Anti-gay/lesbian violence research frequently begins with questions of quantifiable magnitude. How many lesbians and gays are affected? How often? Where are they attacked? Who attacks them? What are the consequences? Answers to these questions are important for determining the seriousness of the problem, and to attract the attention of other researchers, policy-makers and legislators. The studies to date reveal that the answers are not altogether straightforward. Comparable trends are found across North American anti-gay/lesbian violence survey research which use unrepresentative samples and a diversity of research instruments.

This chapter explores the definitions of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the various methods that have been used to measure the dimensions and the nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Canada and the United States including police statistics, victim assistance reporting line records, community-based surveys, and content analysis of legal cases and historical documents. The chapter then outlines the methods used in this study and the demographic makeup of the respondent population. The way in which these sources of data are collected and how they are socially constructed provide a context for this research in Toronto.

In the next section I will provide an overview of the definitions used to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence.

3.2 Constructing Definitions of Anti-gay/lesbian Violence

Definitions of anti-gay/lesbian violence to date have limitations and biases. Much of what is defined as anti-gay/lesbian violence is influenced by psychological and sociological terms and concepts used to explain prejudice, stigmatization, and social hatred. American definitions of anti-gay/lesbian violence are guided by a rights based civil liberties framework that interprets social stratification based on the unequal distribution of wealth in economic, symbolic and cultural forms. Psychological/cultural studies veer in the direction of explaining anti-gay/lesbian violence through individual psychological needs, thus risking essentialist explanations biased by theories of male biological aggression. Sociological studies focus on structural issues related to
gender role socialization, patriarchy, inter-group tensions, and strain to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The use of the terms "hate crime" and "hate-motivated crime" can be problematic because of the assumptions inherently made about the motivations of the perpetrators. Ehrlich (1992:108) and Herek and Berrill (1992:164) claim the need for caution when using these terms. They suggest that anti-gay/lesbian violence may be motivated by several factors, including the perpetrators' need to gain power, or perceptions that territory was invaded or values violated. Perpetrators may be primarily reacting to peer pressure, the notion that gays are easy targets, or opportunities which present themselves in particular situations.

In most violence research done by the lesbian and gay community the term anti-gay/lesbian violence is used instead of hate crimes against lesbians and gay men because it is not limited to Criminal Code offences and includes a wider range of harassing and violent incidents experienced by victims (Faulkner, 1997:4).

The current definition of hate crime used by the Metro Toronto Police Services HCU is a criminal offence committed against a person or their property based on the victim's race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or any other similar factor (Metro Toronto Police, 1997:2). In 1998 the word "solely" was removed from the definition of a hate crime to include "in sole or in part."

Documented hate crime occurrences reveal a wide range of criminal offences: arson, assault, break and enter, bomb threat, harassment, hate propaganda, mischief, robbery, threat, willful dangerousness, and willful hate propaganda (Metro Toronto Police Services, 1997:2).

Ehrlich (1992) uses the concept of ethnoviolence to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence. He defines ethnoviolence as "an act or attempted act in which the actor is motivated to do psychological or physical harm to another, where the 'other' is perceived as a group representative or is identified with a group, and where the motivation for the act is group prejudice" (Ehrlich, 1992:107). Ehrlich claims that anti-gay prejudice persists not only because of individual psychology, but also because of the structure of the society in which we live (Ehrlich, 1992:107).

In explaining his theory of prejudice, Kevin Berrill (1986) defines the language of anti-gay prejudice as essentially sexist, because anti-gay prejudice is based in traditional sex role attitudes transmitted by parents. Those who believe in male superiority perceive gays and
lesbians to be renegades because they have rejected the appropriate hierarchy of beliefs, attitudes and behaviour, and therefore must be punished.

Harry (1992) describes homophobic violence as an expressive act that is an end in itself. He subscribes to the notion that "recreational violence" is instrumental, because it is "a habitual pattern of behaviour adopted to achieve a set of personal needs or ends" (Ehrlich, 1992:108). Harry claims that "violence is anti-gay when its victims are chosen because they are believed to be homosexual" (Harry, 1992:113). Harry suggests that several elements must be in place in order for gay bashing to occur: a) the institution of gender, which defines departure from a specified gender role, and especially sexual departure, as an abomination, b) groups of immature men who feel the need to validate their status as men, c) disengagement by those men from the conventional moral order. and. d) opportunities for gay-bashing (Harry, 1992:121).

Berk, Boyd, and Hamner (1992) suggest that the category of hate-motivated crimes includes (a) those based on the victim's symbolic status, (b) those stemming from the perpetrator's instrumental or expressive motives, (c) those generated by the perpetrator's uncertainty about members of the victim's group, and (d) those with and without substantial premeditation (Berk, Boyd, Hamner, 1992:130).

Herek explains anti-gay/lesbian violence through the concepts of cultural and psychological heterosexism. He defines heterosexism as "an ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any nonheterosexual form of behaviour, identity, relationship, or community" (Herek, 1992:150). Herek defines cultural heterosexism along a continuum with institutional racism and sexism, as manifested in societal customs and institutions: "Through cultural heterosexism, homosexuality is rendered invisible and, when it becomes visible, is condemned by society" (Herek, 1992:150). Psychological heterosexism is defined as, "the manifestation of heterosexism in individuals' attitudes and actions -- and its role in violence against lesbians and gay men" (Herek, 1992:151). For Herek, particular attitudes are functional for certain segments of society until they become dysfunctional. Herek suggests that not all attacks on gays and lesbians are hate motivated, and factors such as peer pressure and situational forces must also be taken into consideration (Herek, 1992:164).

Hamner (1992) uses social identity theory to define acts of hatred towards gays as a result of intergroup conflict: "victims of hate crimes are chosen on the basis of their 'symbolic status,' which derives from their perceived membership in particular social groups. People become
victims because of what they are (gay, Black, Jewish, and so on) rather than who they are" (Hamner, 1992:182).

Comstock (1991) defines anti-gay/lesbian violence "as physical violence perpetrated by non-lesbian/gay people against lesbians and gay men because of their sexual orientation" (Comstock, 1991:2). Comstock avoids a "functional" or "structural" sociological theory in favour of a theoretical framework based on social roles, "because the data describe perpetrators' behaviour as social role playing that is distinctively age and gender specific" (Comstock, 1991:2).

Mason and Tomsen place homophobia and heterosexism central to their theoretical perspective used to explain "heterosexed violence" (Mason & Tomsen, 1997). The term "homophobia" is used because of its common currency as a term used to denote "disapproval of homosexual desire and animosity towards homosexual identities, politics, and lifestyles" (Mason & Tomsen, 1997:viii). The term "heterosexism" is used because it "reflects the structural, institutional and discursive privileges which modern western societies accord to heterosexuality, at the expense of homosexuality" (Mason & Tomsen, 1997:viii). Mason defines hate crime as a crime, motivated by prejudice, bias, or hatred towards a particular group of which the victim is presumed to be a member. Hate crime is generally directed towards a class of people; the individual victim is rarely significant to the offender and is commonly a stranger to him or her (Mason, 1993:1; Cunneen. Fraser, Tomsen, 1997:1).

The National Lesbian and Gay Task Force's 1986 report states violence is anti-gay when "it is directed against persons or their property because: 1) they are lesbian or gay or perceived to be so; 2) they are associated with or advocate on behalf of gay and lesbian people" (NGLTF, 1986:1). By this definition, the victims and perpetrators of anti-gay violence can be anyone -- heterosexual or gay, young or old, male or female, strangers or acquaintances, and members of any race, class, or ethnic group. Although most victims of anti-gay violence are gay or lesbian, the NGLTF suggest that sometimes heterosexuals are attacked because of their association with someone who is gay.

The above range and diversity of definitions influences the lenses through which the social phenomena of anti-gay/lesbian violence are framed. These diverse frameworks all have one thing in common: they point to both structural and individual psychological causes for anti-gay/lesbian violence.
While this study did not begin with preconceived conceptual frameworks, the above definitions are significant because they influence how anti-gay/lesbian violence has been studied and how data have been explained within the North American gay political context. These definitions are methodologically significant because they inform the ways in which researchers explain anti-gay/lesbian violence data.

3.2(a) Definitions of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence used in the Survey

In this study, "anti-gay/lesbian violence" is measured through a scale of victimization which allows respondents to state whether they have been victimized once, twice, or two times or more, in the past year or since the age of sixteen. The variables measured are verbal assaults, threats of physical assault, property damage, objects thrown, being chased or followed, spat upon, punched, kicked, or beaten, assault with a weapon, sexual harassment, sexual assault, harassed by police, and beaten or assaulted by police. Anti-gay/lesbian violence is also measured through open-ended questions which ask about the locations of victimization, the perpetrators, and victim behaviour change due to fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The definitions of anti-gay/lesbian violence used in the survey focus on individual experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence. These individual experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence are then linked with a structural analysis of the institutional response to victims. The specific questions used in scales to measure lifetime experiences of violence cover incidents when the perpetrator is a stranger or a person known to the victim, and a range of situations, from threats of physical harm to use of a gun or knife.

In using a scale to measure violence, problems arise when there are overlapping responses and lack of context by which to explain the violence. This leaves unanswered questions about whether the respondent is replying based upon one incident or many during their lifetime. Despite this problem with scales, most surveys include open and closed-ended questions which allow respondents to elaborate upon their experiences of violence. The survey distributed for this study in Toronto included a victimization scale and open-ended and closed-ended questions (See Appendix 2).

In this study "community" refers to those who attended Gay and Lesbian Pride day in 1995 and 1996 and who were surveyed, as well as the community of persons involved in organizing against anti-gay/lesbian violence at the 519 Church Street Community Centre. The
use of the category "institution" refers to those institutions in Toronto which are linked in their official mandate and volunteer efforts to address the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence. These institutions include: The 519 Church Street Community Centre, the Wellesley Central Hospital, the Metropolitan Toronto Police Hate Crime Unit/Intelligence, the Church and Wellesley Foot Patrol stationed at 52 Division in Toronto, as well as the University of Toronto Sexual Harassment Office.

There are differences and similarities between institutions, the queer community, and grassroots community. Institutions refer to mainstream institutions guided by provincial, federal, and City of Toronto governmental rules and regulations. These institutions are police, hospitals, and hate crime units. Grassroots community organizations such as the 519 Church Street Community Centre are publicly funded by the United Way, the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General, and other funding sources such as the City of Toronto "Breaking the Cycle of Violence" grants and the gay community's "Gay and Lesbian Appeal" grants. While the 519 Community Centre is funded by and therefore bound by some of the requirements of its funding bodies, it remains grassroots in the sense that it is community directed and focused and therefore political in its mandate and philosophy. The queer community is not an institution or a grassroots political organization. It is a conglomerate of diverse individuals with various political, economic, and social views, needs, strengths, opinions, attitudes, and interests which sometimes converge along lines of sexual orientation, class, race, ethnicity, age, ability, gender, and spirituality. For some, the notion of a cohesive queer community is a liberal myth, (Barnard, 1996) and for others it is a political conceptual framework by which to envision mobilization and effect social change (Seidman, 1993, 1996; Segrest, 1995; Warner, 1993).

3.2(b) Instruments of Measurement: The Conflict Tactics Scale

The scales used to measure lifetime experiences of anti-gay victimization influence the ways in which knowledge about the prevalence of anti-gay victimization is presented to the public. The scale used to measure anti-gay/lesbian violence in surveys is based upon the Conflict Tactics Scales commonly used as an instrument in family violence surveys (Straus, 1990). One difference is that surveys of violence experienced by lesbians and gay men deal with stranger violence rather than "intimate" violence. There are problems in using the Conflict Tactics Scales to measure experiences of domestic violence and caution is required in analyzing the data
produced from the use of such scales in anti-gay/lesbian violence research (Straus, 1990:49-71; Kurz, 1993:252-269). In attempting to measure violence the scale tends to treat all respondents' experiences of violence in a gender neutral manner, ignoring power differences between men and women as well as differences in the experience of violence across race and ethnicity, income levels, and sexual orientation. These differences can be measured through simple correlations of the data; nevertheless, differences may get lost in quantifying the data.

Such closed ended scales tend to exclude crucial details about motives, intentions, and consequences. The anti-gay/lesbian violence scale asks whether respondents experienced violence zero, once, or two or more times since the age of 16 or in the past year. While the scale provides information about the incidence of violent attacks, it does not provide information about the damage inflicted or victims' ability to restrain assailants or retaliate. The researchers assume that lesbian and gay respondents are victims of hate motivated violence based on self reports. While this is the appropriate assumption to take in assessing data, researchers using scales should always qualify the findings in terms of their limitations and should pay attention to context and interpretation.

It is difficult to assess what proportion of the general population experiences anti-gay/lesbian violence. If lesbians and gay men account for one-tenth of the population, then incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence may only constitute a fraction of total criminal activities. One must also consider that heterosexuals and bisexuals are subject to threats and intimidations based on others' perception of their lesbian or gay sexual orientation which enlarges the population which may be victimized. Therefore it is not just the one-in-ten gay or lesbian persons in the general population who are potential victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Anti-gay terrorism may also be used to socially control anyone who displays diverse gender identities and sexualities.

In this study qualitative data obtained from survey respondents show trends in the experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence which substantiate the incidence of victimization obtained from my own and others' use of the scale of victimization.
3.3 Canadian and American Sources of Data On Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

In this section I provide a short overview of the methods by which anti-gay/lesbian violence data have been collected in Canada and the United States.²

3.3(a) Police Methods of Collecting Data

Canadian police departments have only recently begun to collect statistics on the sexual orientation of victims and perpetrators of crime. Police statistics on crimes motivated by hate are unreliable due to low reporting rates. While the Metropolitan Toronto Police Service has been monitoring hate crime occurrences since 1993, their restrictive definition of hate crime limits the number of incidents actually documented. The definition used by lesbian and gay organizations is much broader, allowing for documentation of a wide range of prejudicial activities ranging from verbal harassment to actual physical assault. As well, both discretion and professional judgment affect what is actually recorded as a hate crime in police statistics.

Police statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence have been unreliable mainly because many gay men and lesbian women distrust police and do not report. Strained relations between police and the lesbian and gay community exist for many reasons but one major inhibitor to good relations is the state sanctioned social control restrictions police enforce around sexual expression and public and private sex. Lack of trust on the part of lesbian and gay victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence, and lack of respect on the part of police has meant that the cases that do come to the attention of police are rare. Police statistics on "homosexual" assault were not kept in most jurisdictions until the 1990's. Earlier records only came to the attention of the public through media attention in cases where openly gay men were murdered, or where police raided gay bars and bathouses (Bruner, 1981; Lesbian and Gay History Group, 1981; Right to Privacy Commission, 1981; Miller & Humphries, 1983).

The Metropolitan Toronto Police Service has been monitoring hate crime occurrences since 1993 (Metro Toronto Police Service, 1995).³ While it is true that up until 1998 the Toronto Hate Crime Unit's definition of hate crime required that the crime be proven to be solely motivated by hatred toward an identifiable group, the definition used by lesbian and gay organizations is much broader, allowing for documentation of a wide range of prejudicial activities ranging from verbal harassment to actual physical assault (NGLTF, 1986:2).⁴
Both discretion and professional judgement have profound effects on what is eventually recorded as a hate crime in police statistics. For decades, information collected by police and entered into annual Justice Department reports has informed the basis for official crime rates and criminal justice policies. Johnson notes that police statistics have certain limitations as a measurement of crime including the fact that many serious acts of violence are never reported to the police and so will not appear in their records (Johnson, 1996:27). Another limitation relates to the high degree of discretion that accompanies a police officer's role. As gatekeepers, police on patrol assess complaints from citizens before they become part of the official crime count. The personal set of values police take with them when answering a call concerning anti-gay/lesbian violence impacts on how they will deal with the crime, document it, and proceed with an investigation. Police know which cases Crown Attorneys set as priorities and which are likely to be dismissed before they get to court. They know from experience what kind of evidence is needed to secure a conviction at criminal trial. As well, police are bound by the priorities of their own Division. In Toronto the Church-Wellesley Foot Patrol encompasses the downtown core which includes a vicinity in which many lesbian and gay persons live. The foot patrol are trained to become sensitized to the issues of gay and lesbian violence, and therefore are directed to respond to such cases with concern for the context of the violence.

Changes in levels of assault inside the Church-Wellesley catchment area may reflect changes in the willingness of gay and lesbian persons to report to police, or they may reflect real changes in the number of these crimes. Changes may also reflect new policies set by individual police departments such as 52 Division and the Toronto Hate Crime Unit, as well as increases in resources dedicated to responding to certain types of crimes and improvements in the police department's communication technology.

It is also important to remember that when interpreting police statistics it is only the crimes that have been reported to and substantiated by the police that enter official police records either at 52 Division or the Hate Crime Unit. The filtering process that takes place from the officer called to the scene of the crime to the investigating detective to the categorization of the incident as an actual hate related crime is affected by the definitions police use to measure hate. If a gay bashing incident is considered to be "unfounded" by the investigating officer or detective investigating the incident, the case does not appear in the official number of reported incidents. When an incident is "unfounded" it does not necessarily mean that it did not take place. As has
been found in cases of woman abuse, the reasons for designating a case as unfounded may have more to do with the police officer's perception of the victim's character and the probability that the case will be successfully prosecuted, than whether a rape or assault actually occurred (Johnson, 1996:29).

3.3(b) Victim Assistance Methods of Collecting Data

Victim assistance reporting lines such as that of the 519 Church Street Victim Assistance Programme provide an alternative to some victims who do not wish to contact police about a bashing. Fear of secondary victimization may prevent victims from reporting to police or other institutions. External pressures from family and friends may impact on victims by either minimizing, excusing or accepting a certain amount of anti-gay violence as part of being lesbian and gay (Herek & Berrill, 1992). Community based victim assistance programmes such as the 519 Centre collect data specifically from lesbians and gay men. The 519 Centre provides support and advocacy to those who may wish to report to police but who do not want to do so alone. Victims may feel that by reporting to the 519 Centre they have helped in the documentation process. Other factors may influence a victims' decision to not report. Reports to the 519 Centre and community police in downtown Toronto are higher because of the perception that the Church-Wellesley Foot Patrol is sensitized to the issues of homophobic violence in the downtown core. The funneling of reports to downtown police divisions may give the impression that anti-gay/lesbian violence is a problem only within the gay community in large urban areas. This perception is prejudiced by popular media depictions of anti-gay/lesbian violence as an urban problem perpetrated in large cities by male youth (Herek & Berrill, 1992; Comstock, 1991).

3.3(c) Enhanced Sentencing Provisions in the Canadian Criminal Code

Documentation of crimes based on sexual orientation may become more common because of the inclusion of sexual orientation in the enhanced sentencing provisions of the Criminal Code. Federal hate-crime sentencing regulations, adopted in 1994, require a judge, upon sentencing, to impose a more severe sentence if the crime is motivated by the victim's race, religion or nationality. Sexual orientation, age and language were added in 1996 (Sarick, 1998:A17). The enhanced sentencing provisions allow for increased sentencing for crimes that
can be proven to have been motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor (Martin's Criminal Code, 1998, Part xxiii, Sentencing). Enhanced sentencing provisions in the Criminal Code have been implemented since 1995 in the United States (Idelson, 1993; Cacas, 1995).

Increased sentencing provisions are based upon the ability of counsel to provide evidence that the crime was committed on the basis of the perpetrator's willful intent to harm the group in question. Most anti-gay violence cases do not reach this level within the legal process so that the impact of such a provision may only be felt by those with cases in which hatred against lesbian women or gay men is unquestionable or excessive. The effectiveness of the Canadian federal government's hate crime bill C-41 is questioned by lesbians and gays who are sceptical of legal reform and see continued conflict between police and the lesbian and gay community (Hays, 1995; Giese, 1995). Others note that hate crime laws are being used disproportionately against the people they are supposed to protect and fear the same may happen in Canada (Manji, 1995).

3.3(d) Hate Propaganda Laws

Canadian Hate Propaganda laws do not include sexual orientation as an identifiable group limiting this law as a source of data on the dissemination of hate propaganda directed at lesbians and gay men (Martin's Criminal Code, 1998, Part viii, Offences Against the Person). At this time the definition of an identifiable group in the Criminal Code's definition of hate propaganda is any group identified by colour, race, religion, or ethnic group.

Hate propaganda covers a wide range of offences within the Criminal Code including advocating genocide, and publicly inciting hatred (Martin's Criminal Code, 1998:s.319). Within the hate propaganda framework, guilt is measured according to the wilfull communication of hatred against an identifiable group. Hate propaganda includes the promotion of hatred through verbal communication, other than a personal conversation, literature, or symbols. At the same time, the test of harm is fairly exclusionary because victims must show that there is a pattern of harmful offenses which occur over a period of time. Harm is consequently often difficult to prove when the offence is verbal or symbolic in nature. The exclusion of sexual orientation as an identifiable group and the high standard of proof required thus limit hate propaganda law as a reliable source of information on anti-gay hate propaganda.
3.3(e) Sexual Assault Laws

The laws on assault and sexual assault in Canada are also subject to police discretion. The Criminal Code provisions on assault and sexual assault were revised in 1983 to take into consideration feminist criticisms that the definition was too narrow. Thus, in 1983, three offences of assault and three parallel offences of sexual assault came into effect (Johnson, 1996:29). Assaults are categorized according to the degree of injury or harm done. Level I Assault involves simple assault where there was a threat of assault or assault that did not cause serious injury. Level II Assault involves the presence of a weapon or bodily harm to the person. Level III is aggravated assault which results in wounding, maiming, or endangering the victim's life and carries a maximum prison term.

If there is reasonable and probable cause for believing that an assault occurred police may proceed with charges. This is a change from previous legislation which required a witness in the absence of physical evidence such as injuries, before a charge could be laid. The offences of assault and rape in Canada, however, are still subject to the discretion of police officers attending a crime scene (Johnson, 1996:31).

Laws on assault and sexual assault seldom distinguish between assaults based on the sexual orientation of the victims or perpetrators leaving data on such incidents unrecorded. Sexual assault crisis centres have begun to document the sexual orientation of reportees due to reports from lesbians of rapes by other women and by men who presumed the victims' lesbian or bisexual identity.

3.3(f) The United States Hate Crimes Statistics Act

The Hate Crimes Statistics Act of 1990 requires the Attorney General to collect data from police in each state in order to compile annual reports of the numbers of hate motivated crimes committed solely or in part on the basis of race, religion, heterosexuality or homosexuality, and ethnicity. The lack of uniform reporting procedures in each State makes it difficult to estimate the actual instances of hate motivated crime; however, the average annual statistics are comparable to the Canadian rates of victimization reported by Hate Crime Units. The exclusion of gender from the Act makes questionable the commitment to combatting hate-biased crime motivated by the gender of the victim (Wolfe & Copeland, 1994; Jenness & Broad, 1994).
The American Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 differs from the enhanced sentencing provisions within the Canadian Criminal Code in that the Act does not affect criminal cases, although it does have implications for police policy (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997:113). Perhaps the largest impact the Act will have is in providing a new social indicator about what is acceptable and unacceptable prejudice in American society (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997). Despite its good intentions, the law on collection of hate crime data in the United States may be difficult to implement reliably, for a variety of reasons. First, what does the Act do? The Act requires the Attorney General to collect data on eight predicate crimes where there is evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation (both heterosexuality and homosexuality), or ethnicity (Hate Crime Statistics Act, 1990).7 The HCSA instructs the Attorney General to establish guidelines for the collection of data and to determine the necessary evidence and criteria that needs to be present.

The Uniform Crime Reports Section of the FBI was designated to write guidelines for collection of data under the HCSA. The guidelines written for the collection of data by the UCR define a hate crime as "a criminal offense committed against a person or property, which is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias against a race, religion, ethnic/national origin group, or sexual orientation group" (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997:118). The sexual orientation category refers to both heterosexual and homosexual persons. The definition has three elements: predicate crimes, types of prejudice, and motivation. The eight predicate crimes enumerated by the Act are: murder, non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, aggravated assault, simple assault, intimidation, arson, and destruction, damage or vandalism of property. Any of these crimes, motivated, in whole or in part, by one of the enumerated prejudices could be counted as a hate crime.

The HCSA specifies four categories of prejudice that transform an ordinary crime into a hate crime: those based on race, religion, sexual orientation, and ethnicity. Sexual orientation is defined in the Act as "consensual homosexuality or heterosexuality." Hate crime is defined by the motivation of the perpetrators. An everyday crime becomes a hate crime if it is motivated in whole or in part by certain enumerated prejudices. However, this documentation process may be subjective, leaving it to the discretion of the attending officers to define and document the element of motivation involved in the crime. Because motivation is assessed subjectively
according to some open-ended guidelines, hate crime defined in terms of motivation may be extremely difficult to identify and count reliably (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997:136).

The UCR Training Guide outlines factors which officers should consider in determining whether a crime qualifies as a suspected hate crime. While the FBI's UCR has tried to standardize the documentation process, there are at least 17 States which have enacted their own legislation mandating the collection of hate crime statistics. These statutes and the programs that implement them are not uniform.

Jacobs and Eisler suggest that differences between federal, state, and local hate crime statistics may result in confusion over what exactly is defined as a hate crime for the purposes of the Act (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997). Secondly, the collection of statistics on hate crime will do little to effectively challenge those who commit hate crimes. The accumulation of data in a data-base provides statistical evidence of the existence of hate crime, but little else in terms of prevention and improvement of investigative police strategies or sensitivity training (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997:132).

In terms of the wide spectrum of crimes committed in America, hate crimes constitute a low percentage of criminal acts compared to other crimes. What then is the goal of putting so much effort into collecting such statistics? The goals of the Act were: 1) to help law enforcement more effectively combat hate crimes; 2) to help policy makers develop strategies to fight hate crimes, and 3) to demonstrate the nation's concern for the victimized groups (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997:130). Critics see little hope for the first two objectives and propose that the effect of collecting hate crime statistics will be to symbolize the government's concern for certain advocacy groups (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997; Jacobs & Potter, 1998:130-144). While gay men strongly advocated for the inclusion of sexual orientation in the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990, these criticism's and concerns are well founded when considering what the actual effect of such data will have on changing social attitudes and combating hatred. The exclusion of gender from the enumerated category requiring protection adds another dimension to the issue of who exactly benefits from such an Act, and what the commitment of government and law enforcement is in challenging systemic misogyny and heterosexism?
3.3(g) Hate Crime Units (Canada)

Hate Crime Units in Canada provide another source of information on hate crimes based on sexual orientation (Roberts, 1995). However, definitions of hate crime differ across provincial police forces limiting consistent data collection. As well, police focus on documenting hate motivated crimes that can be prosecuted through the courts which raises the number of physical assaults documented as hate motivated crimes in comparison to the diverse range of crimes reported to the 519 Centre.

In Canada there are differences in hate crime/intelligence unit definitions of hate crime across the provinces (Roberts, 1995). Definitions of hate crime differ across provincial police forces so that what may be considered a hate crime in Ontario may not be considered to be a hate crime in British Columbia. Julian Roberts (1995) recommends a uniform definition be used by police forces across Canada, but this change has yet to be implemented.

While the Toronto Hate Crime Unit (hereafter referred to as the HCU) has begun to document hate crimes based on sexual orientation, their official statistics are much lower than those reported to the 519 Centre. The strict guidelines used to determine what constitutes a hate crime may impact upon detectives’ decisions whether to proceed with prosecutions. Up until 1998 in Toronto a hate-motivated crime had to be shown to be committed solely on the basis of hatred toward an identifiable minority group. The definition used by the 519 Centre is more subjective, relying upon the identification made by the victims of the crime rather than strict legal and criminal definitions. Accordingly, a wide range of harms are identified by callers to the 519 Bashing Reporting Line (hereafter referred to as the BRL) and these become official statistics for the community group.

The high number of assault cases documented by the HCU may have something to do with the way in which assault is defined as well as the high standards of proof required to establish that a crime was motivated by hate. As well, the fact that so many crimes are documented as physical assault may have to do with the fact that only major crimes based on sexual orientation are considered to be worth documenting and prosecuting. The way in which assault is defined limits the number of crimes which are considered to be founded by the HCU. Police must first identify a crime to be motivated by hate and then report that incident to the HCU whose detectives then assess the police documentation of the crime scene and decide whether it is indeed a crime motivated by hatred. This sifting process means that both the police
and the detectives who work through the HCU have the power to define and categorize hate motivated crime. Furthermore, this process involves evaluation of the crime by second and third parties and may be with or without the input of the victim. While a victim may define a crime as hate motivated, the categorical framework used by police and the HCU may not allow for the diverse range and impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence experienced by victims. Police and detectives will consider whether the crime has the potential for successful prosecution when evaluating whether it is motivated by hatred. If a crime case does not have much merit in terms of successful prosecution, the HCU may not deem it a case worth classifying as a hate crime. If the crime is classified as hate motivated action must be taken to prosecute as such. Hence, it is possible that only those crimes which are extreme in their nature are most likely to be documented. A restrictive definition of hate crime contributes to the limited documentation, for when a hate crime must be proven to be solely motivated by sexual orientation, there is less likelihood that a wide range of crimes will be considered to be motivated by hate.

Some suggest that legal and police reforms have led to increased reporting and that police statistics can reflect real rates of victimization. While legal reforms help to justify human rights reforms and social justice for lesbians and gay men, it is questionable whether increased policing of the lesbian and gay community, HCU's, or Victim Assistance Programmes (hereafter referred to as VAP) have influenced reporting rates. Other important changes need to be recognized. There has been increased media scrutiny of the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence, and heightened awareness of and focus on the victims of anti-gay crime. Across the country the growth of specialized HCU's in police departments has led to increased expertise in the investigation of complaints, the gathering of evidence, and the treatment of victims (Roberts, 1995). There has been an increase in community support for victim assistance services and lobbying by community groups to alter legislation (Canadian Bar Association, 1995, Egale, 1995, Faulkner, 1997). A specialized treatment team was developed in a Toronto hospital to deal sensitively with victims of anti-gay/lesbian assault (Hierlihy, 1995).

Rather than relying upon police statistics to gauge the prevalence of anti-gay victimization in the general population, or the gay population, researchers need to consider the social context that influences reporting behaviour. Fluctuations in rates of hate crimes based on sexual orientation may be due to changes in reporting practices, changes in legislation, changing
social mores and community concern, declining tolerance for anti-gay violence, and improved response on the part of the justice system.

The advantage of police statistics is that they provide a standard measure to track changes in the number of criminal incidents that come to the attention of police over time (Johnson, 1996:36). While this "standard measure" may be biased, it still provides a consistently biased measure from year-to-year. Police statistics can also be useful in studying the effects of changes in legislation or criminal justice policies, or in studying how police handle cases of anti-gay/lesbian violence; although, they do not help in assessing the prevalence of violent victimization among lesbians and gay men in the general population, or the factors that may put them at risk of violent victimization.

The impact of hate crime provisions in the Criminal Code, various Human Rights Codes adopted by the provinces, and HCUs' documentation of hate crimes, is questionable in light of the lack of preventive action, public education, and research on the effect of anti-gay/lesbian violence on communities. As Garofalo points out, the "quick-fix" of penalty enhancements does not address "how various forms of victimization are linked by common cultural, social, and economic factors" (Garofalo, 1997:144).

3.3(h) The American National Lesbian and Gay Task Force


Absence of a nationwide data collection system makes it impossible to measure changes in anti-gay/lesbian violence at the national level; however, insights into trends are available from examination of data. Using criteria similar or identical to those established by the FBI for identifying and classifying bias incidents, the NGLTF and NCAVP have attempted to conform to police classification procedures in order to more accurately compare findings. While the NGLTF
and NCAVP are very organized in their data collection procedures, there is no comparable organization in Canada with which to compare such a data base.

3.3(i) Surveys of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

Surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence produced by lesbian and gay organizations have provided the best large scale community based studies of the impact and incidences of anti-gay violence in Canada. The surveys utilized by researchers have been modeled on United State's survey instruments and include a scale measuring lifetime incidents of violence, open and closed-ended questions about institutional responses to the violence, the degree of violence experienced, the location of incidents, the perpetrators, and the impact on individuals (New Brunswick, 1990; Smith, 1993; Samis, 1995; Faulkner, 1997).

While American anti-violence projects have been collecting data since 1985, relying on this data is problematic because of the non-representativeness of samples (NGLTF, 1986 - 1991; NCAVP, 1996). However, community-based surveys have allowed researchers to estimate the prevalence of anti-gay/lesbian violence in the general sexual minority population. My alteration of a standard questionnaire developed by American psychologist Gregory Herek allowed for the comparison of data collected at lesbian and gay events (Herek & Berrill, 1992).

Convenience sampling has been used to obtain participants in four Canadian community based studies to date (Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1990; Samis, 1995; Faulkner, 1997). The result of using such a purposive method is that only a certain segment of the lesbian and gay population is studied. Racial and ethnic groups are under-represented in these studies. Closeted lesbians and gays are seldom accessed to participate in such studies. Youth under 15 years of age and older persons over the age of 60 are also under-represented. Differently abled lesbians and gays are excluded from such studies. And there is a lack of analysis of gender and power in many of the studies. Lesbians and gays are often considered to be a homogeneous group and the compounded experience of sexism, racism, and homophobia is under-investigated.

Thus studies and survey methods used to date in Canada have significant limitations. Studies would be more inclusive if they combined survey research, interviews, focus groups and community feedback to provide the best overview of the experiences of victims, the political climate of anti-violence activism, and the needs of the lesbian and gay community.
3.4 Methods used in this study

Taking into consideration the problems with previous unstandardized surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the difficulties obtaining representative samples, I combine survey research, participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and content analysis to provide a case study of the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto (Ragin & Becker, 1997; Geis, 1995). As in most studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence, purposive sampling is used to obtain survey and interview respondents.

Qualitative data collected from respondents and interview participants provide a context for my quantitative findings. This background information fills some of the gaps in existing quantitative research on anti-gay/lesbian violence.

American psychologist Gregory Herek's survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence provided a basis for the development of my survey research approach to studying anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto (Herek, 1992:270-286). As a participant observer I documented my volunteer experience of working with the Community Response to Bashing Committee at the 519 Church Street Community Centre. Through the snowball method I obtained interview subjects who provided supplementary information on the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence. Analysis of historical documents, surveys, and anecdotal evidence provides background information. The constant comparative method is used throughout the thesis research to contrast with findings from this and other studies and generate new theories on anti-gay/lesbian violence with the aim of providing direction for future research for social change.

This study uses a survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence, participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and content analysis of reports to compile a case study of the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. The study started with my volunteer activities as a political activist and participant observer in a community organization in Toronto which focuses on the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Participatory observation allowed me to document the victim assistance model used in Toronto to address anti-gay/lesbian violence. During the process of doing fieldwork I utilized a survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence which had been previously distributed in the United States (Herek, 1992). Using Gregory Herek's survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence I worked with the Community Response to Bashing Committee at the 519 Church Street Community Centre to distribute the survey at Pride Day in Toronto in 1995. I distributed the survey questionnaire independently in 1996. My purpose in distributing a survey
was to obtain information on the prevalence and victim impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence on a population most likely to have experienced such victimization. The empirical data obtained from the two years of survey distribution were analyzed and compared and contrasted with findings from other surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence distributed in Canada and the United States. I then developed a semi-structured interview questionnaire which guided my interviews with ten persons working in institutions that provide services to victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The aim of the interviews was to obtain historical information about the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. Content analysis of reports on anti-gay/lesbian violence by various Toronto institutions allowed me to compare and contrast statistical data collected in Toronto by the 519 Centre's Victim Assistance Programme and the Metro Toronto Hate Crime Unit.

3.4(a) Ethical Review Procedures

Two ethical review procedures were followed in conducting the research. The first involved meeting the requirements of the Ethical Review Committee at the University of Toronto and the second involved discussing the ethics of using the survey data for my doctoral research with the Community Response to Bashing Committee at the 519 Church Street Community Centre. All of the requirements for the Ethical Review were met and administrative consent was given by the examiners (see Appendix 3).

3.4(b) Sample Selection

Purposive sampling was used to obtain survey and interview respondents. This method of sampling has been used in most previous Canadian and American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence. Purposive sampling involves the non-probability sampling method in which the researcher chooses the sample based on knowledge of the population being studied, its elements, and the nature of the research aims (Babbie, 1992:223). The reason why purposive sampling is used by those who study the lesbian and gay population is that there is difficulty obtaining a random sample of the whole population due to their invisibility. Because researchers of sexual minorities are likely to choose an approach which allows them to access lesbian and gay populations, purposive sampling tends to result in the over-representation of middle to higher income earners, able-bodied individuals, and individuals who are Caucasian and whose first
language is English. Purposive sampling does not usually capture lesbian women, gay men, and bisexuals who are closeted or older. This is therefore a limitation of this study.

3.4(c) Purposive Sampling

The purposive method was used to obtain interview participants as well as survey respondents. I selected a sample I believed would yield the most comprehensive understanding of my subject of study, based on my intuitive feel for the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence that came from extended observation and reflection as a volunteer for the Victim Assistance Programme at the 519. In making sampling choices I did not attempt to obtain a representative sample of all potential respondents but rather used the interviews with key informants as supplementary data by which to compare survey data and participant observation notes.

While my sample may not be representative of all institutional responses to anti-gay/lesbian violence, within the time frame available to me, I felt that the total situations available for observation were representative of a more general class of phenomena I wished to describe and explain. And secondly, I felt that my actual observations within the situations I chose to study were representative of all possible observations made of the CRBC. Even though there were possibly many more people I could have interviewed, as well as many more people I could have surveyed, I felt that the data I obtained allowed me to make general observations about the community initiatives at work in Toronto to address anti-gay/lesbian violence, which were sufficient for my study purposes.

I focused on an organization (The 519 Church Street Community Centre), which was widely known to meet the needs of lesbian and gay persons, using the purposive method because I felt that it would be very difficult to obtain a representative sample of lesbian and gay respondents in the general population. Difficulties surrounding the issue of outing participants also imposed the purposive research method because it would allow me to focus on a particular group and obtain their trust, while at the same time retain the anonymity of the participants with the aim of obtaining reliable information about experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence. In this kind of research on a sensitive subject with a group of persons who may not feel comfortable being surveyed due to their desire to maintain privacy, I felt that a controlled probability sampling method would not be appropriate. The case study approach provided me with data
which allowed me to attain a balance between representativeness and generalizability since the method allowed me to triangulate (Mertens, 1998).

3.5 Methods of Data Collection and Data Analysis: Participant Observation and the Grounded Theory Approach

The process by which data was collected influenced the data analysis I engaged in during my thesis research. The first part of data collection, a process which continued until the end of the research, involved participant observation. This process began in 1993 and ended in 1997. Participant observation allowed me to become sensitized to the issues involved in organizing against anti-gay/lesbian violence as well as the experiences of victims. I began the research because I wished to address the problem of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. As a sociologist I began by blending social action with social research by participating as a volunteer in the 519 Centre's CRBC. During that time I was subcontracted and paid to write a report for the 519 Church Street Community Centre and the Department of Justice. In acting as a consultant on the research project for the Department of Justice with the CRBC I gained important research experience in the field which broadened my awareness of working with community groups in a research capacity. Collaboration with other people working and volunteering in the field allowed me to reflect upon my interpretation of the social world.

In 1993 I joined a volunteer group in the 519 Centre. During this initial period my assumptions were that I would use my volunteer work as a part of my Field Work requirements for a course. I received permission from the 519 Church Street Community Centre volunteer coordinator to do this in 1993. As I became more immersed in the organization I became interested in the ways in which statistics were being used and how data on anti-gay/lesbian violence was collected.

In 1995 the 519 obtained funding from the Solicitor General and a new coordinator was hired. I continued to be involved as a volunteer at the 519 Church Street Community Centre's newly formed Community Response to Bashing Committee (CRBC). In 1995 I attended a public forum at which a panel spoke on their experiences of hate crime. There were speakers from Metro Toronto's Police HCU as well as community people who are involved in political activism against hate crime. The forum motivated me to further study this issue. At the next Committee meeting I suggested that the group work together to distribute a questionnaire at Lesbian and Gay
Pride in Toronto in order to obtain qualitative and quantitative data about the experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The group agreed and the survey was distributed in 1995 and again independently in 1996.

During that time many of the assumptions I had about the organization changed and I realized that my documentation of the organization and the individuals in it was as important as my documentation of the experiences of victims. As I attended more and more meetings related to the issue of hate crime I realized that there were many people working and volunteering in Toronto around the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence who could provide me with information about the history of lesbian and gay activism and about their work on behalf of victims.

Assumptions I held were related to my lack of knowledge about anti-gay/lesbian violence and these assumptions changed as I read more and conversed more with people working and volunteering in the field. For example, when I started thinking about this issue I presumed that lesbians and gay men were victimized by those affiliated with hate crime groups. An assumption I soon learned was incorrect. I assumed that the violence that lesbians and gays experienced was disconnected from the ways in which I had been harassed as a woman and lesbian. I began to recall many instances where I had been harassed because I had challenged the strict gender role I was expected to play. In recalling acts of oppression I experienced in the past, I found that my ability to be objective was challenged, and I felt empathy for the victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence, which ultimately influenced the way that I felt about the topic I was researching increasing my commitment to it.

My ten years' experience working as a front-line counsellor in the battered women's movement allowed me to distance myself from the actual violence in order to think theoretically about its meaning. At the same time, the violent nature of some of the attacks on lesbians and gay men described to me during meetings meant that I often felt increased fear for my own safety as I became more aware of my surroundings, the way in which people might perceive me, and the potential for harm as a lesbian.

I participated in outreach to the lesbian and gay community and I also took a self defence course sponsored by the 519 Centre and the University of Toronto. In doing this I interacted with many people who discussed their own experiences and fears. These activities raised my own consciousness and helped me to see the issue from diverse perspectives. These activities also helped me to challenge many of my own preconceived ideas about the nature of anti-gay/lesbian violence.
violence. Thus many assumptions I had have been challenged by my own research process, allowing me to be more open-minded.

During the 1993-1995 period I participated in fundraising and promotional activities with the CRBC which allowed me to interact with 519 staff and volunteers to better understand the cultural context of anti-gay/lesbian violence activism. Interaction with 519 staff also allowed me to assess the internal day-to-day politics at the 519 in contrast to the external social dynamics of the lesbian and gay community in Toronto.

As a group, the CRBC attended criminal trials in which lesbian and gay community members were victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. In following the legal cases through the judicial system we were able to hear expert witness testimony, assess the political dynamics of court procedures, and observe the attitudes of alleged perpetrators and their supporters and the particular problems lesbians and gays encounter in the legal system.

There are some limitations inherent in the field research approach. First, qualitative data seldom yield precise descriptive statements about a large population. Therefore the conclusions that are drawn from the qualitative field research are often regarded as suggestive rather than definitive (Babbie, 1992:306). In the beginning I knew that field research, surveys, and interviews of participants living in or affiliated with the lesbian and gay population could not be generalized to represent a larger population. In general, these risks are inherent in any research on the lesbian and gay population due to the invisibility of some participants. As well, lesbian and gay studies have been criticized for lacking representation and diversity within their own communities. As mentioned, studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence have obtained participants through organizational membership lists or those attending social events in the lesbian and gay community. Thus, most studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence are representative of white men, in the middle income range between the ages of 25 and 35. Another factor involved in such studies is lack of representation of women, the aged, teenagers, the disabled and those of diverse race and ethnicities. The strength of the findings in this study lies in the variation across the sample population.

Rather than attempt a positivistic study with preconceived hypotheses about anti-gay/lesbian violence, an interpretivist philosophy underpins the research approach I have taken in this thesis (Marsh, 1982: Heap, 1995). Using the grounded theory approach I reject the positivist way of seeing and constructing the world. I do not assume that there is a social reality which is
objectively constituted or that there is one true reality that can be determined through objective research (Kirby & McKenna, 1989:34). In contrast, I utilize the interpretivist tradition in which inter-subjectivity and critical reflection guide the research process (Kirby & McKenna, 1989:34).

The process of my inter-subjectivity with my case study participants allowed me to create a dialogue between myself and those whose lives were most affected by anti-gay/lesbian violence. I did not separate myself from the population I set out to study, rather I immersed myself in the world of the 519 Centre and the downtown Toronto institutions addressing anti-gay/lesbian violence. The process of inter-subjectivity also allowed me to create a dialogue between participants in the research process in which all were respected as equally knowing subjects. The Community Response to Bashing Committee (CRBC) provided me with feedback on various versions of the Department of Justice Report and through this process, provided their own interpretation of the survey data. Interview subjects provided feedback on interview transcriptions which enabled them to elaborate on topics they did not recall in the initial interview. The process of critical reflection allowed me to reflect upon the social context in which I researched. In doing so I attempted to ground my work in the social reality in which gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered persons exist, and to use this reality as the concrete context of facts. Thus the context in which facts about anti-gay/lesbian violence are created is as important to me as the creation of new knowledge about anti-gay/lesbian violence.

In this study I use an emergent research process by which the methodology is continually unfolding. I allowed my political position in the social context of my research to guide my research method and this method has evolved over the time period of my work. I did not begin the research with preconceived ideas about what I was going to study. Nor did I begin with a hypothesis which I set out to scientifically test. Instead, I attempt to research the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence allowing theory to be shaped from the data rather than imposing a framework onto the data. Statistics, field notes, interviews, content analysis, volunteer activities, all contribute to the emergence of a story about the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. While in this thesis statistical data could be positivistically interpreted. I have chosen to provide basic descriptive analyses of the data in the form of frequencies and correlations with some suggestions for future data analysis.

In the interpretive philosophical tradition statistics may be used as interpretive data rather than facts suggesting a scientifically obtained truth about anti-gay/lesbian violence (Marsh, 1982;
Heap, 1995). I use statistical facts to support various presuppositions about trends evolving from anti-gay/lesbian violence survey research rather than numbers that reflect a truth about the objective reality for the subjects that provided me with information. This does not mean that the statistics are false or that they do not contribute to knowledge. It means that statistical data contributed to the overall picture I wished to reflect upon and interpret for the purposes of my research. As well these statistics represent a truth for the subjects that generously gave their time to participate in the completion of the survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

In the interpretation of my data I aimed at providing a critical consciousness that recognizes the systemic nature and ideological dimension of gay and lesbian oppression. With this aim in mind I attempted to be conscious of the ideological underpinnings guiding the production of images, ideas, symbols, concepts, and vocabularies about anti-gay/lesbian violence to question who produces what knowledge for whom, and where our social forms of consciousness about anti-gay/lesbian violence come from. In studying a marginalized group I wanted to test and add to existing knowledge information about how victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence suffer injustice, inequality and exploitation in their lives.

Sexual minorities are often excluded from the work of creating knowledge about themselves as well as discriminated against in terms of the unequal distribution of material and social resources. By immersing myself in the research process with those who have been both victims and activists, I wanted to provide an authentic picture of the individual experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the institutional response to the violence. In this way the information gathered is subjectively biased in favour of those who have experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence. This is a positive aspect of feminist epistemology which embraces subjectivity and challenges the neutrality of objective research. Since no research is truly objectively created, the subjective nature of all research on anti-gay/lesbian violence is self-evident. Therefore, in remaining true to feminist challenges to objective science this research in Toronto does not explicitly attempt objectivity (Cain, 1990; Gelsthorpe, 1990; Smart, 1990; Bhavnani, 1994; Cook & Fonnow, 1990).

3.5(a) Analysis of Field Notes

The analysis of data is the most critical process in field research (Babbie, 1992:301-302). The topics that I chose to observe and the ways in which I formulated my analytical conclusions
on the basis of these observations are critical in field research because observations and analysis are interwoven processes. Participation on the CRBC influenced me to suggest that we distribute a survey, and in turn, the distribution of the survey influenced my decision to interview community participants and institutional representatives. The research process was interwoven with my analysis of data and the findings, in turn, provided building blocks by which to do further analysis. In this way I generated theories through the constant comparative method as I worked through the various research strategies, continually contrasting and comparing my findings with new data and background information.

In looking for patterns within norms of behaviour I attempted to discover universals across the data, and when I found them, I asked why these similarities might be salient to the research question. Also of interest to me were cases where the universals did not appear, and in these scenarios I asked how they tested my expectations about what I believed the data should reveal. While similarities should be observed and documented from the field research notes, I was also alert to differences that emerged in the data which might represent no easily identifiable norms in comparison to other data.

As a field researcher I formulated theoretical propositions, observed empirical events, and evaluated theory in an ongoing process. Although my actual field observations were preceded by deductive theoretical formulas, my aim was not to simply test a theory but to develop theories or generalized understandings over the course of my observations, survey research, and interviews. I asked what each new set of empirical observations represented in terms of general social science principles and tentative conclusions and these provided a conceptual framework for further observations. The interaction between data collection and data analysis afforded me a greater flexibility than had I simply worked with survey responses and one unit of analysis. Because I had used field research to guide my method of investigation I was able to continually modify the research design as indicated by my observations, while developing theoretical perspectives, and making changes in the way I studied anti-gay/lesbian violence and community organizing.

The risk in taking the field work approach is that the researcher will observe only those social phenomena that support their theoretical conclusions. This is called selective perception. In order to avoid this criticism I combined field research with interviews to contrast the perceptions of community activists with factual data obtained from those outside the CRBC. In augmenting my qualitative observations with quantitative approaches through survey research
and secondary data in the form of public documents, I was able to provide a safeguard against selective perception and misinterpretation.

A second important issue involved in analysis of the qualitative data is the issue of inter-subjectivity and introspection (Babbie, 1992:303). As I proceeded with my field research I enlisted the assistance of other CRBC members in proceeding with the refinement of my theoretical conclusions. I obtained feedback from CRBC members on two versions of the report: the initial draft and the final copy. Through this process I was able to involve CRBC members in the work of generating theory. Through gaining feedback I was able to develop increased sensitivity to different issues I had previously neglected, such as race and ethnicity and transgendered and transsexual issues. As well the feedback allowed correction for possible subjective biases or interpretations. In gaining feedback from other CRBC members, I was able to examine thoughts and feelings which went into the process of creating this work. The process provided a check and balance to ensure that how I was perceiving local reality was significantly similar to the perceptions of CRBC members. In taking the "role of the other" and as a conscious observer I was able to see the data from the perspective of Black, female, gay male, and transgendered participants in a way I had previously not seen it. This process of introspection allowed me to gain insights into what I saw going on around me as a CRBC member, researcher, and interviewer.

My research approach implies an acceptance of the empiricist, interpretivist, and emancipatory paradigms because it combines quantitative and qualitative research methods with critical feminist participatory research processes (Mertens, 1998:7). Through this combination of research approaches I triangulate data to obtain rich description.

3.6 The Survey

The second step in the research process involved survey distribution. In 1995 a survey was distributed at Toronto’s Gay and Lesbian Pride Day with the help of the Community Response to Bashing Committee (Faulkner, 1997). I distributed the survey again independently in 1996. The survey was adapted from Gregory Herek’s survey on anti-gay/lesbian violence and victimization (Herek, 1992:270-286). I recommended the use of the American survey of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence designed by Gregory Herek in order to provide a comparison between data obtained through the distribution of this survey in the United States with Canadian survey data.
obtained in the Toronto study. The CRBC’s aim in distributing the survey was to obtain qualitative and quantitative data on the experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence experienced by lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, transgendered persons, and heterosexuals.

Analysis of the survey involved making a comparison of the findings with other Canadian and American survey research on hate crimes committed against lesbians and gay men. The report written for the Department of Justice provided a breakdown of the demographic data, the frequency rates and types of violence experienced by lesbians and gays, and examined how the response rates and victimization rates compared with other American and Canadian research (Faulkner, 1997). As well, it compared incidents of attack among racial and ethnic groups, genders, and sexual orientations. The survey data provided information about whether respondents report anti-gay/lesbian violence to police, to victim assistance programmes, to hospitals for medical attention, and their experience with those institutions.

This research is significant because it is among the four most comprehensive studies of violence against lesbian women and gay men and bisexuals in Canada. There were more women than men in the sample. It is unusual to have more women than men in studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence. No other study in Canada, and few in the United States, measure the rates of assault on transsexuals, bisexuals and heterosexuals who are attacked because they are perceived to be lesbian and gay.

During a two year period which involved data analysis and writing a report, I continued to be involved with the CRBC while also researching other reports and documents related to my subject matter. The analysis of quantitative data led me to form various opinions about patterns and trends occurring in the study. These assumptions were sometimes verified by the CRBC work and research on anti-gay/lesbian violence. However, the CRBC work and survey research had been somewhat biased. The survey had been done at Lesbian and Gay Pride day and therefore considered to represent pro-gay sentiment. And participant observation located me as a member of a Committee which was composed of gay-positive participants. Despite these criticisms and limitations the strength of subjective interpretation is that it allows generation of theory from those who are most affected by the daily awareness of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence.
3.6(a) Survey Instrument

I used a anti-gay/lesbian violence survey questionnaire that was developed by psychologist Dr. Gregory Herek (Herek, 1992:270-281). Variations on this questionnaire have been used extensively in other surveys in the United States. The questionnaire is anonymous and is divided into two sections: background information which documents demographic information, and a section which documents the incidents and victim impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence (see Appendix 2).

The purpose of the survey is to document the experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence which are often left unrecorded. The survey obtains qualitative and quantitative data which are grounded in the experiences of the survey respondents and provide a forum for their voices to be heard. The documentation of the survey results present the findings in a way in which participants can see themselves reflected in the data, provides a linkage between the experiences of victims, and provides information about the institutions to which lesbians and gays reach out to in crisis situations. Another purpose of the survey is also to gather data on the victim impact of the perceived threat of anti-gay/lesbian violence, as well as the actual experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

In order to obtain information about victimization, the survey includes questions to generate both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data obtained from the survey help to further the understanding of the physical and verbal assaults which are reported. The survey generates information about perpetrators, where the harassment or violence took place, the impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence on gays and lesbians and reporting behaviour.

The questionnaire in its final form is divided into six categories: Experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence; reporting to the Lesbian and Gay Bashing Reporting Line; reporting to police; seeking medical attention; affect of harassment on behaviour; and demographic information. There are 29 questions on the survey instrument, with a total of 153 variables. The questionnaire takes an average of 10 minutes to complete (see Appendix 2).

Certain questions on the survey were altered to ensure that the questions were relevant to the Canadian context. There were debates within the CRBC on whether demographic questions regarding income and education levels were politically sensitive. Once these issues were resolved the survey was pre-tested on the CRBC in order to determine flaws in the questionnaire construction and to assess the length of time the survey took to be completed.
3.6(b) Survey Distribution

On July 2, 1995, the survey was distributed at the annual Gay and Lesbian Pride Day celebrations in Toronto. In 1996 I distributed the same survey at the same location at the annual Toronto Lesbian and Gay Pride Day celebration. In 1995 368 usable surveys were obtained and in 1996 71 usable surveys were obtained. The response rate for the two years of survey collection is 80.4 percent and the total number of usable surveys is 439.

3.6(c) Research Sample Bias

The survey is anonymous and the research sample is obtained through accessing a lesbian and gay event. The sample is therefore not a random sample of the lesbian and gay population. As well the sample is biased toward those persons who felt comfortable attending lesbian and gay Pride Day in Toronto. The self selected non-random sample is not representative of the whole lesbian and gay population and therefore findings are only generalizations of what may be representative of the lesbian and gay Pride Day population's experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence. However there are some open-ended questions in the questionnaire which allow participants to talk about the nature of their experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence, their fears, and their preventive strategies. The qualitative data allowed me to look for patterns in the responses that were not prompted by the research instrument. Interview participants were obtained through contacts within the 519 Church Street Community Centre. The interviews and participant observation also served to allow cross-referencing and comparison of data.

3.6(d) Purposive Sampling and Representation

The purposive sampling method which is used to obtain respondents in anti-gay/lesbian violence research often results in a sample which may not be statistically representative of the whole lesbian and gay population. However, this criticism needs to be contextualized. While it is argued that sampling those who attend Gay and Lesbian Pride skews results toward those who are out and active in the gay community, another argument may be brought forward to support the representativeness of the Toronto sample population. Since participants are randomly chosen from those attending Gay and Lesbian Pride they provide a probability sample of the overall population in attendance on two days of data collection in 1995 and 1996. All those in attendance at Pride Day in Toronto had equal opportunity to self-select their involvement or to be
approached to participate in the survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The visibility of those attending Pride Day represents the segments of the gay and lesbian community who are probably most likely to experience direct harassment, violence or discrimination due to such visibleness. Therefore, I argue that the Pride Day sample is drawn from a wide cross-section of those most likely to be representative of those gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals who are out and supportive of sexual minorities and who are subsequent victims of hate crimes and acts of anti-gay/lesbian violence. This argument fills the gaps in other research on anti-gay/lesbian violence which presumes the underrepresentativness of survey samples. The implication for this research and further research is that statistical analyses may be performed on empirical data collected from purposive populations with the intent of providing more in-depth analysis.

3.6(e) Response Rate

The response rate from both years' distribution of the survey outlines the number of surveys distributed, returned, and usable. The reasons for the response rate will be discussed as well as comparisons made of response rates of other anti-gay/lesbian surveys.

3.6(f) Analysis of Survey Data

The survey data from 1995 and 1996 were merged. The quantitative data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The frequencies of the data were computed and correlations between the demographic data and the responses to the closed and open ended questions were computed. The qualitative data were transcribed and coded in order to determine patterns in the responses. When codes were developed the responses were counted to determine the numbers who respond to each category. Tables are constructed to show the breakdowns of the data by gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, location, income levels, identification with a lesbian or gay community, and partnership status.

3.7 Interviews

The third stage of data collection involved interviewing. I interviewed participants late in the research process in order to obtain supplementary data. I conducted interviews in order to respond to criticisms, by colleagues, of my research while I was writing the report for the Department of Justice. It had been revealed, through numerous reports on anti-gay/lesbian
violence in North America, that the incidence of anti-gay victimization is high. This fact had already been established with comparable rates across studies (Comstock. 1991; Herek & Berrill. 1992). Critics noted that the lack of representative samples obtained from the lesbian and gay community meant that my research findings could not be generalized to any population other than that which I had studied through access to participants at Toronto Pride Day. While qualitative data provided me with consistent patterns across participant responses, thus establishing trends in the victimization experiences of participants, I was unable to suggest that the statistical findings could be generalized further. With this knowledge I decided that I should combine participant observation, survey data, and interviews in order to be able to generate theory from a case study of the specific context of organizing against anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto.

Interviews were conducted in the winter of 1996-1997 with Karen Baldwin, coordinator of the Victim Assistance Programme at the 519 Church Street Community Centre; Sergeant Gordon Serroul of 52 Division who supervises the Church-Wellesley Foot Patrol; Karen Gaunt, the Programme Manager of the Emergency Department at the Wellesley Central Hospital; Chris Phibbs, Executive Assistant to City Councillor Kyle Rae who was previously involved in implementing the first Bashing Reporting Line at the 519 Church Street Community Centre; Detective John Munro, from the Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Hate Crime Unit; as well as Janice Purdy, Greg Pavelich, and Howard Shulman, three former members of Queer Nation, a group which was active during the 1990-1991 period in which recent lesbian and gay and mainstream institutional changes began to be made in Toronto. Greg Pavelich and Howard Shulman are also presently CRBC volunteers at the 519 Centre. My aim in conducting the interviews was to document and compare the formal and informal institutional responses to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto since 1990-1991.

The unstructured interviews were taped and notes were also taken during the interview. Questions were open ended allowing the interviewee to answer in a way that they felt was relevant to the material being discussed. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and patterns in the responses were investigated. The purpose of the interviews is to help to explain the responses obtained from the questionnaires and the information obtained through participant observation. A copy of the transcribed interviews was returned to interviewees for review and feedback.
3.7(a) Analysis of Interviews

The constant comparative method was used to analyze the qualitative data. The notes from the interviews were coded to determine patterns which may contribute to the development of grounded theory on anti-gay/lesbian violence (Glaser, 1967, 1978, 1982; Kirby & McKenna, 1986).

3.8 Content Analysis

The fourth stage of data collection involved secondary data such as statistics from the 519, and the Toronto Hate Crime Unit. Statistics from the 519 Church Street Community Centre CRBC were contrasted with statistics from the survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the annual statistics from the Toronto Hate Crime Unit to identify the differences in annual rates of reporting as well as to assess the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence.

3.9 The Demographic Makeup of Survey Respondents

The 1995 and 1996 surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence were well received by those attending Lesbian and Gay Pride in Toronto. The response rate was 80 percent. In comparison with the rate of return for other Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys, the Toronto response rate was high. The survey sample is more than 50 percent female. This is the only study of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Canada and the United States known to have more female than male respondents. Therefore, the results from this survey are potentially more informative and representative in terms of lesbians' experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence and gender differences in the experience of this type of violence.

The survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence is also significant because it collected data on anti-gay/lesbian violence and harassment not only from lesbians and gay men, but also from bisexuals, heterosexuals and transgendered persons.

The sample, although dominated by respondents who defined themselves as Caucasian, includes significant ethnic and racial diversity. The range of income levels was greater than expected and the median and average incomes are not within the Canadian norm.

Comparison of demographic data with other Canadian studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence reveals that there are similarities in income range across the studies. The median income range is higher in the Toronto study than the Vancouver, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia
studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The Toronto study has more transgendered and heterosexual respondents than other Canadian studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence because the researchers did not discriminate in terms of the sexual orientation of participants. Heterosexuals who were asked to fill out the survey on Pride Day in Toronto are a random sample of those who are most probably gay-positive and have gay friends. There are similarities in the age breakdown of respondents across the Canadian studies. There is a more diverse range of racial and ethnic identity in the Toronto study than in other Canadian studies. All Canadian anti-gay/lesbian studies reveal a larger urban than rural respondent population. Two other Canadian studies reveal relationship status while the Toronto study only obtained data on whether respondents co-habit with a partner. The Vancouver and Toronto study were the only two studies to ask about affiliation with a lesbian or gay community. The Vancouver and Nova Scotia studies are the only anti-gay/lesbian violence studies in Canada which ask about the custody of children.

The final section of the survey asks respondents to provide information regarding sex, transgendered status, sexual orientation, gender orientation, race/ethnicity, age, income, place of residence, and relationship status. When the data from two years of survey distribution were merged it was found that the demographic makeup of the population in 1995 and 1996 was somewhat consistent in its diversity. As well, the incidences of violence and victimization were consistent over the two year period and across three other Canadian studies on anti-gay/lesbian violence (Smith, 1993, New Brunswick, 1990, Samis, 1995). The demographic data of a range of studies consistently illustrate the diversity of the survey sample.

Given the sampling technique used it was expected that the sample would not be significantly diverse. Canadian surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence have used the purposive sampling method and have mostly been distributed at lesbian and gay events to people affiliated with gay and lesbian organizations. Most previous surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence have been completed by openly gay urban white men affiliated with gay and lesbian political organizations. The preconception that the Toronto sample population would not be diverse was not borne out by the demographics of the Toronto respondents. Lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, transgendered persons, and heterosexuals completed the Toronto survey. Respondents' income ranged widely from below $10,000 to over $80,000 annually. The survey respondents represented a wide range of racial and ethnic groups. The qualitative data show that respondents vary on their level of openness about their sexual orientation. While a large proportion of respondents were from the
Toronto area, rural and out of province locations were also given. The respondents ranged in age from fifteen to sixty-seven years and over one-third presently reside with a partner.

3.9(a) Sex of Respondents

The statistics on sex of respondents reveal a high rate of return from women for both years, despite their usual low response to such surveys (see Table 1). Over one-half of the respondents were female. After merging the data, there were 215 female respondents (51 percent) and 205 male respondents (49 percent). Overall, 19 respondents did not identify their sex. In other Canadian studies of this kind men outnumber women (Samis, 1995:66; New Brunswick, 1991:33; Smith, 1993:9).

| TABLE 1 |
| GENDER BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION -- TORONTO, 1995-1996 |
| RESPONDENT | FEMALE (%) | MALE (%) | TOTAL (%) |
| SEX | 51.2 | 48.8 | 100.0 |
| (215) | (205) | (420) |
| LESBIAN | 66.7 | 0.5 | 35.1 |
| (138) | (1) | (139) |
| GAY | 5.3 | 85.7 | 43.7 |
| (11) | (162) | (173) |
| BISEXUAL | 12.6 | 8.5 | 10.6 |
| (26) | (16) | (42) |
| HETEROSEXUAL | 15.5 | 5.3 | 10.6 |
| (32) | (10) | (42) |
| TRANSGENDERED | 5.0 | 4.1 | 4.6 |
| (10) | (8) | (18) |

Researchers question the high response from gay male participants to all types of surveys distributed to the gay and lesbian population. The majority of anti-gay/lesbian violence studies obtain more male than female respondents, more Caucasian than ethnic minority respondents,
more youth than older people, and more urban than rural participants. (Comstock, 1991; Herek, 1992). None of the anti-gay/lesbian violence studies I have studied have more female than male respondents.

The Toronto survey was distributed adjacent to a community centre that serves both lesbian and gay male community groups. Committee members who distributed the survey were almost equally divided between the genders, although there were a few more men than women. They were asked to approach those who might be underrepresented, such as youth, older persons, ethnic minorities, the disabled, in order to attempt to balance the sample. Unlike some surveys which use gay organization mailing lists, this survey provided opportunity for those who are female and non-white to participate.

3.9(b) Sexual Orientation of Respondents

Out of the 207 women who responded to the survey and identified both their sex and their sexual orientation, 67 percent identified themselves as lesbian. Five percent of women identified as gay, 13 percent as bisexual, and 15 percent as heterosexual. Of the 189 men who responded, 86 percent said they were gay, eight percent bisexual, five percent heterosexual, and one male respondent said he identified as a lesbian.

No other study in Canada has obtained information on anti-gay/lesbian violence from groups other than lesbians, gay men and bisexuals (See Smith 1993; Samis 1995; New Brunswick Coalition for Human Rights Reform, 1990).

Not only do women outnumber men in the survey but women outnumber men in terms of bisexual and heterosexual identity. Sixty-two percent of the bisexual respondents and 76 percent of the heterosexual respondents are women.

Eleven female participants identified as gay and one male identified as lesbian. The gay identification of female participants may be due to the age and politics of the respondents. Some women prefer not to be labelled lesbian because of the feminist affiliation lesbianism connotes. For older lesbians who "came out" during the fifties and sixties, the term "gay" was most often used to identify sexual orientation. It was only with the introduction of feminist analyses of lesbian oppression that the word "lesbian" was used more often. Lesbian feminist women argue that to call lesbians "gay" leads to the perception that lesbians and gay men have more in common politically than they do. Lesbian feminists argue that the gender oppression of women
and lesbians needs to be examined separately from the gay liberation perspective espoused by most gay men. In the seventies and eighties the term "lesbian" became more common as lesbians who were feminists developed a political analysis of heterosexism. The term "queer" rather than gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered, is now more widely used among younger lesbians and gays: however, this category was not provided as a response in the survey questionnaire.

In the Toronto survey one gay man identified as lesbian. This response reflects the fact that there are men who consider themselves to be lesbian in terms of their sexual orientation. This male may be transgendered and, as a female identified person of the male sex, she may be attracted to other women and thus identify as a lesbian.

3.9(c) Transgendered Status of Respondents

In the merged 1997 data 18 respondents identified themselves as transgendered -- ten identified as female and eight as male.

Of the 16 transgendered respondents who responded to the survey and identified their sex, sexual orientation and transgendered status, six identified as lesbian, five as gay, and five as bisexual (see Table 2). Broken down by income, four transgendered participants earn between $1,000 and $19,999, seven earn between $20,999-$39,999 and two earn between $40,000 and $80,000. Ten transgendered respondents are between the age of 15 to 29 years: five between the age of 30 to 44 years: two between the age 45 to 67 years. Fourteen transgendered participants live in Toronto and three live outside Toronto. Six transgendered participants are living with partners while 11 are not. Two transgendered respondents are South Asian. 12 are Caucasian, one is French Canadian, and one self-identifies as a racial/ethnic minority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL ORIENTATION OF TRANSGENDERED RESPONDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORONTO 1995-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.5 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases 2 (11%)
No previous Canadian study on anti-gay/lesbian violence asked respondents to identify whether they are transgendered. The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Projects (NCAVP, 1996) has collected data from transgendered persons since 1995. This absence of transgendered persons in anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys suggests a lack of sensitivity to the violence transgendered persons experience. Lesbians and gay men may not consider the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence to intersect with the experience of transgendered persons. However, transgendered persons possibly experience as much or more violence based on the fact that they challenge the sex/gender scripting of the status quo and the mainstream lesbian and gay community. Despite lack of documentation in surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence, one study confirms that transgendered persons experience violence in Canada (Namaste, 1995).

3.9(d) Age of Respondents

Joseph Harry suggests that surveys of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals relying on non-probability sampling techniques tend to underrepresent youth under 16 years and persons over sixty years of age because youth and elderly persons tend not to be joiners of political movements (Samis, 1995:67). Thus, purposive samples of the lesbian and gay community are largely samples of joiners who are more likely to be in their twenties and thirties (Samis 1995:67). This is true of Canadian studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The age of Toronto survey respondents ranged from 15 to 67. Previous surveys on anti-gay/lesbian violence in Canada report a similar age breakdown among respondents (New Brunswick, 1991:33; Smith, 1993:10; Samis, 1995:67). The average age of respondents was 33, the median age was between 30 and 32 years, and the modal age was between 30 and 31 years. Forty percent of respondents were 15-29 years of age, 50 percent of respondents were 30-44 years of age, and 10 percent of respondents were 45-67 years of age. In the 15-29 year range women outnumbered men; however, men outnumbered women in the 30-44 year category and the 45-67 year category. Compared to lesbian women, gay men were overrepresented in the 30-44 year range and the 45-67 year range. Overall, 50 percent of respondents were 30 to 44 years of age in 1995 and 1996.
3.9(e) Race and Ethnicity of Respondents

Respondents to the 1995 survey were given the option of self-identifying their race/ethnicity in an open ended question format. Due to the difficulty in coding the wide variety of responses to race and ethnicity in the 1995 questionnaire the question was changed to closed-ended answers in 1996 in order to allow for comparisons between groups.

Respondents self-identified themselves as: Canadian, French Canadian, Italian, White, Irish, British, Jewish, South Asian, Hungarian, Pakistani, Filipino, Middle Easterner, European, mixed, Black, Black African, Caucasian, WASP, Eastern European, Portuguese, Afro-Caribbean, Chinese Canadian, Native American, Metis, East Indian, Welsh, Dutch Canadian, Russian/German, Scottish, Southeast Asian, German/Polish, French, Spanish, Sephardi, Celtic, South African, Hispanic, and Greek (see Table 3). Due to the wide range of responses to the race and ethnicity question the data was re-grouped into two categories rather than ten for the purpose of statistical analysis.

There are difficulties in grouping all the racial and ethnic identities into one category called "ethnic minority." While many of the respondents may identify as visible minorities, those who are Jewish cannot be defined in this way. However, both visible minorities and those who identified as Jewish self-identified themselves in response to the survey question which asked people to identify their racial/ethnic background. The numbers in each identifiable category are low and for the purpose of statistical analysis I have chosen in this thesis to group all of these responses into the category of "ethnic minority."

Out of the merged 1995-1996 data, 79.4 percent of the respondents used the words white, Caucasian, WASP, European, Canadian, French Canadian. A total of 20.6 percent of the respondents identified as Native Canadian (three percent), Black or Black African (three percent), East Asian (two percent), South Asian (three percent), South East Asian (one percent), Mid-Eastern (less than one percent), Jewish, (six percent) mixed and minority (two percent). Forty two respondents did not respond to the race and ethnicity question. Caucasian respondents are overrepresented in all Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence studies (Smith, 1993:12; Samis, 1995:67).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACIAL/ETHNIC IDENTITY²</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>VALID PERCENT (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Native,</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Indian, Metis and Inuit, Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African, Afro-Caribbean, West Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian, Chinese, Polynesian, Japanese, Korean, Oriental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian, Bangladeshi, Punjabi, Bengali, Pakistani, Tamil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asian, Filipino, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian, White, Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish, Sephardi³</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Canadian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Missing Cases 42 (9.6%)

² The racial/ethnic categories are self-defined by the respondents themselves and thus represent a broad range of diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds. There is a mixture of responses to the question asking participants to identify their racial/ethnic background. Some of the categories evolving from the responses are racial categories and some are ethnic categories. Since the total number of participants identifying themselves as something other than Caucasian is so small (20.9 percent), for the purposes of statistical analysis and comparison I have chosen to group them into one category labelled "ethnic minority."

³ So few respondents identified as Jewish that it was not possible to identify significant patterns of anti-semitism, even though this prejudice is no doubt experienced by gays and lesbians.

An equal number of men and women responded to the race and ethnicity question.

Seventy-six percent of female and 83 percent of male respondents identified as Caucasian.
Overall, more women (24 percent) than men (17 percent) identified as ethnic minority persons. By sexual orientation, 18 percent of gay respondents and 18 percent of lesbian respondents identified as ethnic minorities. It must be noted that 11 "gay" respondents are women. An equal number of bisexual (32 percent) and heterosexual respondents (32 percent) identified as members of a ethnic minority group. Transgendered, lesbian, and gay respondents were overwhelmingly Caucasian and in each grouping ethnic minority members were underrepresented.

3.9(f) Income Levels

The data on income were first categorized in intervals of $10,000 dollars. In the second categorization process the data were organized into three income ranges: $1,000 to $19,999, $20,000 to $39,999 and $40,000 to $80,000 and upwards. In the third categorization process the real income of each respondent was reentered individually in order to obtain the mean, median, and modal percentages for the total sample.

For the 1995-1996 merged respondents the average annual income is $35,222, the median income is $30,000 and the modal income is $30,000. According to Canadian census data this income range is above the norm for the total Canadian population. Over 30 percent of Toronto respondents earned less than $20,000 annually; 20 percent under $10,000 annually; 38 percent between $20,000 and $39,999 annually, and 29 percent between $40,000 and $80,000. Three percent of respondents reported earning more than $80,000. There are similar variations in income levels across the Canadian studies which signify that the economic distribution of wealth may be consistent across the Canadian gay population which chooses to respond to such surveys (Smith, 1993:12; Samis, 1995:67-68).

3.9(g) Sex Differences in Income Levels

In the Toronto study there were notable differences between men and women in the reported income levels. The mean income for men was higher than that for women -- $41,719 to $28,375. This mean income is higher for both men and women than that found in the general population. Statistics Canada reports that the mean income for Canadian men in 1996 was $32,248 and the mean income for women in 1996 was $20,902 (Statistics Canada, 1998) (see Table 4).
Respondents' incomes were categorized into three income ranges. As in the general population, women were over-represented in the lower income levels and men were overrepresented in the higher income levels. There were more lesbians in the lowest and middle income ranges than gay male respondents, and more gay respondents in the highest income range than lesbians. Fifty percent of bisexual respondents were in the lowest income range. Sixty-two percent of bisexuals in the study are female.

Women were more likely than men to earn between $1,000 and $19,999 annually. Thirty-eight percent of women earned between $1,000 and $19,999 annually while 28 percent of men reported an annual income in the lowest income range. More women than men earned between $20,000 and $39,999. Forty-three percent of women and 33 percent of male respondents reported earning between $20,000 and $39,999 annually. Men dominated the higher income levels. Thirty-nine percent of men earned between $40,000 and over $80,000 compared to 19 percent of the female respondents.

3.9(h) Sexual Orientation Differences in Income Levels

More lesbians than gay men earned between $1,000 and $19,999 annually. Thirty-four percent of lesbian respondents reported earning between $1,000 and $19,999, compared to 25 percent of gay respondents. But more lesbians than gay men earned between $20,000 and $39,999 annually. Forty-five percent of lesbians earned between $20,000 and $39,999 while 32.8 percent of gay respondents said their annual income was in this category. Gay respondents
surpassed lesbians in the $40,000 - $80,000 plus income range. Forty-one percent of gay men reported that their annual income was in the $40,000 - $80,000 plus income range, compared to 20 percent of the lesbian respondents. More than fifty percent of bisexuals reported their annual income in the lowest income bracket, while fifty percent of the heterosexual respondents said their annual income was in the mid-income range. Seventy-six percent of the survey's heterosexual respondents are female.

3.9(i) Income Levels and Sex and Sexual Orientation

In order to determine the mean income for sex and sexual orientation in the Toronto sample an independent-samples T-test was done using respondents' individual incomes. The mean income for all respondents is $35,222. The mean income for men between 1995 to 1996 is $41,719 while the mean income for women during this same period is $28,375. The mean income of men and women in the Toronto sample is higher than the mean income of men and women in the general population. The mean income of Ontario respondents in 1996 was $29,295. The median earnings of Ontario residents in 1996 was $25,263. In 1996 the mean income for male workers living in Ontario was $32,248 while the mean income and salary for female workers living in Ontario was $20,902 (Statistics Canada, 1998)

Bisexuals show the lowest mean income followed by lesbians and heterosexuals. Gay men have the highest mean income. Over 60 percent of the bisexual population is female and over 70 percent of the heterosexual population is female. The mean income for lesbian women and heterosexuals is $29,000 in contrast to $19,000 for bisexuals and $44,000 for gay men. The independent-samples T-test reveals that men make more money than women and it is therefore generally advantageous to be a male in this gay population.

The statistics show that the mean income for the total Toronto sample is higher than that of men and women in the general population. The conclusion that may be drawn is that the average income of respondents in the Toronto sample is higher than that of the general population. Such conclusions must be made with caution. The myth that gay men and lesbian women earn higher incomes than heterosexual men and women is used to argue that sexual orientation is not a category of discrimination in need of protection. Lee Badgett (1997:68-70) suggests that studies which show that gay men and lesbians earn higher incomes than heterosexuals are biased by the fact that they target highly educated men and women through
lesbian and gay membership lists to gay newspapers and magazines or those who have filled out questionnaires at lesbian and gay events. These subgroups of the lesbian and gay population cannot be considered representative of the larger group. Therefore, lack of representative samples with low response rates cannot prove that gay men and lesbians make more money that those in the general heterosexual population. While the Toronto sample represents those who attended Pride Day in 1995 and 1996, it is also true that those who chose to fill out the survey may be more highly educated, which would also raise the average income found in the survey. Thus the results of the Pride Day survey may not be used to describe the larger target group of lesbian, gay, and bisexual respondents.

3.9(j) Area of Residence

The Pride Day respondents gave diverse locations of residence. Respondents lived in Metro Toronto, Scarborough, Mississauga, Greater Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, London, St. Catharine's, Hamilton, Guelph, Kingston, Brampton, Burlington, Peterborough, rural Ontario, Nova Scotia, and the United States. Nineteen respondents lived in another location not represented in the categories, and thirty-five respondents did not give any location of residence. Due to the diverse locations the data was categorized into two groupings namely to enable better comparisons between variables.

A total of 404 respondents in the 1995-1996 data gave their location of residence. Seventy-two percent (286) of respondents live in Metro Toronto, including Scarborough, Mississauga, and the Greater Toronto Area. Twenty-eight percent (113) of respondents live outside of Metro Toronto. Of those who live in Metro Toronto, 47.9 percent are male and 52.1 percent are female. An almost equal percentage of men and women live outside Toronto: 48.7 percent and 51.3 percent. More gay than lesbian respondents reside outside of Metro Toronto. The majority of lesbian, gay, transgendered, bisexual and heterosexual respondents live in Metro Toronto. The high rate of respondents living in urban areas is replicated in other Canadian studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence (New Brunswick, 1991:33; Smith, 1993:10).

The high majority of Metro Toronto respondents may be due to the fact that the survey was distributed at Lesbian and Gay Pride day in downtown Toronto. While many people from outside Toronto attend Pride week celebrations, the survey respondents do not equally represent the rural Ontario population, which comprises only four percent of respondents. Five percent of
respondents live in other large Ontario urban cities: three percent of respondents live in Ottawa, and two percent live in Montreal. Two percent of respondents live in the United States. In terms of respondents from other provinces in Canada, the only other province represented is Nova Scotia with two percent.

3.9(k) Relationship Status

Over one-third of respondents in the 1995-1996 merged data said that they are presently sharing a household with a partner/lover -- one hundred and fifty-nine. 40 percent of respondents out of 399 valid cases. Sixty percent of respondents said that they are not presently living with a partner. Forty respondents did not answer the question. There are similarities across three Canadian studies in terms of relationship status. At least 40 percent of respondents in each study were in a relationship (Smith, 1993:10; Samis, 1995:69). Four Canadian studies asked respondents about children and custody but the Toronto study did not (Samis, 1995:69-70; Smith, 1993:12-13; CLGRO, 1997:5; Bertrand, 1984).

It was found that more women than men are living with a partner. By sex, 45 percent of women live with a partner compared with 34 percent of male respondents. Fifty percent of lesbian respondents are living with a partner compared to 36 percent of gay respondents. Considering that five percent of "gay" respondents are female, the number of actual female respondents living with a partner may be higher than reflected by the statistical data.

3.9(l) Identification with a Lesbian or Gay Community

Toronto respondents were asked what (if any) community within the lesbian or gay community they identify with. Only 93 respondents (21.2 percent of the total respondent population) answered this question. Respondents listed a range of community affiliations: gay, lesbian, queer, socialist feminist, Out-and-Out club, Metropolitan Community Church Toronto (MCCT), Aids Action Now, Gay Fathers of Toronto (GFT), 519 Church Street Community Centre, student groups, ACT-UP, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Youth Toronto (GLBYT), Coalition of Lesbian and Gay Rights Ontario (CLGRO), dyke community, Adventurous Women of London (AWOL), singers, writers, Jewish women, disabled butch, and out of town communities in San Francisco and New York City.
In order to determine the level of involvement of respondents I divided the group between those who identify with a lesbian or gay organization and those who do not. Seventy-three percent of the 93 respondents to this question state they identify with a lesbian or gay community and 26.9 percent do not. More women (83.3 percent) than men (64.0 percent) identify with a community. Eighty-two percent of the lesbians identify with a lesbian or gay community compared to 67.4 percent of gays. All seven of the heterosexuals who responded to this question state they are affiliated with a lesbian or gay community. There was no question on bisexual membership in a bisexual organization. Sixty-six percent (66.7 percent) of bisexuals said they do not identify with a lesbian or gay community while 33.3 percent do. Ethnic minorities are far more likely to identify with a lesbian or gay community compared to Caucasians. Eighty-six percent of the ethnic minority respondents who responded to this question identify with a gay or lesbian community compared to 69.9 percent of the Caucasian respondents. Eighty percent of those in the 45 to 67 age group identify with a lesbian or gay community compared to 76.1 percent of the 30 to 44 age group and 65.7 percent of the 15 to 29 age group. Those in the mid- to upper income range (81 percent) are more likely to identify with a lesbian or gay community than those in the lower income range (65.5 percent). Respondents living in Toronto are more likely to identify with a community (80.3 percent) than those living outside Toronto (55.6 percent). And those living with a partner (78.9 percent) are more likely to identify with a community than those not living with a partner (69.1 percent). The percentage of Toronto participants who identify with a lesbian or gay community is comparable to the Vancouver study of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Samis, 1995:71).

3.10 Demographics in other Canadian Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence Studies

Four studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence have been conducted in Canada using the purposive method of data collection (Faulkner, 1997; Samis, 1995; Smith, 1993; New Brunswick Coalition For Human Rights Reform, 1990).

There are commonalities across the four Canadian studies. The four Canadian studies are highly representative of those living in urban centres. The Toronto and Vancouver sample represent a large urban population while the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick sample are drawn from a smaller population. The respondent population is heterogenous, representing a diversity of sexual identities, income levels, location of residence, ages, race/ethnicities, and partnership
statuses. In all but the Toronto sample men outnumber women. The Toronto survey had the most female respondents across the four studies, while the Vancouver study had the most male respondents. The Toronto study is the only Canadian study to obtain information on anti-gay/lesbian violence from groups other than lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. The Toronto study is the only study to include transgendered persons. Caucasian respondents are overrepresented in all Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence studies. There were variations in income levels across the Canadian studies. The median income range is higher in the Toronto study than the Vancouver, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence. At least 40 percent of respondents in each study were in a relationship. In two studies more women than men report having children. Participation in a lesbian or gay community varied across studies. A majority of Vancouver respondents are involved in a lesbian and gay community while only a minority of Toronto respondents stated that they were.

The sample sizes in the four studies differ. The Toronto sample size is the largest of the three Canadian anti-violence studies. The response rate varies across the four studies. Due to the distribution method most often used, anti-gay/lesbian violence studies have a low response rate. The response rate in Toronto was the highest: 80 percent, compared with 21 percent and 32 percent in the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick studies. The Vancouver study did not provide information on the response rate and the total number of surveys distributed was not given. The average response rate across the three studies was 44 percent.

Despite these similarities and differences, the rates of victimization are somewhat consistent across Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys with the exception of the data collected on sexual harassment. That similar percentages are produced in spite of demographic differences indicates that anti-gay/lesbian violence is a common occurrence throughout Canada. Although anti-gay/lesbian violence may be more frequent in urban areas, anti-gay/lesbian violence occurs in suburban and rural areas also. The Toronto survey data reveal that those living in urban and rural areas are as likely to experience anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The size of the samples in the four studies differs. The Toronto sample size is the largest of the three Canadian anti-violence studies. Four hundred and thirty nine respondents filled out the survey in Toronto compared with 420 respondents in Vancouver, 294 in Nova Scotia, and 176 in New Brunswick. The total number of respondents to the four Canadian surveys was 1,329. The average sample size of the four surveys was 332. The Toronto study represented 33 percent
of the total respondent sample, the Vancouver study 32 percent, the Nova Scotian study 22 percent, and the New Brunswick study 13 percent.

The Toronto survey had the most female respondents of the four studies, while the Vancouver study had the most male respondents. There were 215 female respondents in the Toronto study, the highest response from women in any anti-gay/lesbian violence survey in Canada. The female response represents 41 percent of the total female survey respondents across the four studies. There were 133 women in the Nova Scotia study, 51 in the New Brunswick study, and 122 in the Vancouver study. The Vancouver study had 298 male respondents, a number which represents 38 percent of the total male respondents across the four Canadian studies. There were 205 male respondents in the Toronto study, 161 men in the Nova Scotia study, and 125 men in the New Brunswick study. Overall, men represented almost two thirds of the Canadian respondents and the 789 male respondents represent 59 percent of the total respondent population from the four Canadian studies. Five hundred and twenty-one women participated in the four Canadian studies, representing 39 percent of the total Canadian respondent population.

3.11 Conclusions

Increased awareness of anti-gay/lesbian violence has led to significant improvements in the methods used to study these issues. Researchers have moved from police records and anecdotal evidence which rely upon a small proportion of cases to wide-scale sample surveys in the American research and community based surveys in Canada. These surveys have captured a broad range of experiences, provided information on the consequences for victims, the impact on victims, the reaction of others, as well as the response of institutions and the way victims are treated by police and medical personnel. As in surveys which attempt to assess the prevalence of violence against women in the general population, sample surveys offer the best hope for the most comprehensive information about violence against lesbians and gay men, however, the estimates produced undercount the true prevalence of violence (Johnson, 1996:60). Victim surveys are imperfect tools and researchers need to strive for improved methods of measuring the physical and psychological victimization of lesbians and gays and those presumed to be so. A contextual approach that combines survey research with interviews, participant observation and
content analysis can provide a more reflexive and context sensitive approach to assessing the prevalence and victim impact of anti-gay violence.
CHAPTER FOUR
HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will provide an overview of the Community Response to Bashing Committee (CRBC) model developed by the coordinator and the volunteers of the Victim Assistance Programme to assist and support victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Throughout this documentation I will critique the existing model and institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The aim of this chapter is to present the recent history of organizing against anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto. This encompasses the period beginning with the formation of the Victim Assistance Programme (VAP) in 1990-1991 and ending with the present VAP at the 519 Church Street Community Centre. I will outline the model of victim assistance created by volunteers and lesbian and gay activists from within the Toronto community. Information was obtained through interviews with persons working in public institutions to address anti-gay/lesbian violence.

4.1(a) Background Material

I will begin by contextualizing the CRBC when it began in 1995 as a revamped project of the 519 Church Street Community Centre's Victim Assistance Programme.

Since 1995, attempts have been made to build alliances with Toronto groups working on hate crime issues. The work of victim advocates at the 519 is not the first attempt by grassroots groups and supportive individual volunteers to challenge anti-gay/lesbian violence or hate motivated crime in Toronto.

There has been a long history of poor relations between the police and the lesbian and gay community which has been documented by the Toronto Lesbian and Gay History Group (Lesbian and Gay History Group, 1981; Right to Privacy Commission, 1981; Comstock, 1991:152-173). Political organizing in the 1970's led to ideological change which affected the development of lesbian and gay businesses and economic power, which in turn instilled within lesbian and gay persons a sense of community. This social and economic change took place over several decades and culminated in a more united and organized approach to fighting unjust police treatment. The
state gave police the power to target gays for such crimes as loitering, public sex, sodomy, buggery, and running a bawdy house (Smith, 1990). While police had previously been able to intimidate sexual minorities, the situation changed after economic clout provided motivation for political organizing and resistance (Right to Privacy Commission, 1981).

When the gay bathhouse raids of 1979 and 1981 took place, sexual minorities in Toronto were no longer willing to tolerate interference in their businesses and persecution because of their sexual difference. Lesbian and gay men resisted through public protest and civil prosecution, demanding human rights and change at various social and political levels in Toronto (The Bruner Report, 1981; The Morand Report, 1979; The Toronto Lesbian and Gay History Group, 1981; the Right to Privacy Commission, 1981; Smith, 1990; Berube, 1997). In 1979 a group of progressive lawyers organized the Right to Privacy Committee (RTPC) to represent those charged by the Intelligence Bureau of the Metro Toronto Police as keepers or as found-ins of a common bawdy house. Between 1980 to 1984 The RTPC was able to quash the convictions of nearly 90 percent of the 300 persons charged in the 1979 and 1981 Toronto bathhouse raids. The RTPC also organized the largest anti-police demonstrations in recent Toronto history (Smith, 1990:259).

A decade of silence and animosity between the lesbian and gay community and the police followed this serious confrontation. The political climate changed in the late 1980's. In the early 1980's Anti-Violence programmes sprang up in New York and in San Francisco (Herek, 1992:241-258; Wertheimer, 1992:227-240). During the 1980's, as a response to increased anti-gay/lesbian violence, efforts had been made to organize queer patrols in the Church and Wellesley area forcing communication between police and queer activists. By 1990-1991 reports of gay bashing began to filter down to the 519 Centre. An openly gay executive director and his lesbian assistant facilitated an environment of compassion and support for victims which influenced reporting behaviour. Based on anecdotal evidence, the 519 Centre began to document and share information with police with the aim of obtaining increased protection and criminal prosecution.

In July 1990 the BRL was set up at the 519 Centre (Brown, 1994:11). In July 1990 lesbians and gays demonstrated in Montreal to protest police brutality (Lesbians and Gays Against Violence, 1990; Wells, 1990). AIDS activism heightened the Toronto gay community's awareness of systemic homophobia. Influenced by the political ethos of the times and some high profile gay bashing criminal cases, Torontonians decided to organize against gay bashing (Shein,
Toronto's Queer Nation formed in 1990 to protest the exclusion of out lesbians and gays. Public protests including sit-ins, kiss-ins, threats of outing, were organized to make space for queers in public places where invisibility was implicitly demanded (Maynard, 1991). The philosophy of "in your face" queer activism endeavoured to challenge prevailing heterosexist attitudes. Resistance against anti-gay/lesbian violence is therefore not a new idea or strategy among lesbian and gay activists; however, institutional funding and support for such activism within mainstream organizations is a fairly new form of political organizing against the discrimination which fosters heterosexism and anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The present VAP model has been evolving for seven years at the Centre with intermittent funding and staffing. In the 1990's and earlier, as a result of increased reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence to the Centre, a phone line, intake interview and referral process were put into place; as well, a connection was made with police through the Church-Wellesley Neighbourhood Police Advisory Committee (CWPAC) to ensure better communication between the police and the Centre. This work was considered radical at the time and required the linkage of the 519 Centre with police by then Executive Director Kyle Rae and Victim Assistance Coordinator, Chris Phibbs. In 1995, these processes were still in place at the Centre; however, due to lack of funding, coordination of the program over the years had been sporadic. The impetus for the development of the second-stage of the model was not the same as that for the initial model. While increased reports of bashings and the political activism of Queer Nation influenced the political climate in 1990-1991, the second stage took on a more grassroots approach working from within the Centre, making linkages with agencies such as the City of Toronto, the Wellesley Central Hospital, the Toronto Hate Crimes Unit, and numerous committees in the City with the aim of obtaining institutional and financial support, educating victims about resources, and raising public awareness about anti-gay/lesbian violence.

More recently community activism and programme development have developed alongside each other to allow a grassroots approach to victim assistance at the 519 Centre. The radicalism based on individual identity politics which was alive in the community during the initial 1990-1991 Queer Nation movement has changed toward a more institutional/grassroots approach involving work within institutions that had been previously considered unsympathetic to lesbian and gay concerns. A change in attitude over the years on the part of institutions toward lesbian and gay victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence signals a change in attitude among the public
generally, and this is the result of much of the work of radical groups such as Queer Nation, and the influence of lesbian and gay political activists who once worked on the periphery, but who have now accessed mainstream institutions in order to effect social change. The question remains whether the tactic of working from within organizations to challenge homophobia and heterosexism has worked, or whether institutional discourses of acceptance represent only a symbolic intention toward societal and institutional change. In whose interests do anti-violence programmes work and whom do they represent? This question will be examined in this review of institutional responses to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto.

4.2 The Revamped 519 Church Street Victim Assistance Programme Model (CRBC)

The following section will provide an overview of the CRBC model developed by the coordinator and the volunteers of the Victim Assistance Programme since 1995. Throughout this documentation I will critique the existing model and institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence.

4.2(a) Historical Context

The revamped model adapted by the 519 Church Street Community Centre's Victim Assistance Programme could be considered somewhat similar to that of American anti-violence models in that it is grounded in the awareness of the incidences of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the impact of crime on victims (Wertheimer, 1992:227-234; Herek, 1992:241-259; Berrill, 1992:19-40). The aim of most of the American anti-violence programmes is to educate the public, implement preventive measures through advocacy and referral, and liaise with local police authorities to provide more adequate response to victims of gay bashing.

The 519 model was developed from the experiences of victims and advocates over many years of trial and error. Lack of funding for the programme at the 519 Centre has meant that only parts of the American models have been utilized to deal with the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence. While the budget for the New York Anti-Violence Project (NYAVP) is $250,000 per annum, and the budget for the San Francisco Community United Against Violence (CUAV) is $250,000 per annum, the Toronto Victim Assistance Programme runs on a much lower annual budget of $30,000-$35,000. The New York AVP budget of $250,000 is augmented by specialized grants from private foundations and no fewer than five government agencies as well
as by regular contributions solicited from the community (Wertheimer, 1992:231). The CUAV budget of $250,000 comes from the United Way, of which they are a member agency: from the city and county of San Francisco through the District Attorney's Office; and from the office of Criminal Justice Planning, a state agency that distributes V.O.C.A. funds which are Federal Victim funds. They also have private donations and small private foundation grants (Herck, 1992:242).

The Toronto VAP obtains funding through granting agencies such as the Lesbian and Gay Appeal, the City of Toronto's "Breaking the Cycle of Violence" grants, the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General, and other individual funders. None of these sources of funding are annually renewed. Between 1990 and 1995 the only elements of the San Francisco (CUAV) and New York Anti-Violence Project (NYAVP & NCAVP) model used by the 519 Centre have been the implementation of a Bashing Reporting Line and victim assistance in the form of documentation, advocacy, and referral. While there had been some short term contracts that allow the Centre to maintain continuity in terms of client support and public outreach, (Coutu, 1994) the Centre attempted to broaden the scope of the programme by applying for funding from the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General for a full-time Victim Assistance Programme Coordinator. When a part-time coordinator was hired in 1995 she began to form an approach to public activism, outreach, and support that was influenced, but not strictly modeled on, that of American anti-gay/lesbian violence initiatives. During this time the coordinator liaised with the New York AVP project.

4.3 Activism
4.3(a) The Community Response to Bashing Committee (CRBC) Model

In 1995, the CRBC decided to focus on education and prevention as well as strengthening ties with local community groups. Over a two year period between 1995-1997, in which I was a volunteer, the group met on a monthly basis and set about working on various projects, some of which required sub-committees. The coordinator took on the work of intake interviews, advocacy, referrals, interviews with media, research on other victim assistance programmes, and court support of victims. The coordinator also provided expert witness testimony in one gay-bashing legal case. During this two year period volunteers worked on various group projects and
branched out to become members of other committees in the Toronto community with the aim of representing the interests of the CRBC.

4.3(b) Victim Advocacy

The CRBC combined consciousness raising with political activism as a means of developing its own analysis of anti-gay/lesbian violence. For example, the CRBC followed various gay bashing cases through the courts. Three legal cases in particular educated and sensitized the Committee members to gay bashing, the response from police and the HCU, the response from the Wellesley Central Hospital, and the ways in which the 519 VAP react to and support victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Some of the cases were documented in Ontario media and nationally in Maclean's Magazine (Clement, 1995; Craig, 1995; Darroch, 1995a, 1995b; Drumme, 1995; Corelli, 1995; Oakes, 1995; Pazzano, 1995; Staff, The St. Catherine's Standard, 1995; Toronto Star, 1995).

Attending gay bashing court cases allowed Committee members to experience actual criminal court proceedings involving anti-gay/lesbian violence. As a result of observing court cases, members of the Committee verbalized their own experiences of bashings and discussed ways of dealing with verbal and physical assault on the street. Thus, activism combined consciousness raising and education. As well, Canadian media began to discuss the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence and homophobic attitudes more often (Canadian Press, 1996; Craig, 1996; Deaprose, 1992; Eddelson, 1997; Gill, 1995; Globe and Mail, 1992, 1995, 1997; Go Info, 1992; Hannon, 1995; Harding, 1997; Herland, 1996; Hranilovic, 1996; InfoEgale, 1995; Kennedy, 1996, 1997; Kirby, 1997; Mandel, 1996; Manji, 1995; Mesbur, 1996; Milward, 1997; Newman, April/May, 1996; Pepper, 1994; Rand, 1994; Roberts, 1994; Schacter, 1990; Shein, 1986; Schneider, 1995; Toronto Sun, 1996; Toronto Star, 1993a, 1993b, 1994; Wazana, 1995; Wells, 1990).

4.3(c) Developing Alliances with other Organizations

CRBC members were strategically placed on committees outside of the 519 in order to represent the CRBC and develop alliances in the community. Members reported back to monthly CRBC meetings on the anti-gay/lesbian violence activities of the other committees. This strategy allowed there to be a representative from the CRBC group on committees which we felt should
be dealing with heterosexism because their clientele were either lesbian or gay. Such committees are: The Toronto Safe City Committee, which does safety audits in the downtown core and was working on the report 'Building a Safer City'; the Toronto Transgender Action Committee (TTAC); the Mayor's Sub-Committee on Lesbian and Gay Issues which is a sub-committee of the Mayor's Committee on Racism and Race Relations; The Community Advisory Committee on Anti-Racism and Anti-Hate: B'nai Brith; the Church and Wellesley Police Advisory Committee, and the Metro Initiatives of the Urban Alliance on Race Relations, which produced the Combatting Hate Activity Report for the City of Toronto. In order to be on the Church/Wellesley Neighbourhood Police Advisory Committee (CWNPAC) one must own property or work on the catchment area. There is ongoing discussion on how to liaise more closely with police, specifically the Church/Wellesley Foot Patrol. The 519 VAP coordinator eventually joined the CWNPAC in order to fill this gap.

4.3(d) The Wellesley Central Hospital

Although there is no official committee of the Wellesley Central Hospital that works with the CRBC, Committee members have participated in various projects with the Wellesley (Benebek, 1995:2). The Wellesley Central Hospital piloted a lesbian and gay bashing protocol to teach health care providers how to give lesbian and gay victims sensitive care, assessment, and appropriate referrals (Hierlihy, 1996). Victims who had reported to the BRL participated in focus groups held by the Wellesley Hospital during their production of the training manual, video, and resource materials to educate workers in their Emergency department's Triage. The Emergency Room Protocol, Behind the Bruises (1996) includes a review of recent literature on violence against lesbians and gay men, an educational manual to support the lesbian and gay bashing protocol, and a training video (Hierlihy, 1996).

The project was jointly supported by the 519 Centre, the Wellesley Central Hospital, and the University of Toronto. Volunteers with the Wellesley Hospital donated time during Pride Day to help distribute 519 questionnaires, and volunteers from the 519 Centre volunteered during the celebration launch of the Wellesley hospital's Lesbian and Gay Bashing Protocol. 519 volunteers supported the Wellesley Central Hospital at the lesbian and gay youth "Other Young Lives" Conference. In this way a hospital and a grass-roots organization dealing with anti-gay/lesbian violence created working alliances.
The amalgamation of the Wellesley Central with St. Michael's Hospital in downtown Toronto may place the protocol programme in jeopardy. The St. Michael's Hospital Wellesley Site will no longer have an Emergency, but the current staff at the Wellesley emergency will continue to work at St. Michael's site after the merger (Perra, 1998:7). At this time the St. Michael's hospital has not formally endorsed the emergency room protocol as part of the amalgamation.

4.3(e) The University of Toronto

Sexual orientation is not a protected category in the University of Toronto's anti-discrimination policy, yet there have been various attempts by University of Toronto administration to advertise lesbian and gay positive space on the University of Toronto campus. Despite administrative attempts to symbolically support gay and lesbian positive space, media coverage suggest that conditions for gays and lesbians on University of Toronto campus are not safe. Queer students have recently complained about the lack of gay-positive health service on campus (Jabbari, 1998:1-2). Washrooms on campus have recently been closed due to reports of gay sexual activity (Luksic, 1998:1). As well, queer students on University of Toronto campus have voiced their annoyance at lack of media coverage for their issues (Rein, 1998:5). In the past year, homophobic harassment has taken place on campus in the form of hate propaganda (Johnson, 1998:18). Posters subverting University of Toronto's Gay and Lesbian Positive Space campaign appeared on campus in the winter of 1998, and then in March, homophobic graffiti were found on gay-positive posters produced by the Students' Christian Movement (Sunstrum, 1998:1; Warren, 1998:1-3; Riley, 1998:1). In March 1998 an investigator from Metro Toronto Police's 52 Division was assigned to monitor the case and the Victim Assistance Co-ordinator with the 519 Community Centre became involved. However, little could be done because University of Toronto Police do not consider the offensive material to fall under the Criminal Code Hate Propaganda definition and therefore the university's Harassment Officer is limited in her ability to take action (Warren, 1998:1). University policy requires that one must threaten physical violence in order to commit a hate crime and direct hatred toward a specific individual in order to constitute harassment (Warren, 1998:3). The university claims that there is little it can do about the defacement of gay-positive posters produced when sexual orientation is not included in the Criminal Code Hate Propaganda definition. However, it is noted by community groups that
because religion and race are listed as identifiable groups under section 3.19 of the Criminal Code, similar hate-mongering situations have been dealt with more harshly by other public institutions (Warren, 1998:3). Student activists call for a pro-active approach to the hate-filled defacements even if the law does not provide for retributive mechanisms. Inaction by University of Toronto administration sends a message of tolerance for harassment against lesbians and gay men on university campuses despite attempts to symbolically support lesbian and gay positive space.

4.3(f) The Church Wellesley Police Advisory Committee (CWPAC)

The CWPAC was formed after 1991 with the aim of facilitating community based policing in the downtown core. Since 1982, the Metro Toronto Police Force Mission of Neighbourhood Policing has been guided by an urban policing philosophy the goal of which is a police community partnership in dealing with crime and related problems (Murphy, 1984, 1993; Normandeau, Leighton, 1993:29-30). Community policing contrasts with the professional approach to crime which views crime as the exclusionary property of police. In partnership with the lesbian and gay community via the 519 Centre and the CWPAC, the police have a more general role than simply crime control. One aspect of community policing is the role that police personnel perform as managers who engage in interactive policing (Ministry of the Solicitor General, 1992, 1993a, 1993b). This involves routinely exchanging information on a reciprocal basis with the lesbian and gay community through formal contacts such as the CWPAC and the 519 Centre, and informal networks such as those persons police interact with on a day-to-day basis while working as foot patrol (Normandeau, Leighton, 1993:32).

To meet the mandate of community policing a Resident/Worker Committee was formed from within the CWPAC to represent the interests of people who live and work in the Church and Wellesley neighbourhood. A sergeant and a constable are represented on the CWPAC. Sergeants may be ad hoc members of the CWPAC who have voting privileges but no committee rights. The VAP coordinator is a community member of the Advisory Committee. Elected members must be residents and/or employees within the neighbourhood. The CWPAC follows a model of community policing which includes the community and its businesses which are answerable to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Board. In its attempt to work within
the Church and Wellesley Neighbourhood the CWNPAC has organized forums at the 519 Centre on police and community issues.

Foot patrol from 52 Division are represented on the CWNPAC. The 52 Division foot patrol is divided into six core areas and the needs of each area are assessed according to the Toronto Police Force Mission of Community Policing outlined in the Beyond 2000 (1994) report (Metropolitan Toronto Police Service, 1994). The foot patrol as a whole consists of six sergeants and sixty-eight constables, plus two staff sergeants who supervise the whole of 52 Division. On any given day the foot patrol runs on five shifts, two to a shift, and at any given time during the day there are three shifts operating in the Church Wellesley area: an evening, day and cover shift. A community patrol car and foot patrol are assigned different areas along Church Street. The foot patrol oversees buildings and businesses in the community and regulates safety, garbage disposal and lighting. A safety audit is regularly done to assess these conditions. While Police work with neighbourhood committees has increased communication and provided visible police presence in the Church Wellesley area there are criticisms.

One disjuncture in the theory of community policing is found in the notion of a community as a homogenous group. Anne Marie Singh claims that creating a community along geographical lines limits participation of institutions and groups that are not statistically significant (Brown, 1994c:13). Left out are prostitutes who cannot sit on the CWNPAC because they are not involved in a legitimate business, transvestites, homeless youth, the mentally ill, and the institutions that service them. Due to citizen complaints from Maitland Street area residents, police took strong enforcement procedures to push prostitutes out of the area despite the CWNPAC's commitment that recourse to the justice system should be the last resort.

Murphy (1993) echoes these concerns citing the difficulty in claiming community by geographical boundaries and arguing instead for the concept of "neighbourhood." He notes there are contradictions in decentralizing a centralized police force while maintaining the original organizational structure, management philosophy, and operational boundaries. A standard police force model defines policing problems by individual calls for service which are not necessarily resolved by arrest, while a community based model promotes a less incident driven or reactive style of policing. Based on a consensus model community policing involves working with resident concerns to establish priorities. While police are more likely to be aware of the communities needs, representation of out lesbians and gay men on the police force is still not a
priority. Public order issues require creative strategies to deal with prostitution, drugs, and unsafe conditions; however, in dealing with these issues police may alienate and greatly limit the safety of transvestites, prostitutes, and homeless youth they push out of the Maitland Street area.

While the foot patrol is the preferred style of neighbourhood policing in Toronto, lesbians and gays living in the Church Wellesley area may develop a false sense of security that does not apply in other areas of the city. The assumption that anti-gay/lesbian violence requires foot patrol in the downtown core may lead to a perception that anti-gay/lesbian violence only occurs in that area, which is untrue. Despite these flaws the CWN PAC has used innovative approaches to dealing with issues such as under-age drinking, youth gangs, garbage, and unsafe conditions in the Cawthra Square park. Police are now more likely to give warnings to bars in the Church and Wellesley area before proceeding with criminal charges.

4.3(g) Metropolitan Toronto Hate Crime Unit/Intelligence Services

Since 1993, the Hate Crime Unit (HCU) Intelligence Services has published statistics on hate crimes based upon reported offences to the Toronto Police Service (Metropolitan Toronto Police Services, 1997:1). The HCU is based on the New Jersey Hate Crime Unit Model. The HCU focuses its efforts on education, prevention and criminal investigations of hate motivated crimes in Toronto, hate bias training for crown attorneys, investigative support role and intelligence gathering, hate-bias training for front line officers and detectives, Hate Crime Unit investigations, police recruit training, Toronto Police Service civilian training, hate crime occurrences and case track follow-up, hate motivated crime lectures for schools and youth, hate motivated crime training for communities, and victim support in court (Metropolitan Toronto Police Services, 1997). The HCU has worked closely with the lesbian and gay community to demonstrate their commitment "and dedication to the investigation of hate motivated offences and the prosecution of those who commit hate motivated crimes in Toronto" (Metropolitan Toronto Police Services, 1997:2).

The 519 VAP coordinator acts as a "watchdog" over the HCU annual statistical reports in an attempt to have anti-gay/lesbian violence recognized as a "hate crime." In October 1997 the Metropolitan Toronto Police Subcommittee on Race Relations recommended to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Board that the definition of hate crime be broadened.
As a representative of the CRBC, the VAP coordinator continues to lobby for change in the hate crime definition through her work with the Community Advisory Committee on Anti-Racism and Anti-Hate (Kennedy, 1998:22). In 1998 the VAP coordinator’s representation on this committee influenced the Police Services Board to refuse to accept the latest statistics from the HCU due to missing data. The 519 VAP coordinator reports that crimes based on sexual orientation given to the HCU were not included in the HCU report for 1997. The HCU annual report will be reviewed by the Community Advisory Committee on Anti-Racism and Anti-Hate and then will report back to the Police Services Board. This action on the part of the Toronto Police Services Board reveals the influence the 519 VAP coordinator is gaining in the Toronto community.

4.3(h) Police Services Board Review of Racism

In 1996, before the City of Toronto amalgamation, the CRBC coordinator representing the 519 VAP became involved in the Police Services Board review of racism. She gave a deputation at the Police Services Board hearing on how anti-gay/lesbian violence is affected by racism. The Community/Race Relations Deputations to the Police Services Board took place on Thursday December 12, 1996. Although community groups were given an opportunity to make deputations to the Police Services Board, the experience of attending the deputation and observing the behaviour of police and detectives in the room revealed to me that there continues to be suspicion and animosity between lesbian and gay activists and police. The physical setting in which the deputations were made at the John Street Police Headquarters was not conducive to the facilitation of dialogue and open discussion. Indeed, police guarded the door to the room, spoke when grassroots representatives made their deputations, and acted in an unfriendly way to lesbian and gay outsiders by pointing, staring, and laughing, during the deputations. Notably absent were detectives from the HCU. The existing tensions between the Police Services Board and community activists points to the failure of diversity training. There needs to be less defensiveness among police and more willingness to dialogue and work within the community.

4.3(i) The Safe City Committee

One of the 519 VAP volunteers represents the Safe City Committee which is affiliated with Metro City Hall and is involved with the Violence Against Women Project, Wen-do
Programmes and the distribution of grants for programmes such as the "Breaking the Cycle of Violence" programme. Suggestions made to the Safe City Committee include: stop lights that have a sound beep, more ads at Transit Shelters, implementation of a 392-Safe Line, and focus groups with other Greater Metro Safe City Organizations to discuss the impact of possible amalgamation. Our CRBC member convinced the Safe City Committee to financially subsidize the Wen-Do Self-Defence Programme for lesbians and gays at the 519 Centre. Recently, Bell Telephone removed pay phones from the Church Wellesley area, which would prevent those who are gay bashed from reporting a crime to police or the 519 (Ross, 1994:14). Issues such as these are of concern to the Safe City Committee.

4.3(j) Promoting Self Defense

Self Defense classes based on the Wen-Do philosophy are offered at the 519 Centre twice a year in the Fall and in the Spring. Classes for lesbians and gay men are separate. The cost of the classes is subsidized by the 519 Centre at a cost to participants of $15.00 per class. The University of Toronto partially subsidizes the self-defense classes at the 519 Centre for students who do not wish to take the course on the Toronto University Campus.

Since the research and reporting to the BRL show that lesbian women are most likely to be attacked by people they know, and that gay men are most likely to be attacked by strangers, the CRBC tried to target these groups in the self defense advertising.

It was found that lesbian and bisexual women were more likely to enroll for the self defense courses than were gay men. The Committee attempted to do outreach to gay men through advertising in public locations and newspapers, and as a result enrollment increased.

The Committee helped to publish "Be Safe," dating posters, for which there was a press release on the issue of pick-up dating violence. There had been seven reports to the 519 Centre in 1997 of older men being bashed in their own homes by younger men they picked up in bars. The poster outlined general safety rules for picking up people in bars. The poster was put up in some local bars and published in Xtra Magazine. A package containing a letter, cards, and poster was sent to bars in the downtown area.

In 1997 the VAP coordinator received "Breaking the Cycle of Violence" grant money from the Safe City Committee for training bar employees and owners in the downtown area about anti-gay/lesbian violence. The CRBC's Education Sub-Committee worked on putting an
educational package together for such training. The Committee found that the New York AVP published profiles of attackers, sometimes putting their picture in the local newspaper. The NYAVP also printed licence plate numbers of vehicles which had been documented at bashings; however, the Committee could not decide whether to pursue this tactic.

4.3(k) B'nai Brith

B'nai Brith is presently working on an Education Project in Schools to combat hate activity (Mock, 1995). The 519 VAP shared statistical data with them which were published in the 1995 B'nai Brith report (Mock, 1995).

4.3(l) Transgender Action Committee

Our member on the Transgendered Action Committee (T-TAC), is working with T-TAC on violence issues. The group is looking at media advertising, workfare for transgendered people, and lobbying Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG).

4.3(m) Increased Public Visibility

Each year the CRBC had some kind of presence at Pride Day celebrations in Toronto such as distributing a survey to obtain information about anti-gay/lesbian violence, setting up an information table, and advertising the CRBC in Pride literature.

Fundraising events were organized to coincide with public events such as bar nights where the CRBC would set up tables and the cover charge was donated to the 519 Centre, and two beer bottle drives in which the beer store matched our collection of used beer bottles. The VAP and Wen Do Inc. successfully collaborated on hosting a women's dance at the 519 Centre with proceeds to the 519 Centre. This raised the visibility of the CRBC in the community.

4.3(n) Writing A Report

A caucus of two including myself and another volunteer sociologist was formed to work on constructing a questionnaire on anti-gay/lesbian violence to be distributed at Lesbian and Gay Pride day in Toronto. The aim of the questionnaire was to obtain statistics on the incidences and victim impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence on participants attending Lesbian and Gay Pride. For the purpose of comparability, a questionnaire which had been used in American surveys on anti-
gay/lesbian violence was used as the model (Herek, 1992). With the help of the CRBC the questionnaire was altered to make it specific to a Canadian audience. The survey distribution was advertised in Xtra Magazine.

The coordinator of the VAP wrote a proposal for funding to the Department of Justice in Ottawa. Funding was obtained to complete the data analysis and the writing of a report on the findings. The CRBC coordinator acted as an co-editor. I researched the literature in Canada and the United States and wrote a report which was published in June, 1997 (Faulkner. 1997).

The process of doing research, data analysis, and discussing the politics of publication brought the CRBC closer together in an activity which was mutually beneficial. The Committee members read the report and provided feedback to the author. The collection of statistics and experiential stories from Pride Day respondents allowed the Committee to learn more about a wide range of anti-gay/lesbian violence experiences.

In June 1997 the report was published by the Department of Justice. The CRBC participated in planning for a Press Conference at Toronto City Hall. Press Releases were sent to media in Toronto and the Victim Assistant gave interviews on the report. A panel presentation of the findings took place at the 519 Centre. The publication was the culmination of two years of work which brought the CRBC closer together and educated us about the connections between social science research, fundraising, and policy development.

4.3(o) Advertising Campaigns

The CRBC felt that advertising should be done to promote the 519 Bashing Reporting Line. The Committee decided that it was important to focus on producing Bashing Stickers, wallet sized Bashing Reporting Cards which include Reporting line and police phone numbers, and a pamphlet on how to prevent being bashed, self defense strategies, and what to do if bashed.

The Bashing Reporting Cards and pamphlets were distributed in lesbian and gay bars in the downtown area. This involved setting up a table and being available for people who wanted information about the VAP and BRL. This act of reaching out to the community resulted in increased reporting rates to the BRL.

The Committee organized a Public Speak Out event to celebrate the launch of the 519 Bashing Reporting Cards. The event coincided with the first anniversary of the bashing of a gay male couple on Church Street outside the Second Cup, a coffee shop frequented by lesbians and
gay men. The two men who had been bashed spoke at the commemorative rally and police from the Church/Wellesley Foot Patrol were present.

It was not until 1997 that the Committee had its own BRL phone number placed in the Toronto telephone book, an oversight which possibly prevented many victims from finding the organization in the past. The 519 is widely recognized as the lesbian and gay resource in Toronto by those living in the province. While the 519 Centre is known to many in the downtown core, those who do not live downtown may be unaware of its services. The Committee hoped to rectify this oversight by having the BRL number in the Toronto telephone book. By 1998 bashing reports from other areas of the city became more frequent (Suhanic, 1998:14).

The CRBC felt that it needed to influence media to pay more attention to the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence with the aim of educating the non-gay public. As a result the coordinator and volunteers were involved in many interviews for both newspapers and television. Articles appeared in lesbian and gay publications such as Xtra Magazine, Siren, and Q/C Magazine, on some of the survey's preliminary findings. The coordinator was also interviewed by the Canadian Press, Ryerson University student radio and City TV about the report which I wrote for the Department of Justice and the 519 Centre (Philp, 1997). The CRBC was involved in organizing and presenting the findings of the report at a report launch at the 519 Centre in June, 1997, which was documented in the local lesbian and gay newspaper (Hasselriis, 1997). The Committee also lobbied the TTC Subway administration, the City of Toronto, and the CRTC, to take down posters promoting hateful imagery in the transit system, and to censor hate on Toronto radio shows.

4.3(p) Education

An Education Sub-Committee was organized to develop curriculum for education on anti-gay/lesbian violence with the aim of educating the community about proactive activism. A workshop manual had previously been developed for the Toronto Board of Education on homophobia for teacher curriculum (Toronto Board of Education, 1992; Lenskyj, 1990, 1994). The CRBC felt that there was a need to develop curriculum specifically geared to dealing with issues surrounding anti-gay/lesbian violence. We used American Warren Blumenfeld's (1992) book Homophobia: How We All Pay the Price as a guide for our education workshop package. The Education Sub-Committee worked to prepare an Educational Workshop on Anti-
Gay/Lesbian Violence, mainly focusing on high school students (Blumenfeld, 1992:275-302). A video was prepared on hate crimes against lesbians and gays using portions of other film footage covering hate crime incidents, demonstrations, and interviews in Toronto. The CRBC workshop agenda involves a "Names Exercise" where students brainstorm all of the derogatory names they can think of about lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgendered persons. This sets the stage for a "Dispelling Myths and Stereotypes" exercise. An exercise in the analysis and context of verbal abuse is given using the "Names Exercise." Information about the context of physical violence outlining personal experiences as well as information on statistics, laws, hate crimes, police, and what one can do if attacked are included. A "Homo Work" exercise discusses the ways in which participants and others can counter heterosexism and violence. A "Role Play" exercise involves participants in visualizing what it is like to be in social situations as a gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered person. A question and answer session and evaluation feedback from participants ends the workshop.

4.3(q) Outreach to Local Bars and Schools

Aside from distributing the BRL cards, the Education Sub-Committee decided to offer to give workshops to lesbian and gay bars in the Church/Wellesley area as well to schools on preventive measures.

4.3(r) Workshops

The Coordinator and a Ryerson University social work placement student gave workshops on anti-hate training at an "Anti-Hate Initiative Conference" at City Hall on March 25, and April 1, 1997. The workshop provided initial training on how to respond and mobilize the community. In this capacity the Committee members act as resources to the rest of the community. It was suggested at this conference that a centralized reporting location be implemented to record hate on a Metro-wide level; however, this has not been implemented to date.

4.3(s) Corporate Sponsorship

Employees of the Body Shop, a body care and cosmetics store at the corner of Church and Wellesley Streets, joined our group under the auspices of their "Violence Against Women
Campaign," which started in 1993. The Body Shop offered to donate a percentage of purchases to the CRBC. As part of the project, the Body Shop used the CRBC poster material, pamphlets, and cards, and the Education Sub-Committee presented a workshop to store employees.

4.4 Conclusions

All of the above strategies have helped to develop an updated model of community response to bashing. The Committee now wishes to move into a new realm of community response to bashing by providing a more hands-on interaction with victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The previous model of victim assistance at the 519 Centre is being re-vamped so that volunteers of the CRBC can more quickly respond to victims when they make contact with the 519 Centre. A social work placement student from Toronto's Ryerson University is working with the CRBC coordinator to implement a response to bashing at the 519 Centre which is quicker and more interactive. For example, victims need more immediate support to connect them with appropriate services such as police, medical care, and community organizations. One prolonged barrier to the implementation of such a response team effort has been lack of a communication system by which to allow callers to leave messages. It was not until 1997 that the 519 Centre's phone line could communicate in any other way than a central switchboard which was only operative during the day and evenings until ten o'clock. The fact that many attacks take place during the evening meant that callers could not speak to a person if they telephoned in the evening. Despite this failure of communication systems the fact that the coordinator was the only person available to do intake interviews meant that victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence were put on waiting lists, with the result that they often did not get immediate attention. Callers may now leave a message and get information from an answering machine after hours, although a human response may not be obtained until the next working day. The coordinator has worked in collaboration with the CRBC, the Executive Director, and the social work student to implement a more efficient response to victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The Committee's main focus since 1995 has been to branch out into the community to make itself known. It has taken a few years to prove that the VAP works and to get connected to organizations such as B'nai Brith, the City of Toronto, Metro, and all the different places that want the group's involvement. Volunteers have been essential to the branching out process because staff time would not allow for the VAP coordinator to attend every community meeting
that is necessary. The fact that each volunteer is placed on a committee outside of the 519 and is able to attend meetings and report back allows for lobbying with other Toronto community groups.

The VAP has worked hard over the years to improve the working relationship with agencies in Toronto. The VAP Coordinator has regular meetings with the Hate Crimes Unit, 52 Division, the Foot Patrol and in the past, with the Police Domestic Violence Coordinator. A part of the VAP coordinator's job is to document patterns of reporting and patterns in anti-lesbian and gay violence so that police can include it in their training manuals.

The CRBC attempts to show leadership in hate crime issues in the community. The CRBC has some very highly skilled members who have worked to educate others about hate crime issues and this process of educating and organizing has strengthened bonds within the CRBC and the community. CRBC members continue to look for ways to integrate with community organizations in Toronto with the aim of educating them about the CRBC's work and the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION OF SURVEY FINDINGS: FEAR OF ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE

5.1 Introduction: Fear of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence in the Toronto Study

In the criminal violence literature, women's enhanced vulnerability suggests a sense of fear about physical harm outside the home, in urban areas, while alone (Johnson, 1996:1). All people may exercise prudence in public situations due to potential crime. Homophobia adds an additional dimension to such fears. A high percentage of respondents to the Toronto Pride Day survey show concerns for safety in everyday situations, with family and friends, at work, on public transit, in school, on the street, and in their own neighbourhoods. Fear of homophobia affects respondents' choices of dress, public behaviour, displays of affection, touching friends and lovers, language, travel, and level of openness. Respondents' concerns about safety thus limit their possibilities and prevent them from taking full advantage of the opportunities available in their communities.

The Toronto survey data are clear: for participants the threat of anti-gay/lesbian violence induces fear. This fear acts as a mechanism of social control. This fear has several modes: 1) public dangers outside of the home, 2) obstacles to employment, housing, custody, education, 3) general daily safety, and 4) potential disclosure of sexual orientation and resulting consequences. The Toronto survey data also suggest that women's fear of violence is greater than men's. This finding supports those of other crime surveys which report that women's fear of crime affects their choices in many ways (The Violence Against Women Survey, Statistics Canada, 1993; Johnson, 1996:61-89; Madriz, 1997; Stanko, 1990, 1993; Comstock 1991; Berrill, 1992; von Schulthess, 1992).

Women and minorities live with what criminologists call a "paradox of fear" (Madriz, 1997:11). This paradox of fear is considered to be irrational because it is "out of proportion to the objective probability of being victimized" (Madriz, 1997:11). While official statistics tell women that the likelihood of experiencing victimization is much lower than the likelihood of experiencing property crime, the subjective fear of being a victim of crime is not irrational for women who feel the daily impact of that fear.

While women as a gender constantly consider the effect of their presence upon men in the public domain with the aim of assessing their safety, gays and lesbians reveal differences in
terms of their gender identity and response to the potential for violence. Frye (1983) suggests that lesbians have the power to disrupt phallocratic reality thus their existence must be relegated to the background so that they are not seen (Frye, 1983). Violence against sexual minorities is the result of not participating in what Frye calls the "reality of the play" (Frye, 1983:168). Men have traditionally held the power to view, document, assign characteristics, and categorize groups of people. The aim is to contain those groups within frameworks that define their "other" existence for them in order to maintain the dominant position of men in the foreground.

As women have been categorized into the dichotomies of madonna/whore, and racialized as black/white, the abstraction of gays and lesbians as "other," and the reflection of that identification back onto them as a group, instills in them an awareness that they are framed within a context outside of the normative heterosexual class. Thus, as stigmatized beings, lesbians and gay men internalize their differences. This internalization requires that they see both the image of how the authority sees them in the foreground, plus their own image of themselves within their culture (the background). The dramaturgy of acting "straight" in the culture becomes a masquerade lesson in disguise and manipulation. The ability to act when required is a survival mechanism when not acting might lead to physical assault or verbal harassment. It is not surprising then that sexual minorities and their friends will have thought seriously about the effect of stereotypical images projected onto themselves by potential perpetrators in managing their "spoiled identity" (Goffman, 1963).

This chapter will explore Toronto respondents' fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the effect of that fear through the modification of their behaviour. In order to provide a context for the Toronto study I will contrast the findings with other Canadian (New Brunswick, 1990; Samis, 1995; Smith, 1993) and American research (Comstock, 1991; NGLTF, 1986; Berrill, 1992; NCAVP, 1996).

The first section will focus upon the effect of fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence on respondents by demographic categories. Comparison of fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence documented in other North American research will be provided. I will examine the relationship between respondents' fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence and their experience of violence in the past. Next, I will evaluate respondents' awareness of attacks against others and its effect on their behaviour by demographic characteristics. I will then analyse the qualitative data providing a wide range of examples of how respondents modify their behaviour in response to fear.
5.2 The Impact of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Assault and Harassment on Toronto Respondents

Toronto respondents were asked how the possibility of anti-gay/lesbian harassment or violence affects how they act or behave, how many people they knew who had been victims of bashing and what coping mechanisms respondents employ to protect themselves. The questions are both closed-ended and open-ended. The results point to the larger implications for the perceived threat of violence on individual behaviour and the community at large.

Toronto respondents were asked whether they had been somewhat, greatly, or not at all affected by their awareness of the potential for anti-gay/lesbian violence. Seventy-six percent of the 1995-1996 respondents, three out of four people, stated that the possibility of anti-gay/lesbian harassment or violence had either somewhat or greatly affected how they act or behave. In 1996 there was an 11 percent decline from 1995 of those who were greatly and somewhat affected. Fifty-four percent of respondents were somewhat affected, 24 percent were not at all affected, and 21 percent of respondents were greatly affected.

When cross-tabulating this question of whether respondents had been somewhat or greatly affected with sample variables the modal response is consistently "somewhat." Responses consistently show that the majority are somewhat affected by the potential for anti-gay/lesbian violence. Over half the sample state they are somewhat concerned that they will be bashed in the future with secondary nodes at the extreme (not at all concerned and greatly concerned). To summarize, one-fifth to one-fourth of the sample say they experience no effect, a little more than half say they are somewhat affected, and one-fifth of the sample say they are greatly affected.

5.3 The Effect of Fear of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

Cross-tabulation of the effect of anti-gay/lesbian violence with sexual orientation reveals that fewer lesbians say they were not at all affected by fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Out of the 439 potential respondents 353 (80.4 percent) who gave their sexual orientation responded to the question of whether the potential for bashing had affected their actions or behaviour. A total of 54.5 percent were somewhat affected, 24.6 percent were not at all affected, and 21 percent were greatly affected. Lesbians are more likely to say that they were "somewhat" affected (60.8 percent) while gay men were more likely to say they are not affected at all (25.6 percent). While gay men are more likely to say that they experience more physical assault, the responses to this question suggest that women may be more psychologically affected by fear of anti-gay/lesbian
violence or at least willing to acknowledge it. Heterosexuals (61.8 percent) are least affected by fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence but the response to this question is so low that it is difficult to assess what it might have been had there been equally weighted responses.

The hypothesis to be tested in future research is that gay men are targeted more for anti-gay/lesbian violence but that women are more affected. Gays and lesbians and others are worried about anti-gay/lesbian violence. The subtext of this is that this fear is more significant for lesbians than gays.

5.3(a) Gender

Women (78.4 percent) were slightly more likely than men (73.4 percent) to say that the fear of potential violence had affected their behaviour somewhat or greatly. Women (55.7 percent) were more likely to be somewhat affected than men (53.2 percent). And women (22.7 percent) were more likely to be greatly affected than men (20.2 percent). More men (26.6 percent) than women (21.6 percent) were not at all affected (see Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th>FEMALE (%)</th>
<th>MALE (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>21.6 (40)</td>
<td>26.6 (50)</td>
<td>24.1 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>55.7 (103)</td>
<td>53.2 (100)</td>
<td>54.4 (203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>22.7 (42)</td>
<td>20.2 (38)</td>
<td>21.4 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (185)</td>
<td>100.0 (188)</td>
<td>100.0 (373)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Cases = 66
5.3(b) Sexual Orientation

Lesbian women (90.0 percent) were far more likely to say that they had been somewhat or greatly affected than bisexual (74.3 percent), gay (72.5 percent) and heterosexual (38.2 percent) respondents. When asked whether they had not been affected, lesbians (ten percent) were less likely to answer in the affirmative than gay men (27.5 percent), bisexuals, (25.6 percent), and heterosexuals (61.8 percent). Lesbians were more likely to be somewhat affected. Sixty percent of lesbians were somewhat affected compared to gays (54.4 percent), bisexuals (56.4 percent) and heterosexuals (29.4 percent). Lesbians were also more likely to be greatly affected (29.2 percent) compared to gays (18.1 percent), bisexuals, (17.9 percent), and heterosexuals (8.8 percent). It is clear that lesbian women show higher percentages of fear than gay men (see Table 6).

**TABLE 6**

**EFFECT OF POSSIBLE ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE ON BEHAVIOUR BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>LESBIAN (%)</th>
<th>GAY (%)</th>
<th>BISEXUAL (%)</th>
<th>HETEROSEXUAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>10.0 (12)</td>
<td>27.5 (44)</td>
<td>25.6 (10)</td>
<td>61.8 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>60.8 (73)</td>
<td>54.4 (87)</td>
<td>56.4 (22)</td>
<td>29.4 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>29.2 (35)</td>
<td>18.1 (29)</td>
<td>17.9 (7)</td>
<td>8.8 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (120)</td>
<td>100.0 (160)</td>
<td>100.0 (39)</td>
<td>100.0 (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 86
5.3(c) Race/Ethnicity

By race/ethnicity of respondents, the responses were fairly comparable. Caucasian respondents (77.7 percent) were slightly more likely to be somewhat or greatly affected by knowledge of potential violence compared to ethnic minority respondents (69.4 percent). Caucasians (55.7 percent) were more likely to be somewhat affected compared to ethnic minorities (50 percent). And Caucasians (22 percent) were more likely to be greatly affected than ethnic minorities (19.4 percent). Ethnic minority respondents were more likely to not be affected at all (30.6 percent) compared to Caucasian respondents (22.3 percent) (see Table 7). There was no opportunity for ethnic minorities to discuss how their behaviour is affected by the combined effects of racism, ethnicity, and homophobia. Future research needs to focus more specifically on the combined effects of heterosexism, homophobia and racism.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>CAUCASIAN (%)</th>
<th>ETHNIC MINORITY (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>22.3 (63)</td>
<td>30.6 (22)</td>
<td>24.0 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>55.7 (157)</td>
<td>50.0 (36)</td>
<td>54.5 (193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>22.0 (62)</td>
<td>19.4 (14)</td>
<td>21.5 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (282)</td>
<td>100.0 (72)</td>
<td>100.0 (354)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 85
5.3(d) Transgender

Sixty-eight percent of transgendered respondents were somewhat or greatly affected by knowledge of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence. While 31.3 percent were not at all affected, 43.8 percent were somewhat affected and 25 percent were greatly affected by their awareness of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence. Forty-four percent provided information on how fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence affects their behaviour.

5.4 Fear of Victimization in Canadian Research on Heterosexuals

Statistics on fear of victimization in Canada are found in the General Social Survey (GSS), 1988 and 1993 as well as the Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS), Statistics Canada, 1993. The statistics obtained from the general population contrast with those obtained from the survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The GSS and VAWS show that women more than men are very or somewhat worried about victimization. The VAWS asked women if they were worried for their safety in particular situations. Over half of the respondents are somewhat worried when walking alone to a parking garage (56 percent), waiting for/using public transit after dark (54 percent), walking alone in their area after dark (52 percent), and when walking alone in the evening (34 percent). One quarter of the women are very worried when walking alone to a car in a parking garage (27 percent) or waiting for or using public transit after dark (22 percent). One tenth of the women were very worried walking alone in their area after dark (eight percent) and when home alone in the evening (six percent) (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1996: 168). Consistent with the trend in the Toronto survey, women who had experienced at least one incident of violence since the age of sixteen years were more likely to worry than women who had never been assaulted. For example, 65 percent of women who had ever experienced violence by a man were very or somewhat worried when walking alone in their areas after dark, compared to 55 percent of women who had experienced no violence (CCJS, 1996: 169). The VAWS also found that women in large urban areas were more likely to be concerned about their personal safety than women living in small urban areas or rural areas. For example, 65 percent of women residing in large urban centres were very or somewhat worried when walking alone in their areas after dark, compared to 49 percent of women living in small urban/rural areas (CCJS, 1996: 169).
According to the 1993 General Social Survey (GSS), 42 percent of women and ten percent of men feel "very" or "somewhat" unsafe while walking alone in their neighbourhoods after dark (CCJS, 1996:177). Women are much more likely than men to routinely take steps to protect themselves from victimization. They are more than twice as likely as men to routinely carry something to defend themselves or alert others, and are eight times more likely to routinely stay at home at night to avoid victimization (CCJS, 1996:182). The 1993 GSS shows that as a protective measure to increase safety from crime, 68 percent of women lock their car doors for safety compared to 40 percent of men; 58 percent check the back seat of their car for intruders compared to 33 percent of men; 58 percent of women plan a route with safety in mind compared to 33 percent of men; 24 percent of women stay home at night compared to three percent of men; and, 17 percent of women carry something to defend themselves or alert others compared to 7 percent of men (Canadian Center for Justice Statistics, 1996:182). The GSS found that overall, protective behaviours are less practiced among rural than urban residents, yet women living in both areas are consistently more likely than their male counterparts to routinely take precautions.

Berrill (1992) compared findings from the National Lesbian and Gay Task Force (1984) and other American studies and found that women generally experience higher rates of verbal harassment from family members and greater fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Lesbians tend to experience victimization in non-gay identified public areas and in the home (Berrill, 1992:28). Berrill notes that lesbians are more likely than gay men to have modified their behaviour out of fear for their personal safety. Unfortunately, "such self-imposed limits and the fear that motivates them are themselves a serious form of victimization" (Berrill, 1992:28).

It is clear that women's fear is greater than men's in the general population and in the population represented in this survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

5.5 Fear of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence in other North American Studies

Stephen Samis (1995) and Kevin Berrill (1989, 1992) provide research findings on fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence from North American surveys. In assessing the degree of fear experienced by North American respondents researchers asked questions about how anti-gay/lesbian violence affects participants' actions or behaviour. However the question about fear has been worded differently across questionnaires which makes comparison of findings difficult (Berrill, 1992; Smith, 1993; Samis, 1995).
Male and female Vancouver respondents seem to equally fear victimization in the future. However, when asked about their fear of discrimination in various social situations women are slightly more likely than men to admit they fear future discrimination. Statistics from the Vancouver study of anti-gay/lesbian violence reveal that at least half believe they will be victimized in the future. Half of the women and half of the men think that it is very or somewhat likely they could be bashed in the future due to their sexual orientation (Samis, 1995:85). More women than men stated that they believed that it was either very or somewhat likely they would be discriminated against in the future due to their sexual orientation (80 percent of the women and 75 percent of the men) (Samis, 1995:76-77).

American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence shows that lesbian women experience more fear of victimization and future discrimination. Across American studies women reported greater fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Berrill, 1992:28). And in two surveys that measured discrimination, lesbians also were found to have encountered significantly more discrimination than gay men (Berrill, 1992:28). The NGLTF (1986) report that lesbian women are more likely to modify their behaviour, fear for their safety, and anticipate future victimization. Fifty-seven percent of the women modified their behaviour to reduce the risk of attack compared to 39 percent of the men. Seventy percent of the women feared for their safety compared to 58 percent of the men. And, 88 percent of the women anticipated future victimization compared to 81 percent of the men (NGLTF, 1986:23).

Beatrice von Schulthess (1992) interviewed 75 lesbians living in San Francisco about their experience of anti-lesbian violence and found three recurring themes emerging from the interviews. First, lesbians experience a continuous stream of harassment on the streets because of their gender. Secondly, she found that attacks often began as anti-woman and then an added anti-lesbian dimension was added on by the perpetrator if the woman did not reply with appropriate gender specific responses. Thirdly, she found that respondents developed habits of continually monitoring and analyzing their immediate social situations through "safety mapping." Safety mapping includes the monitoring of clothing that is worn, the route that is taken in the city, interpersonal behaviour, the time, day and location in the city. All of these precautions were taken by women to avoid potentially threatening situations.
Aside from her conclusion that anti-lesbian violence is widespread in San Francisco, von Shulthess concludes that anti-lesbian violence is closely connected to violence against women in general. Finally, she concludes that lesbians alter their way of being because of the potential violence that surrounds them, violence that exists on a continuum of anti-woman at one end and anti-lesbian at the other (von Schulthess, 1992:73). For these reasons von Schulthess frames anti-lesbian violence not only in terms of sexual orientation but in terms of gender and misogynistic violence (von Schulthess, 1992:71).

It is clear that the percentage of respondents in the Toronto sample who are affected by the possibility of anti-gay/lesbian violence (76 percent) compares with the percentages found in other North American studies. Samis (1995) found that 77 percent of respondents believed that it was either very or somewhat likely that they would be discriminated against in the future due to their sexual orientation. Eighty percent of these people were women and 75 percent were men. Berrill (1992) reports that the median proportion from American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence reporting that they feared for their safety was 66 percent. A median proportion of 80 percent expected to be targetted for anti-gay/lesbian violence and harassment in the future (Berrill, 1992:24). Across American studies women reported greater fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Berrill, 1992:28). One study which focused specifically on the experience of lesbians found that lesbians take precautions to protect themselves from anti-woman and anti-lesbian remarks, and their safety concerns are compounded by class and race/ethnicity differences (von Schulthess, 1992).

5.6 Effect of Potential Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Income

Those in the lowest income range reported the greatest impact in terms of their awareness of anti-gay/lesbian violence and their fear of future attacks and harassment. Eighty-four percent of those in the $1-$19,999 income category were somewhat or greatly affected by knowledge of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence compared to 72.7 percent of those in the $20,000-$39,999 income range and 72.8 percent of those in the $40,000-$80,000 income range. Thirty-two percent of those in the $1-$19,999 category were greatly affected, compared with those in the mid (21.2 percent) and upper (12.3 percent) income ranges. More mid- to upper-income respondents were not affected at all: and those in the upper income level were only somewhat affected (60.5
percent) compared with those in the lower (51.6 percent) and mid-income range (51.5 percent) (see Table 8).

### TABLE 8

**EFFECT OF POSSIBLE ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE ON BEHAVIOUR BY INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>$1-$19,999 (%)</th>
<th>$20,000-$39,999 (%)</th>
<th>$40,000-$80,000 (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>16.1 (15)</td>
<td>27.3 (27)</td>
<td>27.2 (22)</td>
<td>23.4 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>51.6 (48)</td>
<td>51.5 (51)</td>
<td>60.5 (49)</td>
<td>54.2 (148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>32.3 (30)</td>
<td>21.2 (21)</td>
<td>12.3 (10)</td>
<td>22.3 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (93)</td>
<td>100.0 (99)</td>
<td>100.0 (81)</td>
<td>100.0 (273)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 166

5.7 Effect of Potential Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Age

Those in the 15 to 29 age range were most affected by potential anti-gay/lesbian violence. Seventy-nine percent of those in the 15 to 29 age range reported that they are somewhat (57.2 percent) or greatly (22.1 percent) affected compared to 74.1 percent in the 30-44 age range and 71.7 percent in the 45-67 age range. Those 45 to 67 years of age were more likely to say they were not at all affected (28.2 percent) compared to those in the 30-44 age range (25.8 percent) and those in the 15-29 age range (20.7 percent). Respondents between the age of 15 to 29 were most affected by the potential for anti-gay/lesbian violence. Across the age groups the majority stated they were somewhat affected (see Table 9).
TABLE 9

EFFECT OF POSSIBLE ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE ON BEHAVIOUR BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>15-29 YRS (%)</th>
<th>30-44 YRS (%)</th>
<th>45-67 YRS (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>20.7 (30)</td>
<td>25.8 (47)</td>
<td>28.2 (11)</td>
<td>24.0 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>57.2 (83)</td>
<td>52.7 (96)</td>
<td>53.8 (21)</td>
<td>54.6 (200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>22.1 (32)</td>
<td>21.4 (39)</td>
<td>17.9 (7)</td>
<td>21.3 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (145)</td>
<td>100.0 (182)</td>
<td>100.0 (39)</td>
<td>100.0 (366)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 73

It seems from the above two examples that those who are most vulnerable -- youth and low income persons -- are more likely to be affected by the potential threat of anti-gay/lesbian violence compared to those over 30 with incomes over $20,000.

5.8 Effect of Potential Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Residence

While it was expected that those living in an urban area would be more fearful of the potential of anti-gay/lesbian violence, it was found that a slightly higher percentage (77.5 percent) of respondents living outside of the Greater Toronto area were either somewhat or greatly affected by the potential for anti-gay/lesbian violence than those who live in the Toronto and Greater Toronto area (74.8 percent). Those from Toronto were also slightly more likely to say they were not affected at all (25.2 percent) compared to those living outside of Toronto (22.5 percent). It is possible that areas without support networks may induce more fear (see Table 10).
TABLE 10
EFFECT OF POSSIBLE ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE
ON BEHAVIOUR BY RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>TORONTO (%)</th>
<th>OUTSIDE TORONTO (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>25.2 (64)</td>
<td>22.5 (23)</td>
<td>24.4 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>56.3 (143)</td>
<td>50.0 (51)</td>
<td>54.5 (194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>18.5 (47)</td>
<td>27.5 (28)</td>
<td>21.1 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (254)</td>
<td>100.0 (102)</td>
<td>100.0 (356)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 83

5.9 Effect of Potential Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Partnership Status

It was predicted that respondents who live with a partner would be less likely to state that they were affected by their fear of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence. This was found to be true in all categories. Seventy-nine percent of those not living with a partner were somewhat or greatly affected by their awareness of potential anti-gay attacks compared to 71 percent of those living with a partner. Those living with a partner were more likely to say they were not at all affected (28.2 percent) than those not living with a partner (21.2 percent). Those living with a partner may be more affected by potential anti-gay/lesbian violence because they lack the security and social networks couples may enjoy. Couples may be less likely to go out at night or frequent lesbian and gay establishments (see Table 11).
TABLE 11
EFFECT OF POSSIBLE ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE ON BEHAVIOUR BY PARTNERSHIP STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>PARTNER (%)</th>
<th>NO PARTNER (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>28.2 (40)</td>
<td>21.2 (45)</td>
<td>24.0 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>51.4 (73)</td>
<td>57.1 (121)</td>
<td>54.8 (194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>20.4 (29)</td>
<td>21.7 (46)</td>
<td>21.2 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (142)</td>
<td>100.0 (212)</td>
<td>100.0 (354)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 85

5.10 Effect of Potential Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Identification with a Gay or Lesbian Community

It was expected that those who identify with a lesbian or gay community would be more affected by awareness of anti-gay/lesbian violence than those who do not. This was found to be untrue in the Toronto sample. Those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community are more affected by awareness of the potential for anti-gay/lesbian violence. While those who identify with a lesbian or gay community and those who do not are equally somewhat affected (50 percent and 54.2 percent) by potential anti-gay/lesbian violence, those who do not identify with a gay or lesbian community are more likely to state that they are greatly affected (33.3 percent) than those who do identify (26.7 percent) with a lesbian or gay community. Eighty-seven percent of those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community are greatly affected by their awareness of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence compared to 76.7 percent of those who do identify with a lesbian or gay community. Those who identify with a lesbian or gay community (23.3 percent) are more likely to state that they are not at all affected by their awareness of potential bashing compared to those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community (12.5 percent). This may be due to the fact that those who are openly gay or lesbian
and active in a lesbian or gay community may feel more protected by both formal and informal security mechanisms they perceive to be in place. (see Table 12).

### TABLE 12

**EFFECT OF POSSIBLE ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE ON BEHAVIOUR BY IDENTIFICATION WITH A LESBIAN OR GAY COMMUNITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>IDENTIFICATION (%)</th>
<th>NON-IDENTIFICATION (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>23.3 (14)</td>
<td>12.5 (3)</td>
<td>20.2 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>50.0 (30)</td>
<td>54.2 (13)</td>
<td>51.2 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATLY</td>
<td>26.7 (16)</td>
<td>33.3 (8)</td>
<td>28.6 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (60)</td>
<td>100.0 (24)</td>
<td>100.0 (84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 355

5.11 The Relationship between Fear of Violence and the Experience of Violence

In comparing respondents' experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence twice or more since the age of sixteen with their fear of potential attack in the future, I wished to assess whether the experience of previous hate-motivated harassment or violence had affected respondents' fear of future attacks. Respondents who have previously experienced two or more incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence and harassment since the age of sixteen are most likely to state that they are somewhat affected by their awareness of the potential for future attacks. This was found to be the case in all categories (See table 13).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL (%)</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT (%)</th>
<th>GREATLY (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Assault</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened with Violence</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>(152)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects Thrown</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chased/ Followed</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spat Upon</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched, Kicked, Beaten</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaulted or Wounded with a</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Harassed Without Assault</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(146)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Assaulted</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed By Police Without</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten or Assailed by Police</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(254)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table represents the percentage of respondents who stated they experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence two times or more since the age of sixteen cross-tabulated by whether the possibility of anti-gay/lesbian violence or harassment has affected how they act or behave.
Over half of those who were somewhat affected by fear of future anti-gay/lesbian violence had been victimized two times or more since the age of sixteen. One quarter of those who were not at all affected and greatly affected by potential anti-gay/lesbian violence had experienced attacks in the past.

Those somewhat affected by fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence were more likely to have been attacked in the past. Of those who were somewhat affected by fear of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence 66.7 percent had been assaulted by police, 63.2 percent had experienced property damage, 56.9 percent had been chased/followed, 56.3 percent had objects thrown at them, 54.7 percent had been sexually harassed without assault, 54.6 percent had been verbally assaulted, 54.5 percent had been spat upon, 53.8 percent were harassed by police without assault, 52.2 percent had been punched, kicked or beaten, 50.0 percent were assaulted or wounded with a weapon, 50.0 were sexually assaulted, and 48.7 percent were threatened with violence.

The relationship between respondents' previous experience of violence and accelerated fear of future violence raises two questions: are they responding to a false sense of fear in assessing future attacks? Or are victims' fears of future attack based on realistic assessments of the probability of future anti-gay/lesbian violence?

The data reveal that based on previous experience of some form of anti-gay/lesbian violence and harassment respondents are sensitive to future attacks, and also have expectations that such a situation could recur. The expectation of those who have been attacked that they may be harassed or assaulted in the future based on their perceived sexual orientation is not unreasonable in terms of the high lifetime incidence of victimization experienced by the sample overall.

5.12 The Awareness of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Attacks Against Others

Respondents were asked how many people they know personally who have been verbally harassed, threatened with violence, or physically attacked because they were assumed to be lesbian or gay. A high percentage of respondents knew of others who had been attacked. Eighty-two percent of respondents said that they knew at least one person who had been attacked because someone presumed them to be lesbian or gay. Thirteen percent of respondents said they knew one person who had been victimized, 32.1 percent knew two or three, and 46.5 percent knew more than three. Eight percent of respondents said they knew of no one who had been
attacked. There was only a three percent decrease over the two year period among those who said they knew at least one person who had been a victim of violence between 1995 and 1996.

The high percentage of Toronto respondents (82 percent) who know at least one person who has been attacked because someone perceived them to be lesbian or gay is comparable with other North American anti-gay/lesbian violence statistics\(^\text{13}\) (Berrill, 1992:21-22).\(^\text{14}\)

### 5.13 Knowledge of Attacks on Others and Its Effect on Behaviour

I investigated whether those who knew victims of violence were more likely to be fearful than those who did not. Those who knew more than three people who had been attacked were more likely to say that they were somewhat and greatly affected. Further analysis of the effect of anti-gay/lesbian violence on actions and behaviour reveals that knowledge of more than three victims is the modal category for all levels of affect. This means that most gays and lesbians in the sample know of people who have been multiply bashed. Only nine percent of those who knew no victims, compared to 58 percent of those who knew of two or three victims of anti-gay lesbian violence were somewhat or greatly affected. Respondents who knew more than three victims were more affected than any other group. Sixty-two percent of those who know three or more victims state they are greatly affected compared to those who are somewhat (43.7 percent) and not at all affected (46.3 percent) (see Table 14).

### 5.14 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Sex

Over the two year period, 95.4 percent of men and 88.5 percent of women said they knew of at least one lesbian or gay person who had been a victim of violence. Slightly more women (48.5 percent) than men (44.1 percent) said they knew of more than three people who had been a victim. However, more men (16.4 percent) than women (10.5 percent) said they knew of one person who had been a victim. And more men (34.9 percent) than women (29.5 percent) said they knew of two or three persons who were victims. Despite the fact that more men said they knew of persons who had been attacked at least once, more women (11.5 percent) than men (4.6 percent) also said that they knew of no one who had been a victim.
TABLE 14

EFFECT OF KNOWLEDGE OF OTHERS' VICTIMIZATION ON BEHAVIOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Victims Known to Respondent</th>
<th>Not at All (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat (%)</th>
<th>Greatly (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12.8 (11)</td>
<td>7.6 (15)</td>
<td>1.3 (1)</td>
<td>7.5 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>15.1 (13)</td>
<td>12.7 (25)</td>
<td>14.5 (11)</td>
<td>13.6 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or Three</td>
<td>26.7 (23)</td>
<td>36.0 (71)</td>
<td>22.4 (17)</td>
<td>30.9 (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Three</td>
<td>46.3 (39)</td>
<td>43.7 (86)</td>
<td>61.8 (47)</td>
<td>47.9 (172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (86)</td>
<td>100.0 (197)</td>
<td>100.0 (76)</td>
<td>100.0 (359)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases = 80

Men may know of more victims because men experience higher incidents of victimization overall. The knowledge of attacks on other men may be an outcome of the communication network established among men which relies upon informal methods of warning to notify others of potential attacks as well as of the identities of potential attackers.

5.15 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Sexual Orientation

It was expected that over the two year period more gay respondents than lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual respondents would know of at least one person who had been a victim of anti-gay/lesbian victimization. This was not exactly true. Ninety-seven (97.5 percent) percent of bisexual respondents knew of at least one person who had been a victim compared to 95.1 percent of gay respondents, 88.5 percent of lesbians, and 84.6 percent of heterosexuals. Surprisingly, more bisexual respondents (57.1 percent) than lesbian respondents (50.8 percent), and more heterosexual respondents (43.6 percent) than gay respondents (42.3 percent) knew of three or more people who had been victims. Heterosexual respondents were more likely to know no one who had been a victim (15.4 percent).
Respondents who know of significant repeated instances of bashing reveal a pattern across categories: approximately four out of five participants know of repeated instances of bashing. Only one category -- heterosexual -- is lower, revealing that about three out of four respondents know of significant repeated instances of bashing. This number is still fairly high. All respondents (particularly non-heterosexuals) see a uniformly disturbingly high level of bashing and aggression.

5.16 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Age

Based on previous research, it was assumed that younger respondents would know of more victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. This was found to be true in the Toronto study. Respondents under 30 years of age reported the highest knowledge about persons who had been victims of violence. Ninety-five percent of those in the 15-29 age range knew at least one victim compared to 90.8 percent in the 30-44 age range, and 89.4 percent in the 45-67 age range. Eighteen percent of those in the 45-67 age range knew only one victim compared with 14.1 percent of the 30-44 age range, and 11.3 percent of the 15-29 age range. More 45 to 67 year olds said they knew of two or three victims (42.1 percent) than 30-44 year olds (33.3 percent) and 15-29 year olds (28.5 percent). However, for the item which asked respondents if they knew more than three victims of violence, more 15-29 year olds (55 percent) than 30-44 year olds (43.4 percent) and 45-67 year olds (28.9 percent) answered in the affirmative.

While those under 30 years of age know of more victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence, all age categories reveal a high knowledge of repeated instances of bashing. Those under 30 years of age are the age group in which incidents of victimization are most likely to occur within the general population. Based on incidents reported by 111 Canadian police agencies to the Revised Uniform Crime Reporting survey database, the 1994 Revised Uniform Crime Reporting Survey showed that victims of violent crime tended to be aged 14 to 32 years. The median age of violent crime victims is 27 years of age. The peak ages of victims of violent crime is 20 and 30 years of age. Victims of sexual assault tend to be slightly younger than other victims of violent crime (Statistics Canada, 1996:70-71) It makes sense therefore that the increased likelihood of victimization among the 30 and under age group would lead to greater awareness of such incidents occurring among the younger lesbian, gay, bisexual, age group cohort.
5.17 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Income

Respondents in the lowest income range knew of the most persons who had been victims of violence. Ninety-six percent of those in the $1-19,999 income category said they knew of at least one victim compared with 91.6 percent in the $40,000-80,000 income range and 90.2 percent in the $20,000-39,999 income level. While those in the $40,000-80,000 income range were most likely to say they knew one (21.4 percent) and two or three victims (34.5 percent), those in the $1-19,999 were highly represented in the category which knew more than three victims (59.6 percent). The finding in this study that a high percentage of victimization occurs among the lower income group is contradicted by other studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Comstock, 1991:37).15

Those in the lowest income range knew of the most victims. As mentioned previously those in the lowest income range were most likely to fear future attacks of anti-gay/lesbian violence. As well, those in the lowest income range experienced the highest percentage of lifetime victimization in all categories except verbal assault. Income levels may reflect class. It is possible, therefore, that victimization in the lesbian and gay community reflects the trend in the general population. Those lesbians and gay men who earn lower incomes face structural disadvantages such as a lower standard of living, lack of access to affordable transportation which forces them to walk on the street, less education regarding their rights and responsibilities, and lack of access to social protections middle- and upper-class persons take for granted.

5.18 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Race/Ethnicity

It was expected based on previous research findings that ethnic minority respondents would know of more victims of homophobic violence (Comstock, 1991:40-44). This was found to be untrue in the Toronto study. Almost the same percentage of ethnic minority persons and Caucasians knew of at least one person who had been a victim of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Ninety-three percent of ethnic majority respondents knew of at least one person who had been a victim of violence compared to 92 percent of Caucasians. More ethnic minority persons (51.9 percent) said that they knew more than three victims of violence compared with 45.6 percent of Caucasians. Caucasians were slightly more likely (32.3 percent) to say they knew of two or three persons who had been victims compared to ethnic majority respondents (30.9 percent).
All North American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence reports that non-Caucasian participants experience higher levels of victimization (Comstock, 1991:40-45). This would suggest that it is more likely that ethnic minorities will know of more victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The finding from the Toronto study presents an anomaly in the research trend.

5.19 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Location

It is generally assumed that those living in urban areas know of more attacks against others than those living in rural areas. Torontonians did not know more victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence than non-Torontonians. An equal percentage of Torontonians and non-Torontonians (91 percent) said they knew of at least one victim. An equal percentage of Torontonians and non-Torontonians (32 percent) said that they knew of two or three victims. However, 47.4 percent of Torontonians knew of more than three victims of violence compared with 44.7 percent of non-Torontonians.

The findings suggest that urban and rural locations do not factor in respondents' awareness of victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. This finding refutes the notion that awareness of victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence and victimization is more common in larger urban areas than in less populated cities and towns.

5.20 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Partnership Status

It was expected that single persons would know of more victims of bashing than those who are in committed relationships. This was found to be true in the Toronto study. Those in the Toronto sample who are not living with a partner are more likely to say they know of victims of bashing. Ninety-five percent of those who are not living with a partner compared with 89 percent of those who are, said that they knew of at least one victim. Eighty-three percent of those who are not living with a partner say they know of two or three (32.9 percent) or more than three (50.2 percent) victims compared to 72 percent who live with a partner. Those who are living with a partner (17 percent) are more likely to say they know of one person compared with those who are not living with a partner (12 percent).

How do we explain that respondents not living with a partner are more likely to know victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence? It is likely that those not living with a partner are more active in lesbian and gay recreational activities such as bars, clubs and community centres where
anti-gay/lesbian violence is likely to take place, and therefore hear and witness more victimization. Those who are in partnerships are also likely to be more protected and insulated within social networks.

5.21 Knowledge of Attacks on Others by Identification with a Lesbian or Gay Community

I assumed that those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community, and possibly closeted, would likely know of less victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence than those who identify with a lesbian or gay community. This was found to be untrue. One hundred percent of those who do not identify with any lesbian or gay community know at least one person who has been a victim of anti-gay/lesbian violence or harassment compared to 91.0 percent of those who do identify with a lesbian or gay community. The differences rise when assessing knowledge of multiple instances of bashing. Those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community were more likely to know multiple victims compared to those who do identify with a gay or lesbian community. Ninety-five percent of those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community know of multiple victims compared to 79 percent of those who do identify with a lesbian or gay community. Humphries and Miller (1979) suggest that those who are not integrated in a gay or lesbian community are more likely to be vulnerable to anti-gay attacks. They suggest that covert rather than overt avenues of engaging with lesbian and gay organizations lead to an increase rather than decrease in the potential for attack and blackmail. Samis (1995) found that the relationship between community involvement and victimization was more relevant for men than women. For women there was little difference between those who are members and those who are not (Samis, 1995:107).

5.22 Modification of Behaviour In Response to Fear: Analysis of the Toronto Qualitative Data

The qualitative data illustrate that the fear of anti-gay violence has a profound impact on the behaviour of many Pride Day respondents. Seventy-eight respondents used terms such as 'angry,' "more cautious," "careful," "nervous," "wary," "embarrassed," "defensive," "more covert," "conservative," "constantly alert," "more attentive," and "guarded" to describe their behaviour when they feel they may be at risk because others perceive them to be lesbian or gay.
The qualitative data provide a context through which to obtain a snapshot of the everyday living conditions of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and those who support them. Taken as a whole, the quotes reveal that respondents and their friends think a lot about how they are perceived and the effect of perceived sexual orientation upon the actions of others. Respondents show that they are extremely conscious of the threat of anti-gay/lesbian violence and harassment in their day-to-day lives and take great pains to manage their stigmatized social identity through "passing" or "covering" (Goffman, 1963). Respondents' quotes reveal that they often think about their personal safety and take great care to transform themselves to adapt to the heterosexist environments they may find themselves in.

Two hundred and thirty-seven (54 percent) respondents provided qualitative information on the specific ways in which they are affected by the knowledge of potential violence.

In analyzing the qualitative data I developed 38 categories to describe the effect of respondents' awareness of the potential for anti-gay/lesbian violence and harassment. These categories were again later reduced to 20 categories. Slightly more women than men gave examples of how fear of crime affects their behaviour. Fifty-one percent of women and forty-nine percent of men reported ways in which they alter their behaviour in attempts to avoid anti-gay/lesbian harassment and violence.

5.23 Modification of Behaviour

Forty-three percent of lesbians and 42 percent of gay respondents reported ways in which they alter their behaviour in attempts to avoid anti-gay/lesbian harassment and violence. More bisexuals (11 percent) than heterosexuals (4 percent) stated that they modify their behaviour to avoid assault.

Of the 439 participants 237 (53.9 percent) provided information of how fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence affects their behaviour. Of these 237 respondents, 122 (51.4 percent) are women and 115 (48.5 percent) are men. The rank ordering of effects of awareness of anti-gay/lesbian violence on behaviour reveals that respondents tend to alter their behaviour to avoid identification as a gay or lesbian person. Thirteen percent of respondents limit public displays of affection, 11 percent attempt to act "straight", and 11 percent maintain constant caution in public. Nine percent of respondents listed "other" reactions to their awareness of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The "other" column includes responses which totalled less than one percent. This
includes such responses as: learning self defense, fear of associating with other lesbians and gays, choosing not to help others who are attacked, attending only gay bars and events, only travelling with friends, less affectionate in public, concern for lesbian and gay friends, fear for safety at school, limiting political and social activities, having an unlisted phone number, increased sensitivity to surroundings, avoidance of public transit, limiting friendships, fear of police, fear of hospitals, fear near gay businesses, experiencing the same affect as sexism, and one male person stated "no effect."

Eight percent of respondents are more aware of potential bashing in the future. Seven percent of respondents are less open about their sexuality. Five percent assimilate to seem heterosexual. Five percent change their daily route to avoid detection. Four percent fight back against discrimination. Three percent each became more political, modified their dress, self censored themselves, fear for their safety, have heightened concern for their neighbourhood, and fear certain neighbourhoods as a result of their awareness of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence. Two percent each avoid wearing gay symbols, deny themselves, fear traffic, and avoid walking outside at night.

Women and men differently rank their reactions to fear of victimization based on awareness of gay bashing. Women reported limiting public displays of affection (20 percent), acting straight (14 percent), and increased caution (11 percent), as the three most frequent behavioural modifications as a result of awareness of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Men reported caution (12 percent), increased awareness (10 percent) and acting straight (eight percent) as the three most frequent responses to awareness of potential victimization. Women reported self censorship (5 percent), modification of dress (four percent), and concern about neighbourhood (3 percent) more frequently than did men. Women reported fear in the home (four percent) and avoidance of wearing gay or lesbian symbols (three percent), more frequently than did men. Men (5 percent) reported fighting back more frequently than did women (3 percent), as well as fear of traffic (four percent), fear of certain neighbourhoods (four percent), avoiding walking at night (three percent), denying selfhood (four percent), and changing their route (seven percent).

5.24 Modification of Behaviour in North American Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence Studies

the attempts on the part of participants to conceal their sexual orientation in order to obtain housing, education, employment, and access to children. There are similarities between the findings in the Toronto study and other Canadian studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Over sixty percent of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick respondents indicate that they modify their behaviour to avoid discrimination and harassment, and women are more likely to report modifying their behaviour than are men (Smith, 1993:42; NBCHR, 1991:31).

The necessity of modifying behaviour becomes clear when the monetary cost of disclosure is assessed. The findings reveal that the disclosure of sexual orientation can be costly for lesbians and gay men. Lesbians and gays report being denied employment, denied promotion, threatened at work, pressured to resign from work, and being fired because of their perceived sexual orientation. Lesbians and gays also report being denied a lease or rental, experiencing discrimination in purchasing a house, or being evicted because of their sexual orientation. Lesbians experienced higher percentages of discrimination at work and in seeking accommodation compared to gay men (Smith, 1993:25; New Brunswick, 1991:31; Samis, 1995:76-77).16

The above findings reveal that Canadians and Americans who respond to anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys are well aware of the potential for anti-gay/lesbian violence. Canadian and American respondents know that disclosure of their sexual orientation may mean loss of employment, custody of children, and housing. Respondents took precautions to modify their behaviour because of their fear of experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence or discrimination. But the data also show that the majority of respondents are only somewhat affected by potential anti-gay/lesbian violence. This may suggest that sexual minorities know of the implications of being out yet are more likely to not modify their behaviour drastically to fit heterosexist prescriptions. Women are more likely than men to modify their behaviour due to fear of violence; however, at times women find it difficult to determine whether their fear is based on their awareness of sexism or of lesbophobia.

5.25 Conclusions

The findings reveal that women's fear of experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence is greater than that of men. Participants who have previously experienced a wide range of anti-gay/lesbian
violence once, or twice or more since the age of sixteen are most likely somewhat affected by their awareness of the potential for future violence.

Examination of other Canadian and American studies reveals that women are slightly more likely than men to modify their behaviour due to their fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence: however, at times women found it difficult to distinguish whether their fear is based upon their awareness of sexism or lesbophobia (Smith, 1993). Seventy-eight percent of female respondents are somewhat or greatly affected by their awareness of potential anti-gay/lesbian violence compared to 73 percent of male respondents. Ninety percent of lesbians are somewhat or greatly affected compared to 72 percent of gay men. And more women (49 percent) than men (44 percent) knew of more than three people who had been victims. More women than men gave examples of how fear of crime affects their behaviour.

Over three quarters of the Pride Day respondents knew at least one person who had been verbally or physically assaulted. Eighty two percent of participants knew at least one person who had been verbally or physically assaulted because of that person’s perceived sexual orientation. Thirteen percent of respondents knew one person who had been a victim, while 32.1 percent knew two or three, and 46.5 percent knew more than three people who had been victims. Seventy-six percent of respondents stated that the possibility of anti-gay/lesbian harassment or violence had either somewhat or greatly affected how they act or behave.

More women than men reported that they alter their behaviour in attempts to avoid anti-gay/lesbian harassment and violence. More lesbian women than gay men, bisexuals, and heterosexuals, and more Caucasian than ethnic minority respondents alter their behaviour due to fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Over one-half (237) of the Toronto survey respondents outlined ways in which they alter their behaviour in response to violence and the potential threat of violence. These behaviours include not speaking about their lives to co-workers, friends, or family; altering clothing; avoiding any physical contact with a partner/lover in public; and limiting political involvement in community issues. This demonstrates how fear of violence undermines the lesbian/gay struggle towards self-acceptance, higher self-esteem, and sense of belonging or community.

The threat of anti-gay violence is a tool of oppression which serves to socially control gay men and lesbians who might be too out, too obvious, too proud, too vocal, and too political. Hate-motivated crime victimizes the individual and the community by deeply entrenching
stigmatizing stereotypes into the psyche of sexual minorities thus controlling their actions, thoughts, political practices, and potential for growth and self actualization.

While the possibility for anti-gay/lesbian violence is great, it could be argued that the fear of experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence is even more pervasive than the actual likelihood of victimization. This also seems not to be true. Victimization scales reveal high incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence over the lifetime of respondents which suggests that fear of anti-gay/lesbian crime is justified. The gendered nature of fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence has been exemplified by the findings in this study which show that women are more likely than men to fear violence. More research needs to be done on the effect of this fear on lesbian women's lives in order to understand its importance and full impact.
CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION OF SURVEY FINDINGS: ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE

6.1 Introduction

Homophobic prejudice is widespread in North American society. Hate crime theorists argue that the general bias toward gay people may have been exacerbated by recent attempts to gain rights and responsibilities given to heterosexual persons (Herek, 1992; Mock, 1995; Hamner, 1992). They suggest that homophobic views prejudice many people's actions and attitudes and that prejudices need to be examined. One such symbolic gesture of prejudice is anti-gay/lesbian violence. Through reporting the nature and frequency of acts of anti-gay/lesbian violence, which encompasses a wide range of harassing and physically violent behaviour, it can be shown that there is a clear link between bias and the impact on members of the sexual minority community.

The following section will explore the survey results on the incidence of victimization from the merged 1995-1996 data collected over a two year period in Toronto at Lesbian and Gay Pride Day. The survey results will be compared with findings from other Canadian and American studies. The purpose of this exploration is to provide a context for understanding the scope, nature and prevalence of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto and Canada. The two major themes are the level of anti-gay/lesbian violence experienced by survey respondents, and the similarities and differences between findings from Canadian and American studies. A summary of the overall results will be provided in table form.

6.2 General Violence Category

Canadian surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence vary in the amount and detail of information each provides. All use a scale of victimization to obtain lifetime incidence of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys typically organize their data under a category of "general" anti-gay/lesbian violence. Surveys gather information on victimization by asking a single question that generalizes all incidents or by summarizing the answers to several questions in a scale specifying various kinds of assault. Four Canadian surveys have asked respondents to report lifetime incidence and each based its general violence category on a series of questions about various kinds of physical assault.
Canadian surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence break down the general violence category according to demographic data on respondents. This allows for comparison of the general violence category responses across studies. However, some provide more detailed analysis than others. Smith (1993) only provides descriptives of the data. New Brunswick (1990) only provides frequency breakdowns. Samis (1995) provides a more detailed empirical analysis of demographics, experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence by gender, and testing of hypotheses. Comstock (1991) and Berrill (1992) compared American anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys in order to determine consistency in percentages across studies from year to year. American statistics have been collected from a variety of different locations using different survey instruments and this complicates the accurate comparison of findings.

6.3 Reporting of Victimization by Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Race/Ethnicity

The rank order of percentages of victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence reporting categories of victimization reveals that the most common form of assault reported by Pride Day survey respondents is verbal assault, followed by threats of assault, sexual harassment, chased/followed, objects thrown, punched, kicked or beaten, harassed by police, property damage, spat upon, sexual assault, weapon assault, and assault by police. The order of the categories of victimization change when broken down by sex, sexual orientation and race/ethnicity.

6.3(a) Reporting of Victimization by Gender

Both men and women reported verbal assault as the number one form of victimization they experienced. Women typically reported sexual harassment and sexual assault more frequently than men. Women reported sexual harassment as the second most common form of victimization while men reported sexual harassment fourth. Women also reported sexual assault more frequently than did men. Women reported sexual assault as the seventh most common victimization while men reported sexual assault tenth. Surprisingly, women and men reported objects thrown, harassed by police, weapon assault and assault by police equally. The forms of victimization which men reported higher than women are typical forms of violence between men. For example, men reported threatened with assault the second most frequent form of victimization while women reported it third. Men reported being beaten and property damage more frequently than did women. Men reported property damage eighth while women reported
property damage tenth. And men reported being beaten sixth while women reported being beaten ninth.

6.3(b) Reporting of Victimization by Sexual Orientation

All gays, lesbians, bisexuals and heterosexuals reported verbal assault as the most frequently experienced form of victimization. Lesbians and heterosexuals reported sexual harassment as the second most frequent form of victimization, while gays reported sexual harassment fifth and bisexuals reported sexual harassment third. Gays and bisexuals reported threats of violence second while lesbians and heterosexuals reported threats of violence third. Lesbians, gays, and heterosexuals reported chased/followed as the fourth most frequent form of victimization while bisexuals reported it fifth. Surprisingly, lesbians reported property damage and being spat upon more frequently than gays, bisexuals and heterosexuals. Lesbians reported spat upon seventh while gay men and heterosexuals reported spat upon ninth, and bisexuals reported it eleventh. Gay men reported being beaten more frequently than other sexual minorities. Gay men reported being beaten the sixth most frequent form of victimization compared to lesbians and bisexuals who reported beatings eighth, and heterosexuals who reported beatings ninth. Both bisexuals and heterosexuals reported harassment by police sixth while gay men reported harassment by police seventh and lesbians reported harassment by police ninth. While gay men reported assault by police eleventh, lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals reported assault by police twelfth. Bisexuals reported assault with a weapon ninth while lesbians and heterosexuals reported assault with a weapon eleventh and gays reported assault with a weapon to be the least frequent form of victimization.

6.3(c) Reporting of Victimization by Race/Ethnicity

Both Caucasians and ethnic minorities reported verbal assault, threatened with victimization, and sexual harassment, as the first, second, and third most frequently experienced forms of victimization. Ethnic minorities had objects thrown at them more frequently than Caucasians. While ethnic minorities reported objects thrown at them the fourth most frequent form of victimization, Caucasians reported objects thrown at them to be the tenth most frequent form of victimization. Both ethnic minorities and Caucasians reported being beaten as the seventh most frequent form of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Ethnic minorities were spat upon more
frequently than Caucasians. Ethnic minorities reported being spat upon sixth while Caucasians reported being spat upon ninth. Caucasians reported harassment by police higher than did ethnic minorities; however, ethnic minorities reported assault by police higher than Caucasians. Caucasians reported police harassment fifth compared to ethnic minorities who reported police harassment ninth. Ethnic minorities reported police assault eleventh while Caucasians reported police assault twelfth. Caucasians experienced property damage more frequently than ethnic minorities. Caucasians reported property damage sixth while ethnic minorities reported property damage eighth.

6.4 Findings from the Scale of Victimization

The scale used to measure the incidence of victimization asked whether respondents had experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence in the past year and since age sixteen. In order to obtain lifetime occurrences of victimization the columns once, and twice or more in the 'since age sixteen' column were added together. Because the Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Vancouver studies on anti-gay/lesbian violence used similar scales in their surveys, the Toronto victimization data could be compared with their findings (Smith 1993; New Brunswick 1990; Samis 1995). American research also used similar scales in their surveys allowing comparison with American statistics (Comstock, 1991; Berrill, 1992). The merged 1995-1996 Toronto survey data reveal that violence has been experienced by many gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, transgendered persons, and heterosexuals assumed to be lesbian or gay. Seventy-seven (77.1) percent of respondents reported experiencing verbal assaults at least once since age sixteen. Fifty-one (51.1) percent were verbally threatened with physical violence. Twenty-two (21.8) percent reported being punched, kicked or beaten. Nineteen (19.4) percent had personal property damaged or destroyed. Thirty-seven (36.8) percent had been chased and followed; 27 (27.0) percent had objects thrown at them. Eighteen (17.5) percent had been spat upon. Thirty-eight (38.0) percent of respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment while 17 (16.7) percent conveyed that they had actually been sexually assaulted. Twenty-one (21.3) percent reported they had been harassed by police and five (5.3) percent reported being beaten or assaulted by police.

The descending order of percentages of victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence reporting categories of victimization reveals that the most common form of assault is verbal assault, followed in order by threats of assault, sexual harassment, chased/followed, objects thrown,
punched, kicked or beaten, harassed by police, property damage, spat upon, sexual assault, weapon assault, and assault by police. The order of categories of victimization changes when broken down by sex, sexual orientation and race/ethnicity.

6.4(a) Verbal Assaualts

Seventy-seven percent of Toronto respondents stated they had been verbally assaulted because someone perceived them to be lesbian or gay. This finding contrasts with other North American survey findings on percentages of verbal assault experienced by survey respondents (New Brunswick, 1990; Samis, 1995; Berrill, 1992:20). The higher percentages of verbal assault documented by the New Brunswick (82 percent) and Vancouver sample (85 percent) may be due to the fact that there is a larger proportion of men in their samples than in the Nova Scotia (72 percent) and Toronto sample. Women comprise almost half the Nova Scotia and over half of the Toronto samples.

Toronto respondents gave a range of examples of verbal assaults they received because it was assumed they were lesbian or gay. Respondents were: verbally harassed by a group of women for being dykes, verbally assaulted by men driving by in cars on the street, verbally assaulted by a taxi driver outside the lesbian Rose Cafe, verbally harassed in the Church-Wellesley area and on the TTC, verbally assaulted at work and while walking on Church Street, verbally harassed by WASP teenagers in Mississgua, verbally assaulted in a bus shelter by two men. insulted by men on the street who followed two lesbians and touched one of them, called "faggot" from a passing car while walking on the street, verbally assaulted by a group of three men. verbally harassed with lewd comments made on the street, called a "dyke" in a bus terminal, shouted and screamed at by punks outside a bar at 2 a.m., entrapped through verbal assault that resulted in physical assault, and verbally assaulted by men who yelled at lesbians to "get some dick". The above examples of verbal assaults given by respondents point to a pattern: the most common anti-gay verbal assaults occur when victims are walking on the street, and the perpetrators are mostly male strangers who are either walking or driving by in cars.

6.4(b) Threatened with Physical Violence

Fifty-one (51.1) percent of Toronto respondents stated they had been threatened with physical violence. This finding is comparable to percentages in the American research which find
that the median proportion of respondents who were threatened with violence is 44 percent (Berrill, 1992:20). Toronto respondents report the second highest percentage of threats of physical violence across Canadian studies.

Toronto and Vancouver participants experienced higher percentages of threats of physical violence compared to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia participants. It is possible that because the Toronto and Vancouver samples have high numbers of male participants as well as higher participation from ethnic minorities, the percentages of threats of physical assault are higher. The Toronto and Vancouver studies also include bisexual respondents which may contribute to the differences in percentages between this and other samples. The Vancouver and Toronto sample are obtained from participants living in a large urban area which may also contribute to differences in the percentages experiencing threats of assault.

Toronto respondents experienced threats of physical assault from men and women in everyday contexts. These included: threats from a group of men while walking home with a partner late at night because they were holding hands, a death threat in a locker at school, threats of murder by "skinhead" males at Wellesley subway station, and threats by acquaintances in public places.

6.4(c) Sexual Harassment

Thirty-eight percent of Toronto respondents reported sexual harassment because someone assumed them to be lesbian or gay. The Toronto and Nova Scotia samples showed higher percentages of sexual harassment than the New Brunswick and Vancouver samples (Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1990; Samis, 1995). The New Brunswick and Vancouver samples have the least number of women in their sample population in contrast to the Toronto and Nova Scotia samples which include a higher proportion of women. This may explain the lower percentages of sexual harassment in the Vancouver and New Brunswick samples. Most of the American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence tends to focus on sexual assault rather than sexual harassment so that there is no comparison of percentages for sexual harassment; however, findings from the NCAVP are comparable to those found in the Toronto survey (Berrill, 1992; Comstock, 1991; NCAVP, 1996).

In the Toronto sample women were more likely than men to provide information about incidents of sexual harassment at work. Respondents reported three incidents of sexual
harassment by co-workers, harassment over the telephone, threat of rape while riding the subway at night, and harassment on the street by men who told women all they needed was a "good man."

6.4(d) Chased/Followed

Thirty-seven percent of Toronto respondents were chased/followed. This percentage is comparable with findings in other Canadian and American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1990; Samis, 1995; Comstock, 1991:38; Berrill, 1992:20). Toronto respondents gave examples of being chased and followed which usually involved verbal assault. Respondents were chased in a car while obscenities were yelled at them, chased/followed by two men after leaving a bar in downtown Hamilton and then assaulted, followed on a street by men because they were holding hands, followed by strangers at night who were trying to pick a fight, followed and verbally taunted, then physically assaulted by friends of perpetrators who were waiting around the corner.

6.4(e) Objects Thrown

Twenty-seven (27.0 percent) percent of Toronto respondents had objects thrown at them. Toronto and Vancouver respondents experienced equal percentages of objects thrown at them compared to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick respondents. The low percentage reflected in the New Brunswick sample may be due to the small sample size. With the exception of the New Brunswick study, the Canadian percentages for this victimization category are comparable with the American percentages (Berrill, 1992:20; Comstock, 1991:38).

Toronto respondents recounted various scenarios in which objects were thrown at them. Respondents were most likely to experience verbal assault in conjunction with objects thrown at them. Respondents were called names and had cans thrown at them on Yonge Street, called "faggot" and had rocks thrown at them by teenagers, and had beer thrown at them in front of a gay-positive church in New York, U.S.A.

6.4(f) Punched/Kicked/Beaten

Twenty-two percent of Toronto respondents had been punched, kicked, or beaten. The responses to this question reveal that those living in large urban areas report more incidents of being beaten. Toronto and Vancouver respondents reported higher percentages of being punched,

Incidents recalled by Toronto respondents ranged from being punched in the stomach at school, physical assault by men on the street after leaving a bar, beaten outside a restaurant by six men in Detroit, beaten by a group of men, stabbed three times in the back on Yonge Street, and tripped and kicked while jogging because someone presumed they were lesbian or gay.

6.4(g) Harassed by Police

Twenty-one percent (21.3 percent) of Toronto respondents reported harassment by police. The four Canadian victimization studies reveal consistently high percentages of harassment by police (Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1990; Samis, 1995). New Brunswick and Toronto respondents showed slightly higher percentages of harassment by police than respondents in the Nova Scotia and Vancouver studies. There are no available data on police harassment from American studies due to the fact that they focus on the category of 'police assault' (Berrill, 1992: Comstock, 1991).

Incidents recalled by Toronto respondents ranged from being harassed by police as an adolescent with a female lover in their car in a rural area, stopped by police unnecessarily and asked for identification in a park, and harassment by police at 52 Division.

6.4(h) Property Damage

Nineteen percent (19.4 percent) of Toronto respondents had property damaged because someone presumed them to be gay or lesbian. The percentage of respondents in the Toronto study who experienced property damage is comparable to other Canadian and American studies (Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1990; Comstock, 1991:38; Berrill, 1992:20).

Incidents recalled by Toronto respondents ranged from having one's door set on fire in a student residence to having clothes torn from one's body, having one's door broken down and a knife held to the throat, broken glass put under car tires in the victim's driveway, robbery attempts, and a gay sign on a door vandalized by guests of a housemate.
6.4(i) Spat Upon

Seventeen (17.5) percent of Toronto respondents had been spat upon. A high percentage of Toronto respondents had been spat upon compared to the percentage found in other Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence studies while American studies showed higher percentages of being spat upon compared to Canadian studies (Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1990; Comstock, 1991:38; Berrill, 1992:20). Toronto respondents did not provide many examples of such incidents; however, one respondent reported being spat upon and verbally harassed by WASP teenagers in Mississauga.

6.4(j) Sexual Assault

Seventeen percent of the Toronto respondents had been sexually assaulted because someone presumed them to be lesbian or gay. The Toronto and Nova Scotia samples revealed higher percentages of sexual assault compared to the Vancouver sample (Smith, 1993; Samis, 1995). The New Brunswick study did not ask about the experience of sexual assault. The percentage of American respondents reporting sexual assault is lower compared to the Canadian percentages (Comstock, 1991:41).

6.4(k) Assault with a Weapon

Eight percent of Toronto respondents were assaulted with a weapon. The Vancouver sample showed a higher percentage of assault with a weapon compared to the Toronto and Nova Scotia samples (Samis, 1995. Smith, 1993). American research shows that percentages experiencing assault with a weapon are comparable to those found in the Toronto survey (Comstock, 1991:38; Berrill, 1992:20; NCAVP, 1996).

Knives were the weapon of choice in attacks reported by Toronto respondents. In the Toronto study one woman reported that her friend had been stabbed in the back three times while they walked on Yonge Street after a dance at the Masonic Temple. Another respondent reported being threatened with a knife to the throat after the perpetrator broke down the victim's door and claimed "all gays should be dead".
6.4(l) Beaten or Assaulted by Police

Five percent of Toronto respondents were beaten or assaulted by police. Vancouver and Toronto respondents report the highest percentages of assault by police compared to respondents from small towns (Samis, 1995). This finding is unusual since in fact, small town police may be more homophobic for various reasons. Comparison with American research shows that a higher percentage of Americans experience anti-gay/lesbian assault from police (Berrill, 1992:32; Comstock, 1991:57). The Toronto and American research show that gay men are much more likely to be beaten or assaulted by police than lesbian women (Comstock, 1991:57). Numerous reports of assault from police have been made in both Canada and the United States (Berrill, 1992:32; Committee on the Judiciary, 1983; Harry, 1982; Humphreys, 1970/1975; Comstock, 1991: 152-162; NGLTF, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990; NGLTF Policy Institute, 1991; Right to Privacy Commission, (Toronto) 1981; The Toronto Lesbian and Gay History Group, 1981).

6.4(m) Harassed or Abused at School

The Toronto study did not ask respondents about harassment or abuse at school. However many respondents provided qualitative data on their experience of harassment at school. In other Canadian studies a high percentage of Canadian respondents reported harassment at school (New Brunswick, 1990; Smith, 1993; Samis, 1995). American research documents incidents of harassment, intimidation, and vandalism on American campuses (Comstock, 1991:57; Berrill, 1992:33-34; NGLTF, 1990).

Toronto respondents report being punched in the stomach at school by a student, harassment from students at school, receiving a death threat in a locker at school, having one’s residence door burned at college, harassment at school which caused the respondent to drop out of school, and harassment from fellow students or classmates.

6.5 Male and female Victimization rates from the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

6.5(a) Women

There were differences in the types of anti-gay/lesbian violence reported by men and women in the Toronto survey since the age of sixteen. Women experienced higher incidences of lifetime victimization in the categories of assault with a weapon, sexual harassment and sexual assault.
Four percent of women said they had been assaulted with a weapon compared with two percent of males. While women show a slightly higher percent of assault with a weapon compared to men, this finding is unusual in surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Samis, 1995:81; Comstock, 1991:40, 26-27).

Women reported only slightly higher percentages of sexual harassment and sexual assault compared to men. Twenty (20.3) percent of women had been sexually harassed compared to 17 (17.1) percent of men. And eight (8.6) percent of women had been sexually assaulted compared to seven (7.5) percent of men. Women consistently show higher percentages of sexual harassment in other Canadian anti-gay/lesbian studies (Samis, 1995:78-82; Smith, 1993:23). However in American and Canadian studies which also ask about sexual assault (rape), the percentage of men having been victimized rises in comparison to women (Smith, 1993:23; Berrill, 1992:27; Comstock, 1991:41). Canadian and American definitions of "sexual assault" differ. A broader definition applies in Canada. "Rape" has a particular and narrower connotation than "sexual assault." The almost equal percentages of women and men experiencing sexual assault and sexual harassment is unusual in comparison to trends in the heterosexual population which show that women experience higher percentages of this form of victimization.

6.5(b) Men

Men experienced higher percentages of violence in the categories of verbal assault, physical assault, property damage, spat upon, assault by police, and chased and followed.

Men reported having experienced a higher percentage of verbal assault than female participants. Forty-four (44.4) percent of men experienced verbal assault compared to 31.9 percent of women. The Toronto finding is supported by American and Canadian studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence which show that men consistently experience higher percentages of verbal abuse and threats of physical violence compared to women (Smith, 1993:16; Berrill, 1992:27).

Men report a higher percentage of threats of physical violence than women. Thirty-two percent of men compared to 18.5 percent of women were threatened with physical violence. This finding corresponds with other Canadian and American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence which show that men are more likely than women to be threatened with physical violence (Smith, 1993:17; Samis, 1995:78-79; Comstock, 1991:41; Berrill, 1992:26-27).
There was a six percent difference in the reports of property damage between men and women. Eleven (11.4) percent of men experienced property damage compared to seven (7.1) percent of women. Canadian anti-gay/lesbian studies do not report on property damage experienced by respondents. However, American research correspondingly shows that a higher percentage of men than women report experiences of vandalism or arson (Comstock, 1991:40; Berrill, 1992:26-27).

The most significant difference between men and women in the Toronto sample was found in the category of being punched, kicked and beaten, where there was a ten percent gap. Thirteen (13.7) percent of men and seven percent of women had been punched, kicked, or beaten. In all North American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence men experience higher percentages of physical assault (Samis, 1995:81-82; Smith, 1993:19; Comstock, 1991:40; Berrill, 1992:27). However, Toronto men show lower percentages of physical assault compared to men in other anti-gay/lesbian violence studies. The Toronto finding is consistent with trends among men in the general population where men experience more physical assaults than women (Statistics Canada, 1996).

Men and women report almost similar occurrences of being spat upon, assaulted by police, and chased and followed since the age of sixteen.

Nine percent of men and seven percent of women report being spat upon. The high percentage of Toronto women reporting being spat upon is unusual in North American studies where men tend to report much higher frequency (Smith, 1993:17; Berrill, 1992:25; Comstock, 1991:40).

Two percent of men and one percent of women report being assaulted by police. The trend in slightly higher percentages of male respondents reporting assault by police are consistent with findings in other North American anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys (Samis, 1995:83; Smith, 1993:21; Comstock, 1991:57; Berrill, 1992:27; NGLTF, 1984).

Reports of harassment by police were quite high for men in comparison to female participants. Almost 12.7 percent of men report harassment by police compared to seven percent of women. Other Canadian victimization studies show men with higher or almost equal percentages of harassment by police compared to women (Smith, 1993:21; Samis, 1995:80). American studies tend to focus on physical assaults rather than harassment by police.
Men and women show almost equivalent percentages of being chased or followed. Nineteen (19.6) percent of men and 16.4 percent of women report being chased or followed because they are assumed to be lesbian or gay. This finding is consistent with the Vancouver study (Samis, 1995:78-79). However, other Canadian and American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence reveal that men consistently report higher percentages of being chased or followed compared to women (Smith, 1993:17; Comstock, 1991:40; Berrill, 1992:27).

Women in this sample report more sexual harassment and sexual assault than men which is consistent with the trends from the general population. However, the slightly higher reports from women in the Toronto survey regarding assault with a weapon are surprising considering that men in the Toronto sample report being beaten more than women.

6.6 Victimization and Sexual Orientation From the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

6.6(a) Lesbians

Gay respondents consistently reported higher percentages of victimization than lesbians in all categories except for sexual harassment. Gays and lesbians experienced almost equal percentages of assault with a weapon. Berrill (1992) suggests that gender differences in rates of victimization may result from several factors. First, men are more likely than women to experience violent crime. Secondly, the higher visibility of gay men may make them more vulnerable to victimization. Thirdly, gay men tend to recognize their sexual orientation earlier than lesbians. Fourthly, lesbians may be more likely than gay men to have modified their behaviour out of fear for their personal safety. Lastly, anti-lesbian violence may be difficult to distinguish from more general violence against women (Berrill, 1992:28; Von Schulthess, 1992).

The almost equal percentage of lesbian women and gay men reporting assault with a weapon in the Toronto study is unusual in Canadian and American anti-gay/lesbian violence studies. Three percent of lesbians reported assault with a weapon while three percent of gay men did so. One percent of bisexual respondents report assault with a weapon while none of the heterosexual respondents report this type of victimization. The equal percentage of lesbian women reporting assault with a weapon in this study is not corroborated in other studies (Smith, 1993:20; Samis, 1995:82; Berrill, 1992:26-27; Comstock, 1991:40).

Lesbians reported slightly higher percentages of sexual harassment than gay men. Sixteen (16.9) percent of lesbians reported sexual harassment compared to 15.5 percent of gay men. Two
percent of bisexuals and three percent of heterosexuals reported sexual harassment. Gay men reported slightly higher incidences of sexual assault (seven percent) compared to lesbians (four percent), bisexual (three percent) and heterosexual (one percent) respondents. The high percentages of sexual harassment experienced by lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals is likely due to the high percentage of female respondents in each category.

Men consistently show higher levels of sexual assault than women in North American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence where sexual assault is defined as completed acts of rape (Berrill, 1992:27; Comstock, 1991:41). This may explain why gay men show higher percentages of sexual assault than lesbians. This trend is found in other Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys (Smith, 1993:23; Samis, 1995:78-81).

6.6(b) Gay Men

Gay men experienced higher percentages of anti-gay/lesbian violence in every victimization category except for assault with a weapon and sexual harassment in which lesbians showed slightly higher percentages of victimization.

Gay men were more likely to be verbally assaulted than lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals. Thirty-nine (39.8) percent of gay men, 25.9 percent of lesbians, eight percent of bisexuals, and two percent of heterosexuals were verbally assaulted. The percentages of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals experiencing verbal assault is low in comparison to other studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Smith, 1993:16; Samis, 1995:78-79; Berrill, 1992:26-27). American victimization surveys show that men consistently experience higher percentages of verbal abuse than women. However, because the sexual orientation of respondents is not indicated, this limits our understanding of what proportion of men and women answering this question are bisexual (Berrill, 1992:26-27).

Gay men were more likely to be threatened with physical assault than bisexuals, lesbians, and heterosexuals. Twenty-seven (27.7) percent of gay men, 14.6 percent of lesbians, six percent of bisexuals, and one percent of heterosexuals were threatened with physical assault. This trend is consistent with other studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence in which gay men experienced higher percentages of threats of violence than lesbian women (Smith, 1993:16; Samis, 1995:78-79). American surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence consistently show that men experience higher
percentages of physical violence; however, men outnumber women in all of these studies (Berrill, 1992:26-27).

Gay men experienced higher percentages of having objects thrown at them compared to lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals. Fifteen (15.2) percent of gay men had objects thrown at them compared to eight percent of lesbians, one percent of bisexuals, and less than one percent of heterosexuals. Men show higher percentages of having objects thrown at them in other North American studies (Comstock, 1991:40; Berrill, 1992:26-27; Samis, 1995:78-79; Smith, 1993:18).

Gay men in the Toronto study were more likely to be chased or followed. Seventeen (17.7) percent of gay respondents reported being chased and followed compared to 14.8 percent of lesbians, three percent of bisexuals, and one percent of heterosexuals. This finding is similar to findings in other North American studies which reveal that gay men are more likely to be chased and followed compared to lesbian women (Samis, 1995:78-79; Smith, 1993:16; Berrill, 1992:26-27; Comstock, 1991:40).

Gay men are punched, kicked or beaten more than bisexuals, lesbians, or heterosexuals. Thirteen (13.7) percent of gay men were punched, kicked, beaten compared to four percent of lesbians, one percent of bisexuals, and less than one percent of heterosexuals. Men consistently report higher percentages of being punched, kicked or beaten in American and Canadian surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Smith, 1993:20; Samis, 1995:82; Comstock, 1991:40; Berrill, 1992:26-27).

Gay men were more likely to be harassed by police compared to lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals. Ten percent of gay men were harassed by police compared to five percent of lesbians, three percent of bisexuals, and one percent of heterosexuals. Two percent of gay men were assaulted by police compared to less than one percent of lesbians and bisexuals. None of the heterosexual respondents report assault by police. This trend is consistent with other studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence in which men were assaulted or harassed by police as a result of homophobia more often than lesbian women (Smith, 1993:21; Samis, 1995:83; Berrill, 1992:26-27, 32).

Gay men reported higher percentages of property damage compared to lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals. Nine percent of gay men had property damaged compared to seven percent of lesbians, one percent of bisexuals, and less than one percent of heterosexuals. This trend is consistent with American research which shows that men report slightly higher
percentages of property vandalized compared to women (Berrill, 1992:26-27; Comstock, 1991:40; Smith, 1993:18).

Gay men and lesbians experienced almost equal percentages of assault with a weapon. Three percent of gay men reported assault with a weapon compared to three percent of lesbians, and one percent of bisexuals. None of the heterosexual respondents reported experiencing assault with a weapon. Men consistently experience higher percentages of assault with a weapon in American surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Smith, 1993:20; Samis, 1995:82; Comstock, 1991:40; Berrill, 1992:26-27).

Gay men experienced higher percentages of being spat upon compared to lesbians, bisexuals and heterosexuals. Nine percent of gay men had been spat upon compared to six percent of lesbians, and less than one percent each of bisexuals and heterosexuals. This finding is consistent with other North American research with finds that gay men report higher percentages of being spat upon compared to lesbian women (Berrill, 1992:26-27; Comstock, 1991:40; Smith, 1993:18).

Heterosexual respondents reported having experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence in every victimization category except assault with a weapon and assault by police. This reveals that lesbian, gay, and bisexual respondents are not the only victims and that some heterosexual respondents also experience anti-gay/lesbian violence because they are presumed to be gay or lesbian. No other Canadian or American survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence included heterosexual respondents in its sample population, which limits comparison with other studies.

6.7 Victimization and Transgender status from the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

The low survey response from transgenderists means that the statistics are fairly unreliable in terms of providing a "truth" about their experience of violence. However, in the context of this study the fact that transgenderists answered the victimization scale does merit comment. The 18 transgendered participants reported experiencing verbal assaults, threats of physical assault, being chased and followed, and sexual harassment. Thirty-three percent of transgendered participants were sexually harassed. Thirty-three percent were verbally assaulted, 22.2 percent were threatened with physical violence, and 16.6 percent were chased or followed. Five percent had experienced property damage and five percent had objects thrown at them. Five percent were sexually assaulted and five percent were harassed by police. None of the
transgendered participants had been spat upon, punched, kicked or beaten, assaulted by police, and assaulted with a weapon. This may indicate that they have not experienced this form of victimization, but this seems unlikely considering the fact that they experienced occurrences of victimization in other categories.

Transgendered participants experienced higher percentages of sexual harassment compared to women and men in the Toronto sample. Thirty-three percent of transgendered participants were sexually harassed compared to 20.3 percent of women and 17.1 percent of men. Transgendered participants reported almost equal percentages of verbal assaults and threats of physical violence compared to women. Thirty-three percent of transgendered participants were verbally assaulted compared to 31.9 percent of women. And 22.2 percent of transgendered participants were threatened with physical assault compared to 18.5 percent of women.

When asked who the perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence were, six transgendered respondents were attacked by men in the public domain, three by co-workers at work, two by students in school, and one by a family member in an unspecified location.

Comparison of the above findings on anti-gay/lesbian violence experienced by transgendered respondents with other anti-gay/lesbian violence studies is limited because transgendered participants are not asked to identify in most North American anti-gay/lesbian violence studies (NCAVP, 1996). However, GenderPac’s first national survey on trans-violence reports that 48 percent of respondents reported having been victims of some kind of assault (including assault with a weapon, assault without a weapon, sexual assault, and rape). In addition, the survey reports that 60 percent reported being a victim of harassment or violence, with 95 percent of the worst incidents involving at least two to three perpetrators (Wayves, 1997:15).

6.8 Victimization by Income Levels in the Toronto Survey, 1995-1996

The lifetime victimization experiences of those in the three major income levels were compared. It was found that most of those in the lowest income range experienced the highest percentage of lifetime victimization in all of the victimization categories except for the category of verbal assault and threatened with physical assault where those who are in the lower and high-range income level experienced almost equal amounts of lifetime victimization. The lowest income range is $1-19,999, followed by $20,000-39,999 and $40,000-80,000. This finding
reflects that those in the lowest income group are more exposed to acts of homophobic intimidation and assault. Women are overrepresented in the lowest income level (38 percent of women and 28 percent of men).

Those in the middle-income range experienced higher percentages of verbal assault (29.2 percent) and threats of physical assault (19.9 percent) compared to those in the low and high income ranges. Twenty-four percent of those in the lower and higher income ranges experienced verbal assault. Seventeen (17.7) percent of those from the lower income range experienced threats of physical assault compared to 15 percent of those in the highest income range. Six percent of those in the lowest income range had personal property damaged or devastated, nine percent had objects thrown. 14.2 percent were chased/followed, seven percent were spat upon, six percent were punched, kicked, beaten, three percent were assaulted with a weapon. 14.9 percent were sexually harassed without assault, seven percent sexually assaulted, nine percent harassed by police without assault, and three percent beaten or assaulted by police.

While studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence report breakdowns of income levels there is little information on the relationship between income and experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Comstock (1991) is one of the few published American research which provides information on this relationship (Comstock, 1991:37, 45, 141). Comstock's overview of American surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence shows that a higher percentage of middle-income people report violent experiences than do those with lower or upper incomes. He also found that more women from lower-class backgrounds and more men from upper-class backgrounds fell within his general anti-gay/lesbian violence experience category than those from other class backgrounds (Comstock, 1991:38).

6.9 Victimization by Race/Ethnicity in the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

The percentages of lifetime occurrences of victimization provided by Caucasian and ethnic minority participants were compared. The categories which developed from those who self-identified their race and ethnicity could be used to study specific racial, ethnic, or cultural subgroups, since in this thesis, the broadest possible view was taken by allowing participants to self-identify. However, while there is much overlap and diversity between groups in this sample, for the purposes of statistical comparison, people who used terms to describe themselves such as Black, East Asian, Hispanic, Jewish, Middle Eastern, South Asian, South East Asian, are
combined to establish the category "ethnic minority" (20.6 percent). The very common response of "white" as well as those who reported being Canadian, French Canadian, American, Australian, or northern European, are designated as Caucasian (79.4 percent) unless respondents used another term to indicate that they were not. In every victimization category ethnic minority respondents experienced lower percentages of victimization than Caucasians.

Caucasians reported greater lifetime experiences of most forms of anti-gay/lesbian violence and victimization compared to ethnic minorities. Caucasians and ethnic minorities experienced almost equal percentages of objects thrown. Sixty-one (61.8) percent of Caucasians were verbally assaulted compared to 14.7 percent of ethnic minorities. Twenty-seven (27.8) percent of Caucasians were chased or followed compared to eight percent of ethnic minorities. Ten (10.3) percent of Caucasians were spat upon compared to six percent of ethnic minorities. Fourteen (14.6) percent of Caucasians were punched, kicked or beaten compared to six percent of ethnic minorities. Twenty-nine percent of Caucasians were sexually harassed compared to nine percent of Caucasians. Three percent of Caucasians were beaten or assaulted by police compared to one percent of ethnic minorities.

The statistics from the Toronto study are not supported by other North American statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence. American research which breaks down the respondent population by race and gender finds that ethnic minorities are more likely to be chased, beaten and spat upon than Caucasians (Comstock, 1991:40-43, 55; Von Schulthess, 1992:29). Comstock's national study shows higher rates of victimization for ethnic minorities except in the subcategory of vandalism or arson (Comstock, 1991:46). Comstock also found that ethnic minority lesbians show higher rates of victimization than Caucasian lesbians, and gay Caucasian men tend to report higher rates of victimization than ethnic minority men (Comstock, 1991:42-43).

Additional Canadian research with larger and more representative samples of ethnic minority lesbians and gay men is clearly needed to assess the relationship between membership in minority racial and ethnic groups and the risk of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

6.10 Victimization by Identification in a Lesbian Or Gay Community from the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

Toronto respondents who identify with a lesbian or gay community show a significantly higher level of victimization than those who do not identify with a gay or lesbian community.
however, those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community report higher levels of fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence. In all victimization categories those who do identify with a gay or lesbian community experienced higher incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence since the age of sixteen. In comparison to those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community, the high percentages of assault experienced by members suggests that those who do identify with a gay or lesbian community experience more lifetime incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The Toronto finding is consistent with other Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence research which finds that those who are members of a lesbian or gay community experience the highest percentages of victimization (Samis, 1995:90-95).

6.11 Experience of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Age from the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

The wide age range of respondents was narrowed into three categories for the purpose of comparison. When cross-tabulated with the victimization scale it was found that those in the lowest (15 to 29) and the middle (30 to 44) age ranges shared high percentages of incidents. However, those in the highest age range showed high percentages of victimization in some categories. In comparison with the three age ranges, those 15 to 29 years of age showed higher percentages of personal property damaged, objects thrown at them, chased/followed, spat upon, assault and wounded with a weapon, harassment by police without assault, and beaten by police. Six percent of those in the 15 to 29 age range had personal property damaged, nine percent had objects thrown at them. 14.2 percent were chased or followed, seven percent were spat upon, three percent were assaulted and wounded with a weapon, nine percent were harassed by police without assault and three percent were beaten or assaulted by police.

Those in the lowest and middle age ranges showed almost equal percentages of sexual harassment without assault and sexual assault. Fourteen percent of those in the 15 to 29 and the 30 to 44 age ranges were sexually harassed without assault. Seven percent of those in the 15 to 29 and the 30 to 44 age ranges were sexually assaulted.

Those in the 15 to 29 age range and 30 to 44 age range shared equally high percentages of verbal assault, threats of physical assault, and having objects thrown at them. Twenty-nine percent of those in the 30 to 44 age range were verbally assaulted compared to 24 percent in the 15 to 29 age range. Nineteen percent of those in the 30 to 44 age range were threatened with physical assault compared to 17.7 percent in the lowest income range. Nine percent of those in
the 15 to 29 age range had objects thrown at them compared to eight percent of those in the 30 to 44 age range.

Only one published North American study on anti-gay/lesbian violence provides detailed information of the relationship between the age of victims and the age of perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Comstock's national study found that men are more frequently victimized by perpetrators younger than them, while women are more frequently victimized by perpetrators older than them (Comstock, 1991:60).

The above findings suggest that those in the youngest age range experience the most anti-gay/lesbian violence. Those who are most socially vulnerable -- youth, those who are out, and those with less socio-economic status -- tend to show higher percentages of victimization.

6.12 Experience of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Partnership Status from the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

Respondents who do not live with a partner are more likely to show higher percentages of victimization compared to those living with a partner; however, in many categories the percentages are somewhat similar. In all victimization categories, except assault with a weapon and assault by police, those who do not live with a partner show much higher percentages of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Four percent of those living with a partner were assaulted and wounded with a weapon compared to three percent of those not living with a partner. Two percent of those not living with a partner and two percent of those living with a partner were beaten or assaulted by police. The higher percentage of victimization by those who are not living with a partner may be due to complex factors such as whether they are likely to go out more at night or frequent bars and gay community events where they might be targeted. The higher experience of victimization by single respondents may be due to the fact that they are often alone in public places and therefore may be seen to be easy targets by perpetrators. It would seem by the responses to this question that those in a relationship and living with a partner enjoy more protection from attacks of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

None of the published North American studies provide information on the experience of violence by relationship status.
6.13 The Experience of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence by Location from the Toronto Survey 1995-1996

It was expected that those living in Toronto and the Greater Toronto area would consistently show higher percentages of experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence. This was found to be true. However, in many categories those living outside Toronto showed high percentages of victimization. Fifty-one percent of those living in Toronto were verbally assaulted at least once since the age of sixteen compared to 25 percent of those living outside Toronto. Thirty-two (32.7) percent of those living in Toronto were threatened with physical assault compared to 17.6 percent of those living outside Toronto. Twenty-six (26.6) percent of those living in Toronto were sexually harassed without assault compared to 12.0 percent of those living outside Toronto. Twenty-five percent of those living in Toronto were chased and followed compared to 12.4 percent of those living outside Toronto. Nineteen (19.9) percent of those living in Toronto had objects thrown at them compared to six percent living outside Toronto. Seventeen percent of those living in Toronto were sexually assaulted compared to four percent of those living outside Toronto. Fifteen percent of those living in Toronto had been punched, kicked, or beaten, 13.0 percent harassed by police without assault, 13.4 percent spat upon, 11.9 percent had personal property damaged, six percent were assaulted and wounded with a weapon, and three percent were beaten or assaulted by police. Six percent of those living outside Toronto had been punched, kicked, beaten, seven percent harassed by police without assault, three percent spat upon, seven percent had personal property damaged, one percent were assaulted and wounded with a weapon, and one percent were beaten or assaulted by police.

Anti-gay/lesbian violence is often thought to be an urban problem that does not concern those living in rural or smaller city areas. While the above statistics reveal that those living in Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area (now Mega-Toronto) do experience higher percentages of victimization since the age of sixteen, the statistics also show that those living outside Toronto experience the same kinds of victimization.

Because this question was not asked in most other North American surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence comparison with the Toronto findings is difficult (Samis, 1995:98-101).
6.14 Comparison of the 1995 and 1996 Survey Victimization Responses

Comparison of the 1995 and 1996 Toronto data reveal very little difference in the incidence of victimization reported by the total respondents over the two year period. In the 1995 data sample 26 percent of respondents reported having objects thrown at them, while 33 percent of the 1996 respondents reported having experienced this form of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

More respondents reported being chased and followed in 1995 than in 1996 (37 percent to 33 percent).

More respondents reported being punched, kicked and beaten in 1996 than in 1995. Incidences of physical 'gay bashing' in 1995 were 29 percent, while in 1996, 28 percent reported experiencing physical assault.

Reports of assault with a weapon also increased between 1995 and 1996. Seven percent of respondents reported assault with a weapon in 1995 compared to 12 percent in 1996.

Sexual harassment rose by 12 percent over the two years, while sexual assault declined by three percent. Thirty-six percent of respondents reported sexual harassment in 1995 compared with 48 percent in 1996. There were three percent fewer reports of sexual assault in 1996 compared with 1995.

Harassment by police rose by four percent in 1996. Twenty percent of respondents reported harassment by police in 1995 and 25 percent in 1996. Reports of assaults by police declined in 1996 by one percent.

6.15 Conclusions

The 1995-1996 Toronto survey provides valuable information about the amount and forms of anti-gay/lesbian violence that are experienced by people attending Pride Day celebrations in Toronto. While not representative of all lesbians and gays, the statistical data collected in Toronto and across Canada are a beginning in the process of identifying, explaining and finding solutions for patterns of violence and victimization in the lives of lesbians, bisexuals and gay men. Attention also needs to be paid to how systemic and institutional discrimination against lesbians and gay men in Canada fosters a climate where anti-gay/lesbian violence is tolerated.

Seventy-seven percent of survey respondents reported experiencing verbal assaults. This finding contrasts with other Canadian and American research. Fifty-one percent of respondents
said they had been threatened with physical violence. Thirty-seven percent were chased or followed. This percentage is comparable with findings in other Canadian and American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Twenty-two percent were punched, kicked or beaten once and twice or more since the age of sixteen because someone assumed them to be lesbian or gay. This percentage is higher than the percentage found in American surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Thirty-eight percent of Toronto respondents had been sexually harassed. Canadian surveys with higher female representation show higher percentages of sexual harassment. Thirty-seven percent of respondents had objects thrown at them. Canadian participants living in urban centres show higher percentages of having objects thrown at them. Twenty-one percent of Toronto respondents reported harassment from police. New Brunswick and Toronto respondents showed slightly higher percentages of harassment by police compared to respondents from Nova Scotia and Vancouver. Nineteen percent of Toronto respondents had property damaged. This percentage is comparable to that found in other North American studies. However, Nova Scotia respondents show a much lower percentage of property damage compared to respondents in the New Brunswick and Toronto study. Seventeen percent of Toronto respondents had been spat upon. This percentage is higher than that found in other Canadian studies but lower than percentages found in American studies. Seventeen percent of Toronto respondents were sexually assaulted. This percentage corresponds with other Canadian findings however, the percentage of American respondents reporting sexual assault is lower. Eight percent of Toronto respondents were assaulted with a weapon. This percentage is comparable with other North American studies. Five percent of Toronto respondents were assaulted by police. Respondents living in urban areas report higher percentages of victimization by police. Respondents to American surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence report lower percentages of assault by police compared to Canadian respondents.

Transgendered respondents reported anti-gay/lesbian violence in all but four victimization categories. It is notable that the highest percentage of victimization transgenderists experienced was in the category of sexual harassment.

Ethnic Minority respondents reported lower lifetime occurrences of victimization in every category compared to Caucasian respondents. The low numbers of ethnic minority respondents prevents a comparison of lifetime experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence with that of Caucasian respondents. More representative samples are needed.
Those in the lowest income level range had higher lifetime victimization incidents in almost every category compared to those in the mid and upper income levels. Those with lower socio-economic status are more susceptible to experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Those in the lowest and middle age ranges (15 to 29 and 30 to 44) shared high percentages of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Younger respondents are more vulnerable to exposure to anti-gay/lesbian violence of some kind.

Respondents who do not live with a partner showed higher percentages of victimization compared to those who do live with a partner. There is limited information on partnership status and victimization in other anti-gay/lesbian violence studies.

Those living in urban areas show higher percentages of victimization however, in some categories urban and rural respondents report similar percentages of victimization. This finding undercuts the notion that anti-gay/lesbian violence is predominantly an urban problem.

Those who identify with a gay or lesbian community are more likely to experience anti-gay/lesbian violence in every victimization category except being spat upon and being beaten or assaulted by police compared to those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community. Those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community show greater fear of experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Analysis of the Toronto survey data reveals differences based on sex in the incidences of victimization. Men experienced higher rates of violence in all categories except assault with a weapon and sexual harassment. Gay men reported higher incidences of victimization and violence than did lesbians. Women experienced higher incidences of lifetime victimization in the categories of assault with a weapon, sexual harassment, and sexual assault. Lesbians may have difficulty determining whether a violent incident was an anti-lesbian attack or an anti-woman attack. This may explain the lower occurrence of victimization based on sexual orientation reported by lesbian respondents.

Gay identified respondents consistently showed higher incidences of victimization than lesbians in all categories except for being assaulted with a weapon, and being sexually harassed. Lesbians consistently report higher lifetime incidences of sexual harassment. An almost equal percent of lesbians and gay men report assault with a weapon.

Heterosexual respondents, 76 percent of whom are women, reported having experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence at least once since the age of sixteen in every victimization category.
except assault with a weapon and assault by police. The finding reveals that lesbian, gay, and bisexual respondents are not the only targets of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The survey provides a context for further understanding physical and verbal assaults experienced by lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, heterosexuals and transgendered persons in Toronto and allows comparisons to be made with research from other lesbian and gay communities in Canada and the United States.

Comparison of survey data collected over a two year period in Toronto reveals that incidences of victimization are consistent over that period. The information gained from the survey research and comparative studies of other experiences of anti-gay/lesbian attacks shows that lesbians and gay men are subject to verbal harassment, threats of violence and/or violent assaults during the course of their daily lives. Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals have been victims in other communities in Canada. Those who filled out similar anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys in Vancouver, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick using a similar scale revealed comparable incidences of victimization.
CHAPTER SEVEN
DISCUSSION OF SURVEY FINDINGS:
THE PERPETRATORS AND LOCATIONS OF ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE

7.1 Introduction

This section will examine the qualitative responses given to the 1995-1996 Toronto survey question which asked respondents to state where they were assaulted and who the perpetrators were. Out of 439 survey respondents, 256 (58 percent) reported the location of assaults and gave information on their perpetrators.

The following chapter is divided into two sections on the perpetrators and locations of anti-gay/lesbian violence. In each section I will provide an overview of the trends evolving from the data. I will provide analysis of the responses by percentages and rank. I will list in descending order of frequency the perpetrators and locations in which respondents to my survey reported experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence. I will compare the findings from my study with other North American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The findings reveal that lesbians and gay men are subject to anti-gay/lesbian harassment and violence in everyday situations. Survey respondents gave a wide range of locations where they had experienced anti-gay/lesbian assault and harassment because someone presumed them to be lesbian or gay. Many respondents gave more than one location. Men and women typically reported different types of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

7.2 Qualitative Data on Perpetrators and Locations of Assault

There was a wide range of responses to the question about the location and perpetrators of the assaults. Many gave multiple responses; therefore the qualitative data responses could not be added to represent a total response rate per respondent. In order to provide an overview of the trends in responses I synthesized the data into major categories.

It should be stressed that the qualitative responses elicit patterns and themes which were not prompted by the researcher; thus trends evolved out of respondents' own recollections of incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Comparison of the Toronto findings with other studies of perpetrators is difficult because as a group perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence have not been studied or surveyed, nor is the
rate of perpetrators in the general population known (Comstock, 1991:56). Only Comstock’s national survey and those conducted by the NGLTF and Potter provide detailed information about perpetrators (Comstock, 1991; NGLTF, 1984; Potter, 1987). The information that respondents to my survey provided about perpetrators is contrasted with these findings in the following discussion.

7.3 The Perpetrators of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

There were a wide range of qualitative responses given by 258 respondents to the question of who the perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence were. The coding process was guided by these responses. Seventy-eight percent of perpetrators committed the crime in the public domain. The majority of perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian harassment and assault were adult or adolescent men in the public domain. Of these perpetrators 39 were described as young men and 63 were described as adult men. Sixty-two unidentified strangers were reported by respondents to be assailants. Twenty-six perpetrators were affiliated with schools. Family and friends in the private domain totaled 11 perpetrators. There were 13 co-workers listed by respondents as perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian harassment or assault.

The following section will discuss the wide range of qualitative responses regarding perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. I will provide the rank order and percentages of perpetrators by gender, sexual orientation, and race and I will contrast the findings with other research on anti-gay/lesbian violence.

7.3(a) Sex/Gender of Victims

Women reported higher percentages of victimization from people they knew such as co-workers and family members, other women, adult males, and professionals, while men reported higher percentages of victimization from male youth, students, friends, police, strangers, people in vehicles, and others. By sex/gender, 43.4 percent of women and 35.8 percent of men were assaulted or harassed by male youth and male adults. Women (31.1 percent) were more likely than men (17.9 percent) to be attacked by adult men. However, more men (29.1 percent) than women (18.9 percent) were victimized by unidentified strangers whose gender was not reported. These perpetrators are likely to be men. Ten percent of males and nine percent of females experienced assault from fellow-students. Men (five percent) were more likely to be assaulted by
police in comparison to women (two percent). Eight percent of men were assaulted by people in vehicles compared to less than one percent of women. Two percent of men and one percent of women were assaulted by friends. Eight percent of women, and two percent of men were victimized by co-workers. Five percent of women were victimized by family and friends compared to less than two percent of men. Women (five percent) were most likely to be assaulted by other women. None of the men were assaulted by women. One percent of women were assaulted by professionals while less than one percent of men were assaulted by professionals.

7.3(b) Sexual Orientation of Victims

Gay men reported higher percentages of assaults from perpetrators compared to lesbians. Overall, gay men reported 46 percent of assaults from all perpetrators. Lesbians reported 35 percent of the attacks from all perpetrators compared to 13 percent of bisexuals and seven percent of heterosexual respondents.

Lesbians were more likely to be assaulted by male youth and male adults than gays, bisexuals, and heterosexuals. Forty-eight percent of lesbian women were assaulted by male adults and male youth, compared to 39.2 percent of gay men. 25.8 percent of bisexuals and 37.6 percent of heterosexuals. This trend is unusual in studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence where it is assumed that gay men are more likely to be assaulted by other men compared to lesbians.

Heterosexuals were more likely to be assaulted by unidentified strangers than lesbians, gays, and bisexuals. Thirty-seven percent of heterosexuals were assaulted by unidentified strangers who assumed they were lesbian or gay compared to 26.8 percent of gay men, 19.4 percent of bisexuals, and 18.8 percent of lesbians.

Bisexuals were more likely to be assaulted by students than gays, lesbians, and heterosexuals. Nineteen percent of bisexuals reported incidents of assault from students, compared to 10.7 percent of gay men, seven percent of lesbians, and six percent of heterosexual respondents.

Surprisingly, heterosexuals reported the highest percentage of assaults by co-workers. Thirteen percent of heterosexuals reported assaults by co-workers compared to nine percent of bisexual respondents, eight percent of lesbians, and one percent of gay men.

Bisexual and lesbian respondents reported a higher percentage of assault from family and friends than gay and heterosexual respondents. There are more female than male bisexual
respondents. Six percent of bisexual respondents compared to five percent of lesbians and two percent of gay men reported assaults from family and friends. Heterosexual respondents did not report assaults from family and friends.

7.3(c) Race/Ethnicity of Victims

Ethnic minorities reported higher percentages of victimization from co-workers, students, women, strangers, and male youth than did Caucasians. Six percent of ethnic minorities and four percent of Caucasians were victimized by co-workers. Seventeen percent of ethnic minorities reported assault from students in school compared to eight percent of Caucasians. Six percent of ethnic minorities reported assault from women compared to two percent of Caucasians. Twenty-five percent of ethnic minorities were assaulted by strangers and seventeen percent were assaulted by male youth. Ethnic minorities report a much lower percentage of assault by adult males compared to Caucasians. Twenty-seven percent of Caucasians had been assaulted by adult males compared to 12 percent of ethnic minorities. Caucasians were slightly more likely to report assault from police and assault from people in vehicles compared to ethnic minorities. Five percent of Caucasians compared to two percent of ethnic minorities reported assault from family and friends.

7.4 The Perpetrator Population

7.4(a) Adult Men

Adult men, the majority of whom were unidentified strangers, were listed most often as the perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto survey respondents. Twenty-four percent (63) of survey respondents reported adult men as perpetrators. This finding is consistent with other North American research. In Comstock's national study men were the perpetrators in the majority of incidents: 95 percent of the perpetrators were identified as men (Comstock, 1991:57).17

Women were more likely to list adult men as perpetrators than men. Thirty-one percent of women and 17.9 percent of men experienced victimization from adult males. Lesbians were slightly more likely to be attacked by adult men than heterosexuals, bisexuals, and gays. Thirty-two percent of lesbians were victimized by adult men compared to 31.3 percent of heterosexuals, 22.6 percent of bisexuals, and 19.6 percent of gays. Caucasians were more likely than ethnic
minorities to be victimized by adult men. Twenty-seven percent of Caucasians were victimized by adult men compared to 12.8 percent of ethnic minorities. The high percentage of women and lesbians who listed adult men as perpetrators is surprising when most studies suggest men are most likely to be attacked by other men.

The highest report of victimization is from adult men. Women reported adult men more often as perpetrators than did men. Women reported adult men to be the most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence while men reported adult men to be the second most frequent perpetrators. Both lesbians and bisexuals reported adult men as the most frequent perpetrators while gays and heterosexuals reported adult men as the second most common perpetrators. Caucasians reported adult men as the most frequent perpetrators while ethnic minorities reported adult men fourth.

7.4(b) Unidentified Strangers

Unidentified strangers whose gender was not given were listed by Toronto respondents as the second most common perpetrator of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Twenty-four percent (62) of Toronto respondents listed unidentified strangers as perpetrators. This finding is inconsistent with Comstock's national study which found that unknown persons are rated most frequently as perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Comstock, 1991:57). In three North American studies at least sixty-five percent of respondents had been assaulted by an unknown person (Comstock, 1991:57; Berrill, 1983; Potter, 1987:39).

Men in the Toronto study were more likely than women to be victimized by unidentified strangers. Twenty-nine percent of men and 18.9 percent of women were attacked by unidentified strangers. Gays, heterosexuals, and bisexuals reported higher percentages of victimization by unidentified strangers than lesbians. Thirty-seven percent of heterosexuals were attacked by unidentified strangers compared to 26.8 percent of gay men, 19.4 percent of bisexuals, and 18.8 percent of lesbians. Ethnic minorities were slightly more likely to be attacked by strangers than Caucasians. Twenty-five percent of ethnic minorities were attacked by strangers compared to 23.7 percent of Caucasians.

Men reported strangers as the most frequent perpetrators while women reported strangers second. This finding differs slightly from Comstock's national study which shows that both men and women reported unknown persons to be the most frequent perpetrators (Comstock, 1991:57).
Gay men and heterosexuals reported strangers as the most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence while lesbians and bisexuals reported strangers second. Ethnic minorities reported strangers as the most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence while Caucasians reported them second.

7.4(c) Male Youth

Male youth were listed as the third most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Fifteen percent (39) of respondents to this question listed male youth as perpetrators. This percentage is lower than that found in other North American studies. In three other North American studies nearly one-half of all the perpetrators were twenty-one years of age and younger, with the great majority less than twenty-eight years old (Comstock, 1991:59; CUAV, 1979-1980; Potter, 1987:39).

Men in the Toronto study reported a higher percentage of attacks from male youth compared to women. Seventeen percent of men listed male youth as perpetrators compared to 12.3 percent of women. Gay men and lesbians were more likely to be attacked by male youth than bisexuals and heterosexuals. Nineteen percent of gay men and 15.3 percent of lesbians were attacked by male youth compared to six percent of heterosexuals and three percent of bisexuals. Ethnic minorities were slightly more likely to be attacked by male youth than Caucasians. Seventeen percent of ethnic minorities were attacked by male youth compared to 15.2 percent of Caucasians.

Both women and men reported male youth as the third most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Both lesbians and gays reported male youth as the third most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Heterosexuals reported male youth as the fourth most frequent perpetrators while bisexuals reported male youth seventh. Ethnic minorities reported male youth as the second most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence while Caucasians reported male youth third.

7.4(d) Students

Students were listed as the fourth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Ten percent (26) of respondents reported students as perpetrators. This finding is similar to that found by one other national North American study in which Comstock
found that fellow students accounted for 13 percent of the perpetrators (Comstock, 1991:57). Men and women reported almost equal percentages of victimization by students. Ten percent of men and nine percent of women reported students as perpetrators. Bisexuals and gay men reported higher percentages of victimization by students compared to lesbians and heterosexuals. Nineteen percent of bisexuals and ten percent of gay men reported victimization by students compared to seven percent of lesbians and six percent of heterosexuals. Ethnic minorities were more likely to report students as perpetrators compared to Caucasians. Seventeen percent of ethnic minorities reported attacks by students compared to eight percent of Caucasians.

Both women and men reported students as the fourth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. This finding differs slightly from Comstock's national study in which fellow students were rated the second most frequent perpetrators (Comstock, 1991:57). Bisexuals reported students higher than gays, lesbians and heterosexuals. Bisexuals reported students as the third most frequent perpetrators while gays reported students fourth, and lesbians and heterosexuals reported them the fifth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Ethnic minorities reported students as the third most frequent perpetrators while Caucasians reported students fourth.

7.4(e) Co-Workers

Co-workers were reported to be the fifth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Five percent (13) of respondents reported co-workers as perpetrators. This finding is comparable to that found by Comstock who reports that four percent of respondents listed co-workers as perpetrators (Comstock, 1991:57). Women were more likely to list co-workers as perpetrators compared to men. Eight percent of women listed co-workers as perpetrators compared to two percent of men. Heterosexuals and bisexuals were more likely to be attacked by co-workers than lesbians and gay men. Twelve percent of heterosexuals and nine percent of bisexuals were victimized by co-workers in contrast to nine percent of bisexuals and less than one percent of gay men. Ethnic minorities were more likely to be attacked by co-workers compared to Caucasians. Six percent of ethnic minorities were attacked by co-workers compared to four percent of Caucasians.
Women reported co-workers as perpetrators more often than did men. Women reported co-workers as the fifth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence compared to men who reported co-workers ninth. This finding is comparable to Comstock's finding that co-workers were the fifth most frequent perpetrator of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Comstock, 1991:57). However, unlike the Toronto study Comstock reports no difference between men and women in the reports of co-workers as perpetrators (Comstock, 1991:57). Lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals reported co-workers more often than did gay men. Lesbians reported co-workers as the fourth most frequent perpetrator group while heterosexuals reported them third and bisexuals reported them fifth. Gays reported co-workers as the tenth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Ethnic minorities reported co-workers as the sixth most frequent perpetrators while Caucasians reported co-workers as the seventh most frequent perpetrators.

7.4(f) People in Vehicles

People in vehicles were reported to be the sixth most common perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Five percent (12) of respondents reported victimization by people in vehicles. No other studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence report people driving by in vehicles as perpetrators. Men were much more likely to report victimization from people in vehicles than women. Eight percent of men reported victimization from people in vehicles compared to less than one percent of women. Bisexuals and gay men reported victimization from people in vehicles while no lesbians or heterosexuals reported victimization from people in vehicles. Nine percent of bisexuals and seven percent of gay men were attacked by people in vehicles. Caucasians and ethnic minorities were equally likely to be attacked by people in vehicles. Five percent of Caucasians were attacked by people in vehicles compared to four percent of ethnic minorities.

More men than women reported drivers as perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Men reported drivers the fifth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence while women reported drivers twelfth. Bisexuals reported drivers to be the fourth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence while gays reported them fifth. None of the lesbians or heterosexuals were victimized by drivers. Caucasians reported drivers as the fifth most frequent perpetrator group while ethnic minorities reported them eighth.
7.4(g) Others as Perpetrators

Other perpetrators such as taxi cab drivers, ex-partners, house guests, lesbian and gay community groups, prostitutes, neighbours, and skin heads constituted responses totalling one percent or less. Others were listed as the seventh most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Combined, the "other" category constituted three percent (11) of the perpetrators listed by Toronto respondents. In Comstock's national study two percent of perpetrators are neighbours, and neighbours are reported to be the eighth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Comstock, 1991:57). Men were more likely than women to list perpetrators from the other category. Five percent of men and three percent of women listed people in the other category as perpetrators. More bisexuals, than gays, and lesbians reported victimization from persons listed in the other category. Nine percent of bisexuals, four percent of gays, and two percent of lesbians were victimized by perpetrators in the other category. Nine percent of bisexuals, four percent of gays, and two percent of lesbians were victimized by perpetrators in the other category. Ethnic minorities were more likely to be victimized by persons in the other category compared to Caucasians. Six percent of ethnic minorities were attacked by perpetrators listed in the "other" category compared to three percent of Caucasians.

7.4(h) Police

Police were listed as the eighth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Four (11) percent of respondents were victimized by police. This percentage is comparable with that found in other North American studies in which perpetrators were listed as police officers (Comstock, 1991:57; NGLTF, June 1984; Philadelphia, June, 1986; Maine, 1985; Morgen, 1988; Vermont, 1987). Men were slightly more likely to report police as perpetrators compared to women. Five percent of men and two percent of women reported police as perpetrators. This percentage difference between men and women is found in other North American studies (Comstock, 1991:57; Vermont, 1987; Philadelphia, 1986). Gays and lesbians reported police as perpetrators while none of the bisexuals and heterosexuals reported police as perpetrators. Six percent of gay men and two percent of lesbians reported police as perpetrators. Caucasians were more likely to be victimized by police than ethnic minorities. Six percent of Caucasians and two percent of ethnic minorities were victimized by police.

Men reported police more frequently as perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence than did women. Men reported police as the sixth most frequent perpetrators while women reported police
ninth. This ranking is lower than that reported in one other North American study. In Comstock's (1991) national study both men and women ranked police as the third most frequent perpetrators (Comstock, 1991:57). Gay men reported police as the sixth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence while lesbians reported them eighth. None of the bisexuals or heterosexuals were victimized by police. Caucasians rated police higher than ethnic minorities. Caucasians reported police as the sixth most frequent perpetrators while ethnic minorities rated them ninth.

7.4(i) Women

Women were listed as the ninth most frequent perpetrator of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Three percent (7) of respondents listed women as perpetrators. While women reported other women as perpetrators none of the men reported women as perpetrators. Five percent of women reported other women as perpetrators. These findings are comparable to those found in Comstock's national study in which women report a higher rate of victimization by female perpetrators than do men (15 percent and one percent, respectively) (Comstock, 1991:59). Women were also more likely to be victimized by other women, alone or in a group than were men (seven percent and zero percent, respectively) (Comstock, 1991:59). Lesbians and gays reported women as perpetrators while none of the bisexuals or heterosexuals reported women as perpetrators. Five percent of lesbians and less than one percent of gays reported women as perpetrators. Ethnic minorities were more likely to report women as perpetrators compared to Caucasians. Six percent of ethnic minorities were victimized by women compared to two percent of Caucasians.

Women reported women as perpetrators more frequently than did men. Women reported other women as the sixth most frequent perpetrators while none of the men was victimized by women. In Comstock's (1991) national study women were reported to be the twelfth most frequent perpetrators. Women ranked other women as the tenth and men ranked women the eleventh most frequent perpetrator (Comstock, 1991:57). Lesbians reported women as the seventh most frequent perpetrator while gays reported women twelfth. None of the bisexuals or heterosexuals were victimized by women. Ethnic minorities reported women as the fifth most frequent perpetrators while Caucasians reported women as the eleventh most frequent perpetrator group.
7.4(j) Family/Relative

Family members were listed as the tenth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Two percent (6) of Toronto respondents reported family members as perpetrators. Women were more likely to report family members as perpetrators than men. Four percent of women reported family members as perpetrators compared to less than one percent of men. Other North American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence report family members as perpetrators (Comstock, 1991:57; NGLTF, 1984: 26; Morgen, 1988:5-6). The family members listed by participants in Comstock's study are brothers, mothers, male relatives, male parents, and sisters (Comstock, 1991:57). Lesbians and bisexuals were more likely than gays and heterosexuals to report family members as perpetrators. Three percent of lesbians and three percent of bisexuals reported family members as perpetrators compared to one percent of gay men. None of the heterosexuals reported family members as perpetrators. Two percent of Caucasians reported family members as perpetrators while none of the ethnic minorities reported family members as perpetrators.

Women ranked family members as perpetrators more often than did men. Women reported family members as the seventh most frequent perpetrator group while men reported family members tenth. Lesbians reported family members as the seventh most frequent perpetrators while gays reported them eighth and bisexuals ranked them ninth. None of the heterosexuals reported family members as perpetrators. Caucasians reported family members as the ninth most frequent perpetrator group. None of the ethnic minorities were victimized by family members.

7.4(k) Friends

Friends were reported as the eleventh most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. Two percent (five) of respondents reported friends as perpetrators. Men were slightly more likely to report friends as perpetrators compared to women. Two percent of men and one percent of women reported friends as perpetrators. This finding is comparable with that found in Comstock's national study in which four percent of perpetrators were friends, including six percent of women and three percent of men (Comstock, 1991:57). Bisexuals and lesbians were more likely than gays and heterosexuals to report friends as perpetrators. Three percent of bisexuals and two percent of lesbians reported friends as
perpetrators compared to less than one percent of gay men. None of the heterosexuals reported friends as perpetrators. Ethnic minorities and Caucasians reported an equal percentage of victimization by friends. Two percent of ethnic minorities and two percent of Caucasians reported friends as perpetrators.

Men reported friends as perpetrators more often than did women. Men reported friends eighth while women reported friends as the tenth most likely perpetrator group. Comstock’s national survey reports that friends are the sixth most frequent perpetrator (Comstock, 1991:57). In contrast to the Toronto study, women in Comstock’s study reported friends as perpetrators more often than did men. Women reported friends as the fourth most frequent perpetrator while men reported friends as the seventh most frequent perpetrator (Comstock, 1991:57). Bisexuals reported friends higher as perpetrators than did gays and lesbians. Bisexuals reported friends as the eighth most likely perpetrators compared to lesbians and gays who reported friends ninth. None of the heterosexuals reported friends as perpetrators. Both Caucasians and ethnic minorities reported friends as the tenth most frequent perpetrators.

7.4(l) Professionals

Professionals were listed as the twelfth most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence by Toronto respondents. One percent (3) of respondents reported victimization by professionals. Men and women reported almost equal percentages of victimization by professionals. One percent of women and less than one percent of men were victimized by professionals. This finding is comparable with that found in Comstock’s national study. Comstock (1991) reports that one percent of participants were victimized by a doctor, including two percent of women and one percent of men (Comstock, 1991:57). Heterosexuals were more likely than lesbians and gay men to report professionals as perpetrators. Six percent of heterosexuals were victimized by professionals compared to one percent of lesbians and less than one percent of gays. Only one percent of Caucasians reported professionals as perpetrators compared to none of the ethnic minorities.

Both women and men reported professionals as the eleventh most likely perpetrator group. This finding is similar to that found by Comstock in which participants reported professionals as the eleventh most frequent perpetrator (Comstock, 1991:57). Men reported professionals the tenth and women reported professionals the thirteenth most frequent perpetrator
(Cornstock, 1991:57). Heterosexuals reported professionals as the sixth most frequent perpetrator group while lesbians and gays reported professionals as the eleventh most frequent perpetrator group. None of the bisexuals were attacked by professionals. Caucasians and ethnic minorities reported professionals as the least common perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

7.4(m) Summary

Findings from the Toronto survey are fairly typical in comparison with those found in other surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence which study perpetrators. However, the findings are limited to analysis of the gender, sexual orientation, and race and ethnicity of victims, and there are limited data on the sexual orientation, gender, and race and ethnicity of perpetrators. While American studies report strangers as the most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Toronto respondents report adult men to be the most frequent perpetrators. Toronto respondents also report male youth more frequently as perpetrators compared to other North American studies. And students are reported to be more frequent perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence in other North American studies compared to this study completed in Toronto. North American research also reports police more frequently as perpetrators compared to this study completed in Toronto. However, this study and other anti-gay/lesbian violence studies reported co-workers as perpetrators with equal frequency. The differences across survey findings are minimal and there are more similarities than differences. More importantly, the perpetrator categories identified by victims are consistent across North American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence and thus provide evidence for the validity of the Toronto research.

7.5 The Locations of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Assaults and Harassment 1995-1996

Survey respondents gave a wide range of locations where they had experienced anti-gay/lesbian assault and harassment because someone presumed them to be lesbian or gay. Many respondents gave more than one location. In the coding exercise the total number of locations given reflects the total number of times that location was mentioned by respondents, rather than the number of respondents who experienced violence in that context. The wide range of locations where respondents were assaulted are: the street, inside or outside a lesbian and gay bar or organization, at school, on subway or transit, at work, at home, in a mall, in a restaurant, in
restrooms, doctors' offices, cars, in community centres, parks, police stations, taxi cabs, and from cars on the street.

The following section will analyse by percentages the wide range of responses to the question about the locations of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

7.5(a) Attacks on the Street 1995-1996

The public domain was most often reported by Toronto survey respondents as the location of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Trends in American research are that most anti-gay/lesbian violence occurs on the street perpetrated by strangers (Comstock, 1991:48; Berrill, 1992). This trend was borne out by this study. Most Canadian research does not specify the locations where people were chased or followed but it is highly likely that these crimes occurred on the street (Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1990; Samis, 1995:84-86). Adult men were most often the perpetrators. Survey respondents reported that a total of 78 percent of all attacks took place in the public domain and 55 percent of these were on the street. Of the 144 perpetrators who attacked respondents on the street 24 percent were adult men, 24 percent unidentified strangers, 15 percent male youth, ten percent students, five percent co-workers, five percent strangers in vehicles, four percent police officers, three percent women, and two percent friends. One percent each were professionals, ex-partners, prostitutes, and “skinheads” (who may or may not have been members of an organized hate crime group).

The attacks on the street included verbal harassment, physical assault, having objects thrown at them or being chased. Often verbal harassment was a precursor to actual assaults. Respondents reported verbal harassment from people in passing cars and some were chased by people in cars. Women were less likely to report assaults from passing cars but were more likely to talk about men shouting to them as they walked on the street or men trying to touch them in public.

Men were more likely to be assaulted on the street. Sixty-three percent of men and 48 percent of women reported having experienced some kind of harassment or assault on the street. Gay men reported having been victimized on the street more often than lesbian women. Sixty-two percent of gay men compared with 51.8 percent of lesbians were assaulted on the street. Forty-five percent of bisexuals and 50 percent of heterosexuals reported assaults on the street.
because someone presumed them to be lesbian or gay. Men were identified most often as the perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian attacks on the street.

The street was reported as the number one location in which incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence were experienced by Toronto respondents. Both men and women reported the street as the number one location of victimization. Lesbians, gays, bisexuals and heterosexuals reported the street as the number one location of victimization. And both Caucasians and ethnic minorities reported the street as the number one location where they experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence.

7.5(b) Attacks at School

Schools are the second most likely location in which Toronto respondents experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence. Twelve percent of Toronto respondents reported at least one incident of anti-gay/lesbian violence in a school setting. This percentage is much lower than that reported in the majority of other Canadian and American anti-gay/lesbian violence studies (Berrell, 1992:21-22, 26-27, 32-33; Comstock, 1991:48-49; Smith, 1993:28; New Brunswick, 1991:32: Samis, 1995:80-83). Instances of homophobia and heterosexism in schools, colleges, and universities has been documented in other North American research (Herr, 1997; Rey & Gibson, 1997; Harris, 1997; Van de Ven, 1994; Savin-Williams, 1994; Herek, 1993; Friend, 1993; Crumpacker & Vander Haegen, 1993).

Nine percent of Pride Day respondents reported a single victimization incident in school while there was a total of 33 multiple incidents (13 percent). Women reported slightly more attacks in school than men. Thirteen percent of women experienced victimization in school compared to 12.7 percent of men. Surprisingly, heterosexual and bisexual respondents reported higher percentages of attacks in school than gays and lesbians. Nineteen percent of bisexuals and 12.5 percent of heterosexuals, compared to 11.6 percent of gay men and ten percent of lesbian women, said they experienced anti-gay/lesbian harassment or assault in school. The perpetrators of the attacks in school were predominantly other students known to the victims. The reported perpetrators of assaults at school were: sixteen friends, three male youth, two family members, one professional, and two unidentified strangers.

Schools were ranked as the second most likely location of victimization by all Toronto respondents. Both women and men ranked the school as the second most likely location of victimization. Gay men and bisexuals ranked schools as the second most likely location in which
they experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence while lesbians and heterosexuals ranked schools as the third most likely location for victimization. Both Caucasians and ethnic minorities ranked schools as the second most likely location of victimization.

7.5(c) Attacks Outside or Near Lesbian and Gay Bars or Organizations

Lesbian or gay bars or organizations were the third most frequent location of victimization. This finding is inconsistent with other American and Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence studies which find that attacks outside gay and lesbian businesses are reported as the most frequent locations of victimization (Comstock, 1991:48-51; Samis, 1995:84). There were 24 reports (nine percent) of attacks outside a lesbian and gay bar or organization. Women were more frequently assaulted near a lesbian and gay establishment than men. Thirteen percent of women and six percent of men were assaulted outside a lesbian and gay bar or organization. Heterosexual respondents reported a higher percentage of attacks outside a lesbian or gay bar or organization than lesbians, gays, and bisexuals. Eighteen percent of heterosexual respondents, 12.9 percent of lesbians, seven percent of bisexuals, and six percent of gay men said they had been assaulted outside a lesbian or gay bar or establishment. Men were most often cited as the perpetrators of these attacks. The 24 reported perpetrators were: 11 adult men, three youth, seven unidentified strangers, one woman, one person in a vehicle, and one taxi-cab driver.

Lesbian and gay organizations were reported as the third most common location in which Toronto respondents experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence. Both women and men reported lesbian and gay organizations as the third most common location of victimization. Lesbians and heterosexuals reported lesbian and gay organizations as the second most common location of victimization while gay men and bisexuals reported gay businesses as the fourth most frequent location of victimization. Caucasians reported lesbian and gay organizations as the third most frequent location of victimization while none of the ethnic minorities had been victimized near a lesbian or gay organization.

7.5(d) Assaults in the Private Domain/Home

The home was the fourth most common location where respondents experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence. Sixteen respondents (six percent) reported the home as the location of an anti-gay/lesbian assault. This percentage is lower than that found in other surveys of anti-
gay/lesbian violence in which between 16 to 41 percent of participants had been victimized by family members (Smith, 1993:39-40; Samis, 1995:80-83; Berrill, 1992:35; Comstock, 1991:48-52). Women and lesbians were slightly more likely than men to be assaulted in the home by perpetrators known to them. Seven percent of women and six percent of men reported anti-gay/lesbian victimization in the home. Eight percent of lesbian women, six percent of gay men, and six percent of bisexual respondents reported victimization in the home. No heterosexual respondents reported attacks in the home. Male family members were most often reported to have assaulted respondents in the home and most of the perpetrators were known to the victim. The reported perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian harassment or assault in the home were: six family members, four adult men, two neighbours, one male youth, one student, one friend, one unidentified stranger, and one guest.

The home is ranked as the fourth most likely location in which Toronto respondents experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence. Men reported the home as a more frequent location of victimization than women. Men reported the home as the fourth most common location of victimization while women reported the home fifth. Gay men reported the home as the third most frequent location of victimization while lesbians reported the home the fourth most frequent location of victimization. Bisexuals reported the home as the sixth most frequent location of victimization. None of the heterosexuals were victimized in the home. Caucasians reported the home to be the fourth most frequent location of victimization while ethnic minorities reported the home seventh.

7.5(e) Assaults at Work

Work is the fifth most likely location in which Toronto respondents experienced victimization. Six percent of Toronto survey respondents report that a total of 14 incidents of harassment or assault took place at work. Other Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence research show higher percentages of victimization at work (Samis, 1995:80; NBCHRR, 1991:31). The Toronto statistics are more comparable with American statistics than other Canadian statistics (Comstock, 1992:48-52). More women than men report sexual harassment or assault at work perpetrated by co-workers. Women report eight percent and men report three percent of attacks at work. More heterosexual respondents than lesbian, gay or bisexual respondents were assaulted or harassed at work because they were presumed to be lesbian or gay. Heterosexual respondents
report 12.5 percent of the assaults at work, bisexuals ten percent, lesbians eight percent, and gays two percent. The reported perpetrators of assaults at work were: ten co-workers, two police, one adult male, and one unidentified stranger. Many women cited sexual harassment by co-workers at work. Respondents cite co-workers to be the perpetrators in the majority of work related incidents.

Women report work as a more common location of victimization compared to men. Women report work as the fourth most frequent location of victimization compared to men who report work fifth. Bisexuals report work as the third most common location of victimization compared to lesbians and heterosexuals who report work as the fourth most frequent location of victimization. Gays report work as the eighth most common location of victimization. Ethnic minorities are more likely to be victimized at work compared to Caucasians. Ethnic minorities report work as the fourth most frequent location of victimization while Caucasians reported it fifth.

7.5(f) Assaults on Public Transit

Public transit is the sixth most likely location in which Toronto respondents experienced victimization. There was a total of seven reports of anti-gay/lesbian harassment or assault on public transportation from Toronto survey respondents (three percent). The Toronto findings on attacks in public transit are consistent with findings from American research (Comstock, 1991:49-50; Samis, 1995:84). Women reported more attacks on public transit than men: four percent of women and one percent of men. Bisexuals reported more attacks on public transit than lesbians and gay men. Of these respondents, seven percent were bisexual, four percent lesbian, and two percent gay. None of the heterosexual respondents reported victimization on public transit. Ethnic minorities (six percent) were more likely to be victimized on public transit compared to Caucasians (2 percent). Men were the largest perpetrator group reported on transit. The seven perpetrators of the attacks on public transit were: three adult men, one youth, one woman, one friend, and one stranger.

Women report public transit as a location in which they experience victimization higher than do men. Women report public transit as the sixth most common location of victimization and men report it seventh. Bisexuals report public transit higher than lesbians, gays, and heterosexuals. Bisexuals report public transit as the fifth most frequent location of victimization.
while lesbians report it sixth, and gays report it ninth. None of the heterosexuals were victimized on public transit. Ethnic minorities report public transit as a location of victimization much higher than do Caucasians. Ethnic minorities report public transit as the third most frequent location of victimization compared to Caucasians who report it eighth.

7.5(g) Attacks at Police Stations

Police stations are the seventh most common location in which Toronto respondents experienced victimization. Respondents indicate that they have experienced both verbal and physical anti-gay/lesbian assault and harassment from police in police stations or on the street. Police were reported to be the perpetrators in 11 incidents (four percent) of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Six persons state that the location of the assault was in a police station (two percent). Respondents report they have been stopped, questioned, and verbally harassed by police, and ignored by police when they had been assaulted or harassed. There was no mention of women police officers involved in any of the attacks. When gender of the police was indicated the perpetrators were men. Men were more likely to be assaulted in a police station or on the street by police than women. There were a total of six reports of harassment or attack on the basis of the victim’s perceived sexual orientation in a police station: three percent of men and one percent of women. Of those who identified their sexual orientation four percent were gay men and one percent lesbian. One male reported an assault by police while in prison.

The percentage of Toronto respondents experiencing assault by police is lower compared to percentages found in American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Comstock, 1991:57, 152, 273-274; Berrill, 1992:32). However, the percentage of Toronto respondents experiencing assault by police is comparable to that found in other Canadian anti-gay/lesbian violence studies (Samis, 1995:80-83; Smith, 1993:21; NBCHRR, 1991:33).

Men reported a police station as the seventh most frequent location of victimization while women report a police station as the ninth most frequent location for experiencing anti-gay/lesbian victimization. The identification of a police station as the location of anti-gay/lesbian victimization is unusual in Canadian and American research. While participants in Comstock’s national study reported police officers to be the third most frequent perpetrators, none of the participants identified a police station as the location of victimization (Comstock, 1991: 49, 57). Gays report the police station as the fifth most frequent location of victimization while lesbians
report a police station as the seventh most frequent location of victimization. None of the bisexuals and heterosexuals were victimized in a police station. Ethnic minorities and Caucasians both report a police station as the sixth most common location of victimization.

7.5(h) Attacks in Taxi Cabs/Cars

Taxi cabs or cars are the eighth most likely location in which Toronto respondents experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence. Four respondents (one percent) were victimized in a taxi cab or car. There are no data on attacks in cars or taxi cabs in other North American literature by which to provide a comparison with the Toronto findings (Comstock, 1991). Two men (one percent) and two women (one percent) were attacked in cars. Bisexuals and heterosexuals were more likely to report victimization in cars than gay men and lesbians. Six percent of bisexuals and six percent of heterosexuals were victimized in cars while less than one percent of gays report cars as locations in which they were victimized. None of the lesbians reported taxi cabs or cars as locations of victimization. Two percent of Caucasians report victimization due to their sexual orientation in a car or taxi cab while none of the ethnic minorities report victimization in a car or taxi cab.

7.5(i) Attacks in a Doctor's Office

Doctors' offices were ranked the ninth most common location of victimization by Toronto survey respondents. There is no information on victimization in a doctor's office in other North American research by which to provide a comparison with this finding in the Toronto sample. Three persons (one percent) were victimized in a doctor's office -- one woman (less than one percent) and two men (one percent). Two gay men (one percent) and one lesbian (one percent) were victimized in a doctor's office. One percent of Caucasians (3) and none of the ethnic minorities were victimized in a doctor's office.

7.5(j) Attacks in Restaurants

Restaurants are ranked as the tenth most common location in which Toronto respondents report victimization. Two (less than one percent) Toronto respondents experienced anti-gay/lesbian victimization in a restaurant. Two gay men (one percent) were victimized in a

7.5(k) Attacks in Community Centres

Community centres are reported as the eleventh most common location in which Toronto respondents were victimized. Two (less than one percent) Toronto respondents were attacked near a community centre. Data on victimization near a community centre are not available in other North American research. There is no indication in the responses whether the attacks took place near a lesbian or gay community centre. One woman (less than one percent) was victimized near a community centre and one man (less than one percent) was victimized near a community centre. One of these victims is a lesbian (one percent) and one victim is a gay man (less than one percent).

7.5(l) Attacks in Parks

The park was the least common location of victimization listed by Toronto respondents. Two (less than one percent) of Toronto respondents reported the park as a location of victimization. There is limited North American data on experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence in parks (Comstock, 1991:48). However, Comstock reports that 12 percent of respondents to his national survey had been victimized in an area known for cruising (not adjacent to a bar, disco, or baths) (Comstock, 1991:48). One lesbian woman (less than one percent) and one gay man (less than one percent) listed the park as a location of victimization.

7.6 HIV/AIDS Related Assault

Men reported hearing more references to HIV/AIDS during attacks than women. There was a total of 54 reports (18 percent) from Toronto survey respondents in which attackers made reference to HIV/AIDS. Sixty-six percent of these were men and 33 percent of these were women. Gay men experienced slightly more references to HIV/AIDS in the attacks than lesbians and bisexuals. Twenty-two percent of gay men, 20 percent of bisexuals, and 17 percent of lesbians reported references to HIV/AIDS in attacks. Two transgendered respondents reported reference to HIV/AIDS in attacks. One man was called an "Aids carrying Fag." The majority of respondents said they had not experienced reference to HIV/AIDS in attacks (82 percent). These

7.7 Summary

Participants provided information on a wide range of settings in which they had been victimized because of their presumed sexual orientation. Survey respondents gave a wide range of locations where they had experienced anti-gay/lesbian assault and harassment because someone presumed them to be lesbian or gay. Many respondents gave more than one location. The settings in which they are victimized are comparable to those found in other North American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence. The public domain was the most frequent location of victimization for both men and women and this finding is similar to trends found in other anti-gay/lesbian research. Similar to other North American studies schools are the second most frequent location of victimization. Participants are less likely to report being attacked outside a lesbian or gay organization compared to participants in other North American surveys. Men were more likely to say they had been assaulted by other men near a lesbian and gay establishment, at school, and in a police station compared to women who were more likely to be victimized on public transit, at work, and in the home. This finding is consistent with other North American research. Men reported higher levels of violence occurring on the street perpetrated by individuals and groups of strangers, most often young men. Men are more likely to be victimized by male police than are women which is a trend found in most other anti-gay/lesbian violence research. Men reported hearing more references to HIV/AIDS during attacks than women. Almost half of Toronto survey respondents said they were alone when they were attacked.

7.8 Conclusions

The 1995-1996 Toronto survey provides a context for understanding the location of assaults and the characteristics of perpetrators. The findings in this chapter reveal that lesbians and gay men are subject to anti-gay/lesbian harassment and violence in everyday settings; in order of frequency, on the street, at school, near a lesbian or gay organization, at home, at work, on public transit, at a police station, in a taxi cab, a doctor's office, a restaurant, a community centre, and a park. The perpetrators of these anti-gay incidents were most commonly adult males,
male and female strangers, male youth, and male and female students, followed by co-workers, drivers, police, women, family members, friends, professionals, ex-partners, community groups, house guests, prostitutes, neighbours, and skinheads.

The perpetrators and settings of anti-gay/lesbian violence in this study reflect trends found in other North American research. This study completed in Toronto provides a research base for more in-depth study of perpetrators and the settings of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The aim of such research would be to determine how to implement safety mechanisms and policy to deter anti-gay/lesbian violence. Identifying the wide range of settings of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the diverse perpetrator population allows us to conceptualize such initiatives. What should be stressed is that while the findings in this research point to certain trends that focus on stranger violence against men in public places, the settings of victimization and perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence are also diverse. Researchers need to continually ask whether the findings reflect the experience of the whole sexual minority population. And researchers need to systematically study the experience of gays and lesbians from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds since these groups have traditionally been excluded from, or have been underrepresented in, anti-gay/lesbian violence research.
CHAPTER EIGHT
THE REPORTING EXPERIENCES OF VICTIMS:
THE AFTERMATH OF ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE

8.1 Introduction

This chapter examines and compares the documentation of hate-related crime based on sexual orientation as reported to the 519 Church Street Bashing Reporting Line (BRL) between 1990 and 1995; reports by Toronto survey respondents to police, hospitals, and the BRL; and reports to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Hate Crime Unit (HCU). Survey respondents and victims who reported to the BRL provided ratings of police and medical services and gave reasons for not reporting the bashing to agencies and institutions. In contrasting reporting rates between the various agencies, and in reviewing victims' reasons for not reporting, a snapshot picture of the scope and range of the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence emerges, which in turn, leads to analysis and identification of problems and to issues which need to be addressed.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides statistics and analyzes reporting patterns from the Annual Reports to the BRL, 1990-1995, as well as Toronto survey respondents' reasons for not reporting to the BRL (1995-1996). Section two provides statistics from the Annual Reports to the Toronto HCU, 1993-1996, survey and BRL respondents' reports to police, and their reasons for not reporting to police. This includes an analysis of the qualitative data on police as perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Section three analyzes the survey and BRL statistics on respondents' attempts to obtain medical attention after an incident of anti-gay/lesbian violence. A comparison of the Toronto statistics will be made with statistics in other North American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

A combination of open-ended and closed-ended questions was used in the Toronto survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence to assess if respondents had reported an event, their experience if they had reported, and reasons for not reporting the violence to hospital, police, or the BRL.

Despite the fact that survey respondents reported high incidences of harassment and assault overall, by comparison the reporting rates to public agencies are quite low. This disparity has been explained by Garnets, Herek, and Levy (1992) to be a consequence of secondary victimization and knowledge that mainstream institutions do not respond adequately to the needs
of lesbians and gays. This study's respondents' ratings of institutions such as hospitals and police were generally low. Even though similar trends are evident in other research, the implications are generally ignored in policy development.

8.2 The 519 Bashing Reporting Line (BRL)

8.2(a) Reporting to the 519 Church Street BRL

In Toronto the 519 Church Street Community Centre's BRL was introduced in 1990-1991 as a response to the increased incidence of lesbian and gay bashing in the neighbouring downtown Church-Wellesley area. Reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence are made to the 519 because it is the most central community centre which serves the downtown area in which many sexual minorities live. The BRL has been compiling statistics since 1990. The Victim Assistance Advocate associated with the BRL does not counsel victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence but only acts as a documentor, and referral resource. The intake questionnaire includes items on the sex of the victim, the type of attacks and injuries received, to whom the victim reported, police response, reasons why they chose not to report to police, the ages and number of perpetrators, the time, day, month of the attack, and whether suspects were apprehended, charged, and prosecuted through the courts. The "Lesbian and Gay Bashing Report" is completed in person or over the telephone (see Appendix 4).

8.2(b) Annual Reports to the 519 Lesbian and Gay Bashing Reporting Line in Toronto 1990-1995

Other than surveys, the most reliable non-criminal justice source of data to draw upon to get a sense of the actual experience of lesbian and gay victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence is a community-based source such as the 519 BRL. The BRL victim assistant and volunteers have documented reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence using a confidential reporting form which is then communicated to police for further investigation. Before 1996 the Line was available only during the Centre's operating hours. Since 1996 callers have been able to leave a message after hours which is then followed up by the Victim Assistant Advocate.

The reports to the BRL have been consistent since 1990 for both women and men (see Table 15). Men consistently make over 80 percent of the reports to the BRL annually while women report less than 20 percent annually; however, these trends changed in 1995. The
percentage of reports by men decreased between 1994 and 1995 while reports by women increased. In 1995 74.1 percent of the reports were made by men and 25.8 percent of the reports were made by women. A change in the statistics is evident after 1994 when a female victim assistant was hired at the BRL. The percentage of women reporting to the BRL has risen since 1994 but the number of men reporting has almost doubled at the same time. The year in which the highest number of both women and men reported is 1991 when the BRL was in its second year of operation. There is no clear explanation for the radical shift in numbers; however, there was a paid victim advocate working at the BRL between 1991 and 1992 who may have facilitated increased attention and provided support to victims who phoned the 519. Another factor which may explain the high reporting rate in the early 1990's is the level of public activism about anti-gay/lesbian violence during the time period in which Queer Nation was in operation. In 1991, 210 persons reported and in 1992, 121 persons reported. Between 1990 and 1995 five transgendered persons reported attacks to the BRL.

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE OF REPORTS TO THE 519 BASHING REPORTING LINE BY SEX/GENDER, 1990-1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED ATTACKS</th>
<th>1990 (%)</th>
<th>1991 (%)</th>
<th>1992 (%)</th>
<th>1993 (%)</th>
<th>1994 (%)</th>
<th>1995 (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>12.6 (12)</td>
<td>13.3 (28)</td>
<td>14.8 (18)</td>
<td>17.0 (7)</td>
<td>15.7 (6)</td>
<td>25.8 (22)</td>
<td>15.7 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>87.3 (83)</td>
<td>84.7 (178)</td>
<td>84.2 (102)</td>
<td>80.4 (33)</td>
<td>84.2 (32)</td>
<td>74.1 (63)</td>
<td>83.3 (491)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSGENDER</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1.9 (4)</td>
<td>0.8 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0.8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>100.0 (95)</td>
<td>100.0 (210)</td>
<td>100.0 (121)</td>
<td>100.0 (41)</td>
<td>100.0 (38)</td>
<td>100.0 (85)</td>
<td>100.0 (589)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminologists suggest that reporting line data are limited in terms of reliability. The implication is that incidents of bashing may be under or over-represented depending on many
complex factors. Roberts (1995) suggests that when analyzing such data criminologists should remember two things: first, that the data do not capture all the incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence taking place in Toronto, and secondly, that self-reported hate-motivated incidents may also involve crimes that are not motivated by hatred of gays or lesbians, although they may have been seen that way by the victim. The reverse may also be true. Offenders may choose victims based on their sexual orientation without this being known by the victim (Roberts, 1995:32).

Between 1990 and 1995, there were 410 documented reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence made to the BRL by 589 persons. The number of reports is less than the number of victims because each bashing is counted as one incident despite the number of victims involved. There were 294 bashings involving one victim, 94 bashings involving two victims, 16 bashings involving three victims, four bashings involving four victims, and two bashings involving more than 4 victims. Men and women and transgendered persons were bashed. Men were more likely to report victimization than women: 491 men (83.5 percent), 93 women (15.8 percent), and five transgendered persons were victims of bashings. There were 723 types of assault reported by the 589 victims. There is a high incidence of physical assault reported: over half (56.9 percent) of the incidents involved some form of physical assault. Over a third of incidents involved some form of verbal harassment. Less than ten percent were hate-motivated cases of vandalism or theft. A further 60 reports were made concerning assaults and harassment against gays and lesbians by police officers (these are not included in Table 16).

Table 16 shows that the majority of types of assaults reported to the 519 BRL were made by men (85.2%), while 13.9 percent of reports of types of assaults were from women and less than one percent of reports were from transgendered victims. In every year of reporting to the BRL male victims outnumbered female victims. The number of assaults reported totals much higher than the 410 reports because many of the victims experienced multiple forms of anti-gay/lesbian assault.
TABLE 16

TYPES OF ASSAULT REPORTED TO THE 519 BASHING REPORTING LINE IN TORONTO 1990-1995 BY SEX/GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assault</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Trans-Gender (%)</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
<th>% of Total 1990-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Assault</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal/Physical Assault</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism/Theft</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder/Attempted Murder</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Threat to Kill</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat/Assault with Weapons</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there were 410 reports by 588 people, the number of assaults is higher due to multiple forms of violence reported.
8.2(c) Assaults Reported to the BRL

Through listing in descending order the percentages of assaults reported to the BRL by gender and transgender it is evident that men and women report verbal/physical assault, verbal assault, assault with weapons and verbal threat to kill as the four most frequent forms of victimization. While men and women reported verbal/physical assault as the most frequent form of assault, women reported higher percentages of this type of combined victimization (36.6 percent) than did men (29.7 percent). Men reported higher percentages of verbal assault (21.7 percent) compared to women (17.8 percent). Transgendered respondents reported an even higher percentage of verbal assault (66.6 percent) compared to men and women. The reports of vandalism/theft and physical assault were reversed for women and men. Women reported physical assault more frequently than vandalism/theft while men reported vandalism/theft higher. Transgendered persons reported physical assault as the second most frequent form of assault while women and men reported physical assault much lower. Sixteen percent of transgendered respondents experienced physical assault compared to seven percent of men and four percent of women. Transgendered respondents reported vandalism/theft as the third most frequent form of assault experienced. Men and women equally reported sexual assault and attempted murder to be the least common form of victimization experienced. It must be remembered that victims may have reported multiple assaults to the BRL in any one reported incident.

8.2(d) Types of Assault Reported to the BRL 1990-1995

Between 1990 and 1995, there were 410 reports and 723 types of assault reported to the BRL. Two hundred and twenty victims reported experiencing combined verbal/physical assault (30 percent). Verbal harassment (21.5 percent), verbal threat to kill (13.2 percent), and threat or attack with weapons (15.2 percent) were the next most common types of assault reported.

More men (85.2 percent) reported types of assault to the BRL than women (13.9 percent). Female victims reported higher percentages of assault in every category except verbal assault, physical assault, and vandalism and theft. Men report higher percentages of verbal harassment and physical assault than women. For both female (36.6 percent) and male victims (29.7 percent) verbal/physical assault was the most common type of assault followed by verbal assault, (21.7 percent of women and 17.8 percent of men) threat/assault with weapons, (15.8 percent of women
and 15.2 percent of men) and verbal threat to kill (15.2 percent of women and 15.2 percent of men).

Transgendered victims who reported to the BRL reported verbal assault (66.6 percent), vandalism (16.6 percent), and physical assault (16.6 percent).

8.2(e) Types of Injuries Reported to the BRL 1990-1995

Victims reported a range of injuries, some of which were multiple. For this reason the number of injuries reported (449) exceeds the number of bashings reported (410) by the 588 victims. The most commonly reported injury victims reported were bruises (38.3 percent), lacerations (21.3 percent) and head injuries (17.8 percent). Six percent reported personal violation -- clothing torn and taken off. Six percent reported fractures while three percent reported sprains. A minority of victims suffered rape (one percent) and injury to the groin area (one percent). Six percent reported other injuries such as scratches and emotional trauma. Men (89 percent) reported experiencing more injuries than women (11 percent).

8.2(f) Toronto Survey Respondents' Reasons for not Reporting to the Bashing Reporting Line

Other Canadian and American anti-gay/lesbian violence research have not provided information on the reasons why respondents chose not to report to a gay or lesbian community organization. Samis (1995) asked respondents whether they reported to a community organization: however, the results of this question are not provided in his thesis. Information about reports to community organizations is important because it allows us to track the wide range of anti-gay/lesbian harassment and violence experienced by the sexual minority population.

1995-1996 Toronto survey respondents were asked if they had reported anti-gay/lesbian assault or harassment to the Toronto Lesbian and Gay BRL. Only 132 of the 439 survey respondents answered this question. Between 1995 and 1996, 13 respondents (four percent) said they had reported to the BRL while 294 (95.8 percent) said they had not.

Toronto survey respondents were asked why they had not reported anti-gay/lesbian violence or harassment to the BRL. While the number of reports to the BRL far outnumber those made to police, a majority of Toronto survey respondents had never reported to the BRL. Over half (55.6 percent) of respondents to this question said they did not report because they either did
not know the BRL existed or there was no reporting line in their area. One quarter of respondents reported that they did not report because they felt that either nothing would be done about the crime or they would not be taken seriously even if they did report. Only two percent of respondents did not report to the BRL because they feared secondary victimization in the form of police harassment.

Two hundred and twelve (48 percent) respondents gave a wide range of qualitative responses explaining why they chose not to report to the BRL. Twenty-three percent said that there was no BRL in their area. Many respondents said that they did not report to the BRL because they did not know it existed (33.0 percent). Others (14.2 percent) stated that they did not think that the incident was serious enough to report. Some respondents (11.3 percent) said that they felt that nothing would be, or could be done, about the assault, and for that reason they did not report to the BRL. Six percent said they did not report for other reasons. Four percent said that they did not think verbal assaults were important enough to report. Four percent said that they did not report because they dealt with it in another way. Two percent said that they did not report because they feared police and other institutional involvement. Less than one percent said they did not report because they could not identify the attackers and one percent said they could not get through to the BRL.

Some of the respondents said that they lived outside of Toronto, in the United States, or in another country at the time of the bashing and therefore had no knowledge of the BRL.

8.2(g) Other Reporting Patterns

Of those who reported to the 519 BRL 35.3 percent had also reported to other agencies in Toronto. Twenty percent of victims said that they also reported to police. The second most common agency reported to was 911 Emergency (seven percent). Three percent reported to a hospital or to family and friends. Respondents also reported that they contacted the Toronto Transit Commission (one percent) and a Justice of the Peace (one percent), although the reasons for doing so were not given (see Table 17).
TABLE 17
OTHER 519 REPORTING PATTERNS (1990-1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN (%)</th>
<th>MEN (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL 1990-1995 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE 519 BASHING</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTING LINE</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(495)</td>
<td>(588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 EMERGENCY</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORONTO TRANSIT</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSION</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTICE OF THE PEACE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICE</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(168)</td>
<td>(192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>(784)</td>
<td>(918)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other = Family and friends.

The majority of men and women who reported to the BRL did not report to other agencies. However 30 percent of women and 38 percent of men who reported to the BRL also reported elsewhere. More men (21.4 percent) than women (17.9 percent) reported to police as well as to the BRL. Women were more likely to report to "others" whom they identified as family and friends. Men were more likely to report to 911 Emergency and hospitals compared to women.
8.2(h) Summary

Out of 410 incidents reported of various forms of attacks by the 588 victims to the BRL, between 1990 and 1995, victims reported 723 types of assault. More men than women reported assault to the BRL. For both female and male victims verbal and physical assaults were the most commonly reported forms followed by threat/assault with weapons, and verbal threat to kill. Men reported higher percentages of verbal assault, vandalism and theft, and physical assault compared to women. However women reported higher percentages of verbal and physical assault, murder and attempted murder, verbal threat to kill, and threat or assault with weapons. The higher percentage of victimization of women in these categories dispels the myth that anti-gay/lesbian violence is only a gay male problem. Victims who reported to the BRL said that they experienced a range of injuries, some of which were multiple.

The BRL does not ask respondents to self-identify race/ethnicity, nor does it ask about children, income and education levels.

8.3 Police

8.3(a) Types of Assault Reported to the Toronto Hate Crime Unit (HCU) 1993-1996

In contrast to the statistics from the BRL (1990-1995) and the 1995-1996 Toronto survey, incidents of hate crime based on the sexual orientation of the victim reported to the HCU between 1993 and 1996, are much lower. Only 59 different kinds of incidents were listed by the HCU during the four years of documentation compared with the more than 410 reports documented by the BRL, and the approximately 329 reports from the 439 Toronto survey respondents. The HCU reports that on average, 54 percent of victims of hate crime based on sexual orientation were assaulted, 19 percent were victims of mischief, (such as break and enter, damage to property, violation of reputation) and 15 percent were threatened. Five percent were robbed, three percent were harassed, two percent were victims of dangerous driving and two percent were victims of bomb threats in a lesbian or gay community centre (see Table 18). Hate crimes based on sexual orientation constitute an average of eleven percent of the reports of these verbal assaults documented by the Toronto HCU annually.
A comparison of the HCU's statistics with those from the BRL and the Toronto survey reveals both similarities and differences. While on average between 1993 and 1996 15 percent of the total HCU cases involving sexual orientation were classified as threats, between 1995 and 1996, (a one year period) 19 percent of Toronto survey respondents said that they had been threatened with physical assault in the past year. These numbers show a consistent annual rate of threats over the four years of documentation by the HCU, and the two years of survey data collection in Toronto. However, a higher percentage of verbal harassment and threats was
reported to the BRL between 1990 and 1995. Twenty-one percent of BRL respondents reported verbal harassment between 1990 and 1995. The higher rate of physical assault reported to the HCU can be explained by the different way police document "founded" and "unfounded" crimes. The BRL's categorization process allows the subjects to self-identify the hate crime and therefore more reports are documented.

The HCU focuses on prosecuting assaults involving physical assault and mischief despite the fact that Toronto survey respondents show that threats of physical assault, verbal harassment, chased/followed, objects thrown, and sexual harassment are much more frequently experienced by lesbian women and gay men. While on average over four years the HCU reported that 54 percent of its sexual orientation cases were assault-related, between 1995-1996, only 19 percent of Toronto survey respondents reported some kind of physical assault in the past year. Of those who reported to the BRL, 17 percent said they had been physically assaulted between 1990-1995. While many of the Toronto survey respondents reported instances of harassment, both sexual and verbal, the HCU often reports no cases of verbal and sexual harassment. The discrepancy between the Toronto survey statistics, which show the wide range of victimization experienced by lesbians and gay men, and those of the HCU, point to a problem with the way in which police focus only on cases which can be prosecuted as hate crimes according to the definition used under the Criminal Code. Another problem with the HCU statistics is that it shows a bias in favour of the collection of statistics on gay male victimization. Lesbian women are seriously underrepresented in the HCU's documentation and prosecution of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

While the HCU collects statistics on hate crimes based on sexual orientation it ignores the gendered face of hate crime. Crawford, Gartner and Dawson (1992) conducted a quantitative analysis of intimate femicide in Ontario between 1974 and 1990. According to the official records they examined, a total of 551 women were killed by their current or estranged male intimate partners between 1974 and 1990 in Ontario. Depending on the specific definition of intimate femicide used, intimate femicides accounted for between 61 percent and 78 percent of all killings of women where an offender was identified. On average, between 32 and 41 women were victims of intimate femicide each year in Ontario between 1974 and 1990 (Crawford, Gartner, Dawson, 1992:54). Despite the high numbers of women killed by their partners and ex-partners in Ontario annually none of these types of murders have been documented as a hate crime based on gender by the Toronto Hate Crime Unit since 1993. The HCU could pay more
attention to the complex interrelationship between hate crimes based on combined race, sexual orientation, and gender discrimination. The misogynist elements underlying violence against women and persons who attempt to upset the strict, heterosexual, gender-role scripting necessary to perpetuate patriarchal relations are left unexamined in the present documentary process. The problematic outcome of this exclusion is that crimes of hate are disconnected from each other so that the similarities are not examined. The important benefits of looking more closely at the intersections between people's experiences of hate-motivated victimization would be to unearth the similarities across bias-motivated crimes.

8.3(b) Hate Crime Statistics Recorded by Police in Canada

Not all police services across Canada collect hate crime statistics. A summary of information submitted to the Department of Justice reveals seven jurisdictions collect statistics on hate crimes based on sexual orientation (Roberts, 1995:22). The definition of a hate crime differs across police services in Canada making the comparison of statistics collected on sexual orientation difficult. Of those HCU's which do collect statistics on sexual orientation in Canada, it is found that the median proportion of hate crimes based on sexual orientation is 10 percent and physical assaults constitute the majority of the documented victimizations (Roberts, 1995:22).

Canadian hate crime statistics tend to be collected in urban rather than rural police services due to the notion that hate crimes are an urban phenomenon (Roberts, 1995:22). Hate crime statistics have been gathered by the Police de la Communauté urbaine de Montréal since 1988, the Ottawa Carleton Regional Police Bias Crime Unit since 1993, as well as Vancouver Police, Toronto Police since 1995, the City of Halifax Police Department since 1994, and the Edmonton Police Service since 1994 (Roberts, 1995:22-27, 67-70).

Canadian and American Departments of Justice report that crimes based on sexual orientation constituted 11 percent of the hate crimes in Canada between 1993-1994 and 11.7 percent of the crimes based on sexual orientation in the United States in 1992 (Roberts, 1995:70). This statistic is low compared to the average of 61 percent of hate crime attacks against racial minorities annually.

The HCU was formed to meet the needs of the Toronto community and to connect with other Hate Crime Units in Canada. The 1997 HCU annual report reveals that the number of
arrests for hate crimes in Toronto fluctuates from year to year. Yearly percentage comparisons since 1993 reveal a 61 percent increase in 1994, a 21 percent increase in 1995, a 52 percent decrease in 1996 and a seven percent increase in 1997.

Since 1993 five particular groups have been consistently targetted in hate motivated crimes: Black people, members of the Jewish faith, South Asians, the Gay Community, and Asians are the most frequently victimized. Criminal offences based on a person's sexual orientation consisted mainly of assaults reported in 52 Division which has a large gay and lesbian population. Between 1993 and 1997, 83 sexual orientation offences fell within the HCU's definitional categories: 16 in 1993, 11 in 1994, 22 in 1995, 18 in 1996, and 16 in 1997 (Metropolitan Toronto Police, 1997:4). The majority of the bias crimes against the gay community were assaults. Most documented crime were committed in public places against gay men living and working in the downtown core (Metropolitan Toronto Police, 1997:4-5). The highest reported offences from year-to-year are assaults, mischief, and threats.

The HCU reports significantly less anti-gay/lesbian violence than reports obtained by the 519 Centre. This occurs because the HCU definition of hate crime leads it to focus on physical assaults rather than the wide range of victimization accepted by the 519 Centre. The HCU's lower statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence in comparison to the 519 Centre BRL is also due to the fact that the crime must be proven to have been committed "solely" rather than "in whole or in part" on the basis of sexual orientation. The word "solely" was removed from the HCU's definition of hate crime in 1998.

Compared to the statistics evolving from the Toronto survey and the BRL, the rate of victimization documented by the HCU is significantly lower. The difference between the HCU documentation of victimization and the actual experience of victims reporting to the BRL points to a serious problem. Police statistics on hate-motivated crimes based on sexual orientation seriously underestimate the magnitude of the problem of hate crime based on sexual orientation across Canada (Roberts, 1995:28).

The Toronto Police Services documentation of hate-motivated crimes and the resulting prosecution of perpetrators feeds into the mythology that hate crimes against lesbians and gay men are an urban phenomenon which occur on the street perpetrated by male youth, alone or in gangs. Since 1993 almost all (94 percent) of the sexual orientation hate crimes which were documented were directed at gay men rather than lesbians. Mischief and assault are the most
common incidents recorded by the Metro Toronto police against sexual minorities. The Toronto Police Services data reveal that the typical offender prosecuted for hate crimes is a young male under 20 years of age who is a first time offender (Roberts, 1995:23). These data raise many serious questions. Are these perpetrators the most easily caught or are they the most common perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence? Are gay men more likely to be victims than lesbian women? Are those living in urban areas more likely to be targetted for anti-gay/lesbian violence? Survey data and data collected by the BRL in Toronto show different experiences.

The trends from the Toronto Police Services contradict those found in the Toronto survey and the BRL which show that while gay men report higher percentages of victimization overall, lesbian women and bisexuals also experience a high percentage of victimization. Secondly, the Toronto survey findings show that lesbians and gay men are not assaulted only by male youth but by many different people in a wide range of locations. Thirdly, the phenomenon of gay bashing does not simply occur in large cities with a large gay and lesbian population. The Toronto survey findings reveal that gays and lesbians from both urban and rural areas have been targetted for anti-gay/lesbian violence. There seems to be a dislocation between what the gay community is experiencing in terms of victimization and what police are documenting as hate crimes based on sexual orientation. This dislocation has serious implications and raises questions that need to be answered.

Analysis of HCU statistics in comparison with 519 statistics reveals contradictions which undercut the HCU claim to community accountability. The discrepancies raise questions about whether the HCU exists as a social control mechanism with the aim of prosecuting and containing the most salient examples of hate motivated crime, or whether its role is to educate and work with the public to promote social change.

8.3(c) Trends from the 1993 National Data Collection of American Hate Crimes

The trends that develop from examination of the institutional response to anti-gay/lesbian violence in Toronto are similar to those found in other North American studies. Agencies which cater to a large lesbian or gay clientele receive more reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence than police because lesbians and gay men feel safer reporting to them. Hate Crime Units focus on criminal offences which can be prosecuted through the judicial court system, leaving minor offences such as verbal harassment undocumented and unattended. When asked about the
response of personnel in institutions in which lesbians and gays seek help, respondents to surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence and clients using community services report a wide range of treatment from lack of concern to outright negligence on the part of police, medical professionals, and even some lesbian and gay victim assistant advocates who are meant to provide support. The trends reveal that while institutions move to implement policy to guide increased awareness and sensitivity to victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence, the actual attitudes of employees have not altered to meet institutional mandates.

The trends in the Toronto HCU data are mirrored in the findings from the first publication of the FBI's Hate Crime Statistics program based on statistics gathered by law enforcement agencies which reported hate crime incidents in 1993 (FBI, 1995:9; see also, Garofolo, 1997:134-145). Among the 7,587 reported incidents, 62 percent were racially motivated (FBI, 1995:137). This finding is consistent with Canadian HCU sources which estimate that 61 percent of all hate crimes are racially motivated. Religious hatred is the second most common motivation for hate crime victimizations, with the overwhelming majority of religion-motivated incidents directed against Jewish persons. Incidents motivated by the sexual orientation and ethnicity of the victims were the next most common. The FBI figures show that 11 percent of the incidents were motivated by the sexual orientation of the victim, and nine percent were motivated by the ethnicity of the victim. The figure for incidents motivated on by the sexual orientation of the victim are consistent with Canadian figures which show that on average, 11 percent of the reported hate crimes are motivated by the sexual orientation of the victim or community (Roberts, 1995:70).

In terms of the types of crime documented by the FBI, less serious face-to-face confrontational crimes dominate. Like the Toronto survey findings, Garofalo reports that intimidation and harassment tend to be the most common form of victimization, followed by assaults, with simple assaults outnumbering aggravated assaults (Garofolo, 1997:139). Vandalism and property crime are also represented among the types of crime documented. Interestingly, the majority of crimes motivated by the race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation of victims involved face-to-face altercations such as assault, harassment, and intimidation, while the majority of crimes that target victims because of their religion consist of property crimes, primarily vandalism (Garofolo, 1997:139). One half of the hate crimes motivated by the victim's
religion were directed at individuals, compared to 87 percent to 94 percent of the incidents in other categories (race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation) which were directed at individuals.

In documenting the numbers of victims and offenders, the 1993 FBI data reveal that there are multiple victims and offenders in hate crimes, but that victims outnumber offenders (FBI, 1995:9). Victim and offender characteristics show that the victims of hate crimes tend to be young. And hate crime offenders tend to be even younger than the victims. Like the Toronto survey findings, victims and offenders in hate crimes are predominantly men, and there is an overrepresentation of male victims and offenders in hate crimes compared to non-hate crimes (Garofolo, 1997:140). Similar to the Toronto survey findings, hate victimizations are usually committed by offenders who are strangers to the victims. The FBI data suggest a predominance of public locations for hate victimizations, although victimizations also occurred in homes and residences. Victims in hate crimes were less likely to be seriously injured than were victims in non-hate assaults (Garofolo, 1997:141).

All of these findings suggest that, with the exception of crimes motivated by religious hatred, "hate crimes typically involve spontaneous street confrontations initiated by small, unorganized groups of youths" (Garofolo, 1997:141). This trend was also found in the Toronto study. However, caution must be reserved in using these findings to generalize to the whole North American community. The FBI data are obtained from a one year collection of hate crime statistics in the United States. As well, the definitions and categorization processes used by the FBI may underestimate the true degree of hate crime.

Berrill and Herek mention a number of studies suggesting that rates of reporting to the police may be 20 percent or lower among gay and lesbian victims (Berrill, Herek, 1992:293-294). Garofalo notes that lesbians and gays are seldom encouraged to report and this may explain why their victimizations are underrepresented in hate crime data sets (Garofalo, 1997:138).

Other factors impacting on the political nature of the data collection reflect a growing dissatisfaction with the fact that gender is not included as a category within the Hate Crime Statistics Act 1990, despite the fact that many crimes committed against women are motivated primarily by a general hatred of women (Garofolo, 1997:139).

Critical examination of HCU, BRL, and survey statistics unpacks the myths which are used to support a story about anti-gay/lesbian violence. The story may have some validity but may also act to collude in focusing on one type of hate crime without making the connections
between gender crimes, racial crimes, and sexual orientation crimes. We need to examine how hate crimes against women intersect with homophobia and heterosexism and secondly we must ask why it is that crimes against gay men get more public attention than crimes against women.

8.3(d) Reporting to Police and Rating the Police Response, 1990-1995

Larger problems exist in the attitude police display toward lesbian women and gay men who call them for assistance. While some police show apathy toward respondent's experience of victimization, others have themselves been perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

8.3(e) BRL Reporting to Police

One hundred and ninety-two people who reported to the BRL said they also reported to police. Twenty-four of these victims were female and 168 were male. Despite some reports of police as perpetrators, 28.2 percent of those who reported to the BRL and rated the police response said that police had been helpful. However, some victims who reported to the BRL also said that police refused to help them (21.4 percent), were slow in responding to their call for help (16.9 percent), showed sarcasm toward them (11.2 percent), blamed the victim (nine percent), denied the bashing took place (seven percent), and had minimized the injury victims received (four percent). The sexual orientation statistical data were gathered during the same time period that the Foot Patrol was in operation in the Church-Wellesley area, 1990 to 1995.

8.3(f) BRL Rating of Police

Fifty-six percent of women and 45 percent of men who reported to the BRL had significant dissatisfaction with police. While an equal percentage of men and women said police were helpful, (28.2 percent) more women (22.7 percent) than men (nine percent) said police displayed sarcasm. More women (nine percent) than men (four percent) said police minimized the injury. More men (22.5 percent) than women (13.6 percent) said police refused to help. An almost equal percentage of men (ten percent) and women (nine percent) said police blamed the victim.
8.3(g) BRL Convictions

While male and female victims report 723 types of assault, some of which are multiple, the 519 BRL reports that only three of the suspects who assaulted women were caught compared to 39 of those who assaulted men. The three who assaulted women were charged by police while 32 of those who assaulted men were charged. Women and men were unable to identify suspects in many of the cases. Seven of the suspects who attacked men and were seen were not charged by police after police involvement. The outcome of these cases is not provided by the 519 BRL; however, it is likely that only a small percentage of crimes committed resulted in a conviction (519 BRL, Reports 1990-1995). The low numbers of perpetrators who were caught and convicted suggests that many of the hate crimes based on sexual orientation are either under-investigated by police or never reported to authorities other than the 519 Centre.

8.3(h) Survey Respondents' Rating of Police, 1995-1996

Only 38 (nine percent) of the 1995-1996 Toronto survey respondents reported anti-gay/lesbian violence to police. A low percentage of survey respondents reported their rating of police. Of the 71 respondents who rated police, thirty-six percent rated the police response poor, 22.5 percent fair, 22.5 percent average, 12.7 percent good, and five percent excellent. When asked to provide more detail about their experiences with police 63.6 percent of respondents rated them indifferent, 51.3 percent homophobic, 37.3 percent hostile, 37.5 percent sexist, and 30.6 percent racist. Forty-three percent rated police professional, 23.3 percent efficient, 22.7 percent helpful, 22.7 percent supportive, and 23.8 percent threatening. However, 76.7 percent rated police not efficient, 77.3 percent not helpful, 72.7 percent not sensitive, and 77.3 percent not supportive. This trend is reflected in other Canadian studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence (Kelner, 1979; Samis, 1995:109-110). The limited data available on this topic point to the need for more research on how police attitudes affect reporting rates (Garafolo, 1997).18

Consistent with the Toronto survey respondents who rated the police response, Vancouver respondents provided both positive and negative ratings of police (Samis, 1995:109).19 Reports to police and ratings of police are also documented in the American research on anti-gay/lesbian violence (Comstock, 1991:158-160; Berrill, 1992:32; NGLTF, 1991:12, 39).20 Comstock and the National Lesbian and Gay Task Force note that by contrast with American statistics for reporting rates in the general population, the percentage of lesbians
and gays who do not report is higher (Comstock, 1991:58; NGLTF, 1991:12).\textsuperscript{21} The NGLTF report that the number of anti-gay/lesbian crimes documented by local police departments in 1991 is considerably lower than the number gathered by gay and lesbian victim service agencies (NGLTF, 1991:12).\textsuperscript{22}

The NGLTF give a number of explanations for this low reporting rate. Statistics to lesbian and gay organizations are taken from suburban as well as outlying areas. Meanwhile law enforcement data reflect only those crimes reported to city police. Another factor is that some episodes reported by victims to local groups do not fit the legal definition of a crime, and therefore are not counted by police. Underreporting to police is often due to fear of retaliation by offenders, or exposure that could lead to discrimination. Many victims decline to come forward because they anticipate a hostile or indifferent response from the police. Local groups also maintain that police frequently fail to properly identify, classify, and investigate reported anti-gay crimes because of prejudice, poor training (or no training), or a desire to avoid the publicity and extra work associated with handling bias crimes (NGLTF, 1991:12).

8.3(i) Toronto Survey Respondents' and BRL Reasons for not Reporting to Police, 1995-1996

1995 and 1996 Toronto survey respondents were asked if they reported to police. The reasons for not reporting to police mirror the reasons given by survey respondents for not reporting to the BRL. The majority of respondents fear secondary victimization in some form or another. Out of 255 cases, 15 percent reported to police while 85 percent had not. These 174 survey respondents gave a wide range of qualitative responses which elaborate on their reasons. Twenty percent thought it was not important enough and police would not take their complaint seriously. Twelve percent perceived nothing would be done, or could be done about the bashing. Twelve percent fear and distrust the police. Eight percent said the assault was verbal and that it was an isolated event that police could do nothing about. Six percent felt that reporting to the police would be too problematic and would not do any good. Five percent felt police involvement would make things worse. Another five percent chose to deal with the assault in their own way. Four percent each felt unsafe reporting to police, were closeted and therefore would not out themselves to police, and felt police are homophobic and racist. Three percent said police were the attackers and for this reason could not report the assault to police. These
respondents revealed considerable anger at this situation. Another three percent did not report to police because of their own internalized homophobia. Two percent had no evidence. Another two percent stated the assault happened long ago before rights' discourse and political mobilization, and for this reason they did not report to police. One percent said someone else called the police on their behalf and under one percent of victims said they are police officers and therefore would not report to police for fear of outing themselves.

8.3(j) BRL Victims' Reasons For Not Reporting to Police, 1990-1995

A high number of BRL victims did not respond to this question. However, of the 197 who did comment, 14.2 percent said that the major reason they chose not to report to police was their perception of police homophobia. The second most common reason (12.6 percent) was that the assault was verbal and they did not think anything could be done about it. A minority of victims (two percent) who reported to the 519 BRL perceive police to be racist.

Women (16.2 percent) were more likely than men (13.7 percent) to say that they chose not to report to police because of their perception of police homophobia. Women (five percent) were also more likely to cite police racism than men (one percent). And women (16.2 percent) were more likely than men (11.8 percent) to not report because the assault was verbal. The perception on the part of victims that verbal assaults are not worth reporting may be due to the public sense that police take physical assaults more seriously and are able to do more about them. There is a serious underestimation of the effect of verbal assault on victims' self esteem as well as its place in the escalation of anti-gay/lesbian violence from one stage to another.

Compared to Toronto respondents a higher percentage of respondents to other Canadian and American surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence stated that fear of secondary victimization prevented them from reporting to police (Samis, 1995:114; Comstock, 1991:159). The seriousness of the problem of under-reporting is proven by the findings of these studies. Clearly, gay and lesbian respondents show high percentages of fear of secondary victimization as a result of reporting to police.

8.3(k) BRL Victims' Reports of the Police as Perpetrators, 1995-1996

The reluctance on the part of victims to report to police may be explained by examining the BRL responses to the question of whether police had been the perpetrators in incidents
reported to the BRL. Between 1990 and 1995, 60 people out of 588 persons who reported to the BRL responded to this question, and of these respondents, 37 percent (22 persons) had been verbally assaulted by police. Men were more likely to respond to this question about police as perpetrators than women. Only one woman responded to the question. Two percent of women had been verbally assaulted by police compared with 35 percent of men. Twenty-three percent of men complained to police about being assaulted yet the police charged them with assault rather than the perpetrators. Seventeen percent of male victims were physically assaulted by police, while ten percent were the victims of under-cover gay baiting, possibly in a bar setting. Five percent of the men were threatened with a police gun. One man who reported to the BRL was sexually assaulted, raped, threatened with a gun, and physically assaulted by a police guard while in a jail.

The BRL respondents' reports of assault by police are corroborated by Toronto survey respondents' reports. Thirty-one out of 439 Toronto survey respondents (nine percent) reported that they had been harassed by police at least once in the past year while 62 (21 percent) said they had been harassed at least once since the age of sixteen. Nine Toronto survey respondents (three percent) had been beaten or assaulted at least once by police during the past year, while 15 (five percent) had been beaten or assaulted at least once by police since the age of sixteen. Six survey respondents provided qualitative information on their experience of victimization by police.

Consistent with the Toronto survey and BRL reports, respondents in other Canadian surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence had been harassed and bashed by police (Samis, 1995:80-83, Smith, 1993; New Brunswick, 1991). These findings point to the need for re-assessment of sensitivity training and diversity programmes in police colleges.

8.4 Medical Attention

8.4(a) 519 BRL Victims' Responses Regarding Medical Attention

Between 1990 and 1996, 31 victims who reported an assault to the BRL said they reported to a hospital. Out of 588 victims during the five year period, five percent of respondents sought medical attention. Twenty-nine of these victims were male and two were female. The low number of BRL victims who reported injuries to hospitals is surprising considering that the 588 victims reported 449 injuries, some of which were multiple.
Some indication of the gravity of the incidents reported to the BRL can be found in a breakdown of injuries reported by respondents. The types of injuries reported by victims to the BRL range from head injuries, bruises, lacerations, scratches, sprains, rapes, groin injuries, fractures, and emotional trauma requiring time off work or school. Two-hundred and thirteen men and women provided information about 449 types of injuries they experienced as a result of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Thirty-eight percent of respondents reported bruising as the number one injury they experienced, followed by lacerations (21.0 percent), head injuries (18.0 percent), torn clothing (six percent), fractures (six percent), other injuries such as scratches and emotional trauma (six percent), sprains (two percent), groin injuries (one percent) and rape (one percent). Women ranked other injuries such as scratches and emotional trauma (17.6 percent) much higher than men (four percent). One percent of men and one percent of women reported that they had been raped. Men ranked fractures and injury to the groin much higher than did women.

8.4(b) Toronto Survey Responses Regarding Medical Attention

One hundred and twenty-one survey respondents answered the question about needing medical attention because of injuries experienced as a result of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Of the 121 survey respondents who answered the question about injuries, only 22 (18 percent) said that they needed to seek medical attention while 99 (82 percent) respondents said they had not sought medical attention.

Qualitative information was obtained from 70 Toronto survey respondents on their reasons for not seeking medical attention for their injuries. Of the 70 respondents who gave information 33 (47.1 percent) respondents said that the injury was minor and there was no serious damage as a result of the assault. Five respondents (seven percent) said they experienced shame, fear, humiliation, and embarrassment because of the attack and therefore chose not to seek medical attention. Seven respondents (10 percent) said the assaults were verbal and therefore no medical attention was needed. Sixteen respondents (22.9 percent) said they had minor injuries and felt no medical attention was necessary. Two respondents (three percent) said they sought medical attention but remained closeted and lied about the cause of their injuries. Five respondents (seven percent) said they were hurt but that no medical attention was needed. Two respondents (three percent) said they sought medical attention but they did not get the
attention they needed. None of the respondents mentioned seeking therapy in order to cope with the after-affects of the assault.

Survey respondents were asked if they went to Emergency, a family physician, a walk-in-clinic, or elsewhere. Forty-one percent went to Emergency, 26 percent saw a family physician, 20 percent went to a walk-in-clinic, and 12 percent sought medical attention elsewhere.

Survey respondents were asked about the time period in which they sought medical attention. Out of the 27 respondents who answered this question, 15 (56 percent) said they sought medical attention immediately, seven (26 percent) within 48 hours, and five (19 percent) after 48 hours.

Of the 29 respondents who responded to the question about rating the hospital's response, 12 (41 percent) said the hospital response was average, which is a significant improvement over the poor rating given police. However, five (17 percent) respondents said that the hospital response was poor, six said it was fair (21 percent), three (ten percent) said it was good, and three (ten percent) said it was excellent.

**8.4(c) Trends in Obtaining Medical Attention in North American Research**

There are little statistical data on injuries and medical attention received by victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence in the North American literature; however, the NCAVP (1996) report shows that 33 percent of victims who should have received medical attention during 1996 did not get it (NCAVP, 1996). Other researchers have focused on the psychological consequences of anti-gay/lesbian violence and the health care needs of victims (Otim & Skinner, 1996; Savin-Williams, 1994; McKee, Hayes, Axiotis, 1994; D'Augelli, 1993; Dillon, 1986; Duluney & Kelley, 1982; Stermac & Sheridan, 1993; Garnets, Herek, Levy, 1992; Bohn 1984; Orzek, 1989). In Toronto the Wellesley Central Hospital developed a Lesbian and Gay Bashing Protocol to meet the needs of sexual minority victims in the Emergency Room Triage because they witnessed the physical injuries and psychological trauma of gay bashing victims (Hierlihy, 1996).

**8.4(d) Trends in Reporting to North American Victim Assistance Programmes**

There is no other Victim Assistance programme like the 519 BRL in Canada with which to provide a comparison in terms of organizational history, statistical reports, and trends over numerous years of documentation and advocacy. Findings from the 519 BRL provide a unique
departure point from which to assess potential trends for other newly developing Canadian victim assistance programmes (Roberts, 1995:33). American research on reporting patterns to lesbian and gay community organizations reveals similar reporting trends. In Toronto the reports of victimization documented by the BRL show that attacks that involve combined verbal assault and physical assault are the most commonly reported forms of victimization, followed by vandalism and threats of assault. A similar pattern is shown in the American research (Berrill, 1992:36-37; NGLTF, 1991:7). While reports to the BRL have fluctuated for both men and women since 1990 reports to American Victim Assistance Programmes have steadily climbed (Berrill, 1992:36-37). While this increase may indicate increased victimization it may also indicate improved documentation by community groups. Proof of increased reporting in other areas has also been established. Despite the rise in reports to American community groups it is believed that the majority of anti-gay/lesbian violence is never reported to anyone. Although American researchers assert that lesbians and gays are prone to a level of victimization that far exceeds that of the non-gay and lesbian population (Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force, 1988) the financial support provided to Canadian victim assistance programmes have largely failed to acknowledge and address the existence and needs of the victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

8.5 Conclusions

In Canada gay communities promote the collection of hate crime statistics through Hate Crime Units and Bashing Reporting Lines. In the United States, gays and lesbians lobbied for documentation of hate crimes based on sexual orientation through the Federal Hate Crime Statistics Act (1990). The Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1998 encourages federal and state cooperation to fight hate crimes. While gay men in Canada and in the United States lobbied for inclusion of "sexual orientation" in the enhanced sentencing provisions of the Criminal Code (Canada) and the United States Federal Hate Crime Statistics Act, of 1990, little attention has been given to gender and the specific situation of lesbians within the North American gay lobby framework (Jenness & Broad, 1994; Wolfe & Copeland, 1994; Pendo, 1994).

While police and the gay community endorse the documentation of hate crime statistics for the sake of proving such crimes exist, critics question how statistics will challenge systemic homophobia and heterosexism and help to make connections between racism, sexism and classism. Others question how improved data systems will deter hate crime offenders when there
is little evidence to support the deterrent effects of criminalization or increased penalties (Garofalo, 1997:143). Punishment-focused responses to hate crime victimization may undermine the demand to engage in other responses that may be more time consuming and expensive but perhaps more effective. An alternative to criminalization of the hate crime offender may be ongoing education, prevention, investigation, and victim services efforts. Community policing models, such as that in place in New York City, require the police department to maintain a separate unit to investigate hate crimes, assist hate crime victims, and coordinate with prosecutors in hate crime cases (Garofalo, 1997:143). However, it is true that penalty enhancements are much less expensive and much more commonly used to combat hate crime.

According to annual statistics collected in Toronto at the BRL, lesbian and gay victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence are more likely to report anti-gay/lesbian violence to the BRL than police. Despite the high number of reports documented by the BRL few Toronto survey respondents said they reported incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence to the 519 or the police. We are left with a question about the actual number of experiences of anti-gay/lesbian violence which are never reported. The two most common reasons given by survey respondents for not reporting to the BRL were that they did not think that verbal assault was serious enough to report and they did not know the service existed. The most frequent reasons survey respondents cited for not reporting to police were: they did not feel that verbal assault was serious enough to report; they felt that the police would not take the report seriously or take any action; they feared secondary victimization through police homophobia; and they feared being outing.

Information from survey respondents and those who reported to the BRL reveal that many lesbians and gay men distrust the police and therefore do not feel that they can report anti-gay/lesbian violence to them. The majority of survey respondents rated the police response to be poor. Some victims who reported to the BRL gave instances where police had been perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. This feedback is troubling considering that the BRL has been collecting statistics during the same time period in which the Church-Wellesley Foot Patrol has been in operation. Police diversity training clearly has not eliminated homophobic attitudes within the police force, even when such sensitivity is a requirement of working within a gay and lesbian community. Although some reports to the BRL may be made by people who do not live in the catchment area, lack of police response and actual police brutality against reportees reveals the inadequacies of current police training in the areas of diversity and community and cultural
sensitivity. While police were given a poor rating by survey respondents, hospitals and those who provide medical attention were given an average rating. The findings reveal that, from the perspective of the victims, agencies which should provide support and advocacy to victims of anti-gay/lesbian harassment and assault continue to display homophobic and heterosexist attitudes and actions toward those whom they perceive to be lesbian or gay.

Underreporting by the Toronto HCU and other police units across Canada suggests that there is a wide range of criminal offences not being documented by police mainly because they are not categorized as Criminal Code offences. Verbal assaults and harassment may be dealt with at the community level by police officers. In Toronto the Church-Wellesley foot patrol do intervene in cases of street harassment involving taunts, verbal harassment, following, and chasing. Toronto police have found that it is much more effective to deal with minor cases of homophobic harassment on a personal level, by giving an initial warning, asking for a letter of apology, and, in the case of young perpetrators, informing family members of their children's actions. It is not known how many incidents are dealt with in this way by community police nor how effective such education initiatives are. More research could be done on this topic to assess whether victims feel that such intervention is commensurate with the severity of the crime.
CHAPTER NINE
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 Introduction

The following policy recommendations are guided by the findings from each chapter. I will briefly outline what was found in each chapter, how these findings fill the gaps in the research or literature, and the implications for future research or policy development.

9.2 Recommendations Flowing from the Thesis

9.2(a) Funding

Since 1990-1991 there have been attempts to document and react to the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence through the 519 Centre, a publicly funded grassroots community organization. During this time various mainstream organizations have been persuaded to address the institutional homophobia and heterosexism underlying their approaches to anti-gay/lesbian violence. The CRBC needs funding to continue their work with the Toronto community. As well, it needs continued volunteer input to assess the needs of the community and provide support to victims. Research could be done on funding agencies which might be interested in providing financial support on an annual basis. Funding is not annually renewed and the 519 Centre must constantly justify the need for programme funding. Annualized funding would ensure that the 519 VAP could focus on outreach, education, and research. Finally, more staff and volunteers are needed to continue the work of the Victim Assistance Programme.

9.2(b) Diversity

There needs to be more outreach to diverse members of the lesbian and gay community in order that the CRBC may reflect the multi-ethnic lesbian and gay population.

While the 519 exists as a place where Caucasian lesbians and gay men may feel comfortable volunteering, their outreach to ethnic minority lesbians and gay men could improve. More effort needs to be put into making connections between racism and anti-gay/lesbian violence.
Gender and race are not central concerns of the gay movement organizing against anti-gay/lesbian violence, even though the model and the structure of the VAP are borrowed from feminist organizing (Jenness & Broad, 1994: Wolfe & Copeland, 1994). Linkages need to be made between groups organizing against race, religious, and gender hatred and the anti-gay/lesbian violence movement. Connections need to be made between racism, sexism, and homophobia to more fully understand how these forms of oppression impact upon the experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

9.2(c) Public Visibility and Public Accountability

The 519 Centre model of VAP is based upon grass-roots anti-violence approaches first used in the battered women's movement. The VAP could gain greater visibility by creating stronger alliances with OAITH, the Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses, and other such associations organizing against violence.

While the 519 provides a non-judgemental and supportive environment for victims it needs to better meet the needs of the community. Lack of effective response to the needs of victims has meant that many complaints have gone undocumented. Victims have been left without immediate support and advocacy. Lack of funding for staff and ineffective use of volunteers have led to a focus on outreach and research rather than victim assistance. This fault needs to be rectified through programme evaluation and strategic planning to provide an improved response. Debating with police about police statistics is making a political statement that looks good in the media; however, the immediate needs of victims are more important if the 519 wants to remain true to its philosophy by providing advocacy and compassion to victims.

9.2(d) Police Accountability

The present VAP model is organized separate from police. The geographical distance between police and the 519 ensures that there is a space where victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence can feel comfortable reporting crime. While some anti-violence programmes are situated within police stations, the 519's distinctiveness is essential for good community relations (Pepper & Holland, 1993). While the 519 and police may not agree on statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence, the 519 still acts as an advocate for victims who may feel unable to report
to police. Thus, the distinct nature of its affiliation with and accountability to the community should be retained.

Policy makers who focus on the problem of anti-gay/lesbian violence in large urban cities with a large lesbian or gay population must acknowledge that anti-gay/lesbian violence is also a rural problem. More work needs to be done by the 519 and police to facilitate communication between victim assistance programmes across Ontario and police divisions and detachments.

9.2(e) Volunteer Activism

Volunteers need to be trained to act as victim advocates at the 519. In directing attention to political advocacy issues the VAP coordinator has not been able to focus on this area. While the VAP coordinator documents the initial intake and provides referral and advocacy, the counselling element is lacking in the approach to dealing with victims. Since gay and lesbian victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence are doubly victimized within mainstream institutions there needs to be a place where they know they can get short and long term support in the form of initial one-on-one counselling and group support with other survivors.

9.2(f) Institutional Connections

While the 1997 report documents statistical findings from other studies in Canada, there has been no comparison of the various community efforts to mobilize against anti-gay/lesbian violence (Faulkner, 1997). Research needs to continue on what other agencies in Canada have done to meet the needs of victims.

The CRBC's priorities are education, action, community development and research. A significant number of the initiatives the group outlined in 1995 have been dealt with through community development, research, education and participation. These activities have heightened the profile of the CRBC in the community and educated participants on issues of anti-gay/lesbian violence. The initiatives which the CRBC should develop now are: a women's cooperative protection network, Neighbourhood Watch, alliances with shelters for battered women and sexual assault crisis centres, links with neighbourhood business establishments, a wider catchment area to include all the Greater Toronto area (GTA), and increased outreach to diverse groups in the community.
9.2(g) Media

When the CRBC began its work, media coverage of anti-gay/lesbian violence was increasing in Canada. This media coverage has placed the issue of hate crime within the public domain providing support for gay and lesbian victims and institutions. The high profile recently given to hate crime in the Canadian media has elevated public interest in the topic. This is positive for the 519 Centre and the work being done to counter anti-gay/lesbian violence. The 519 needs to continue to facilitate critical media attention on the topic of anti-gay/lesbian violence in order to influence change in how public institutions deal with victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Media attention also validates victims to come forward to report crimes.

9.2(h) Publications and Future Research

In 1997 a report written for the 519 and the Department of Justice was published. This report, bringing together research on anti-gay/lesbian violence in Canada, is the first document to report on survey findings from the Toronto population and thus to provide a research base for further research. The survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence originally used for this study could be updated and refined to obtain important information which was not gathered through the first survey distributed in 1995 and 1996. The CRBC needs to continually replicate research to ensure that it has a sound basis for applying for more grant money and government support.

Statistics on anti-gay/lesbian violence have been documented through victim reporting intake forms at the 519 since 1990. No systematic scientific study of these intake reports has been done. Compilation of records and more systematic documentation of data could provide information resulting in publications which could in turn be used to lobby for future funding and support. Publications could also provide much needed information to the public on the experiences of victims and the institutional response they receive. Follow-up interviews with victims who have reported to the 519 could provide valuable information about their experience with police, hospitals, social services, therapists, lawyers, judges, and crown attorneys.

While the focus of officials in the HCU has been education, their initiatives must also address how social inequality, sexual inequality, and racial discrimination combine to influence perpetrators of anti-gay/lesbian violence. More research needs to be done on the effectiveness of education programmes and police training to assess whether attitudinal change correlates with decreased incidence of anti-gay/lesbian violence.
It is necessary to standardize surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence used in Canada which measure rates and document incidents of violence to allow comparisons to be made over time. This study should be used as a research base for other studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Canada. This would ensure that future research is not done in isolation and that new methods and theories can be generated to explore and examine anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Instead of relying on membership lists from gay and lesbian organizations researchers need to broaden the scope of the study to include those who are least likely to participate. Future studies should attempt to survey those groups least likely to be represented in sample populations which are typically accessed to participate in anti-gay/lesbian violence surveys. Assessment is needed of the experience of those who are not out, not involved in lesbian and gay organizations, over the age of forty, under the age of 16, female, non-white, differently abled, from lower socio-economic statuses, transgendered, and those with less than a high school education.

Researchers need to provide a control group of those who claim never to have experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence or harassment to see how they compare with the case sample and to assess how representative the samples are of all victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Researchers need to study the population using a random sampling method to get a more representative picture of the experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence need to pay more attention to an analysis of gender and race and power rather than specifically focusing on gay men since lesbians and gay men do not constitute a homogenous group.

It is recommended that researchers use the Ontario based health study conducted by CLGRO as a research model that combines community activism, a survey on health care, focus groups and feedback from lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered participants obtained from community meetings held in several Ontario centres (CLGRO, 1997).

Special consideration needs to be made to the issue of gender as a category of hate crime, and questions need to be asked about why police are not laying criminal charges in cases where gender has been a factor in a hate-motivated crime. More research needs to be done on this issue. Feminist groups need to work together to collect statistics from shelters for battered women on violence against women and to lobby for change in the way HCU's document hate crime. Reports
of violence and murder of women need to be collected in order to exemplify the gendered nature of hate motivated crime.

Research needs to be done with the victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence who report to community programmes to determine gaps in service and to assess the psychological impact and necessary supports for victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. This would require accessing the records of the Victim Assistance Programme at the 519 Centre to obtain information about reports and asking the 519 Centre to liaise between the researcher and the reportees to gain permission to interview them.

Researchers need to use previous studies on anti-gay/lesbian violence as a research base from which to improve research instruments for future assessment and evaluation of programmes, such as the 519 Church Street Community Centre.

9.2(i) Health

Victim services need to be implemented at the 519 to provide more support for victims. Victims not only need initial support and referral from the victim assistance programme, but they also need follow-up and counselling to enable them to deal with the after effects of bashing. Qualified therapists who have knowledge about the specific mental health effects of anti-gay/lesbian violence should be available to victims on a referral basis. Follow-up should be done by the 519 six months and a year after the bashing in order to track the victim’s case through the courts, the medical system, and any other social institutions the victim may be using.

9.2(j) The Wellesley-Central Hospital

The Wellesley-Central Hospital developed the first North American model to address the needs of gay bashing victims in Emergency (Hierlihy, 1995). The hospital worked closely with the lesbian and gay community to develop an Emergency Room Protocol. However, the white face of the gay community was represented in the documents and video published by the Wellesley, with little examination of the impact on diverse members of the community. Increased sensitivity to diverse communities within the lesbian and gay community is needed. Research combining needs assessment and programme evaluation with the lesbian and gay community should be done as a follow-up to assess the success of this programme.
The Emergency Room Protocol has been implemented with the Wellesley Central Hospital's Triage Emergency Unit and emergency workers have been sensitized to gay bashing (Benedek, 1995:2). With the closure of the Wellesley Central Hospital and the merger with St. Michael's hospital, the survival of this protocol is jeopardized. St. Michael's hospital must be lobbied to continue to use the Emergency Room Protocol in Emergency in order to meet the needs of lesbian and gay residents in the downtown core. All hospitals in Toronto should use the ER Protocol to assist them in dealing with lesbian and gay victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

9.2(k) Advertising

Advertising of the Bashing Reporting Line through cards, posters, pamphlets, and a telephone number in the telephone book has worked to raise the visibility of the CRBC. Each time the Committee did outreach in the community reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence to the 519 increased. Outreach provides victims and survivors with an outlet where they can obtain support, advice, and advocacy. A monthly column in Xtra Magazine written by the coordinator or a CRBC volunteer might further raise the awareness of the community work of the Committee. As well, the column could help to report on trends in victimization and provide documentation of reported perpetrators and places to call for help. Following the New York Anti-Violence Program, the Committee might consider publishing a profile of attackers and print license plate numbers of vehicles which were documented at bashings.

9.2(l) Technology and Communications

While communications systems at the 519 have been improved to facilitate documentation of phone calls from victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence, there needs to be a counselling component added to the programme with on-site staff potentially modelled on the New York Victim Assistance Programme. Future support groups for domestic violence and anti-gay/lesbian violence survivors in the future would provide victims with a resource where they can get support and advocacy. A phone number at the 519 could be advertised as a central location for reporting gay bashing in Ontario. Police should set up a 1-800 central number for reporting hate crime across Canada so that all statistics on hate crime can be funnelled into one department.
Setting up a Web-site at the 519 Church Street Community Centre could provide valuable information on resources to the lesbian and gay community. The facilitation of electronic mail could broaden the membership of the CRBC and enable more efficient communication of information locally and across Canada.

9.2(m) Volunteer Recruitment

CRBC members have worked to integrate themselves in community organizations in Toronto. Without volunteers the CRBC would have difficulty surviving. Volunteers are essential for ensuring communication and action for social change. In order to keep volunteers the 519 could do better in validating and honouring their work through their newsletter and the public media. As well, CRBC members need to continue to look for ways to integrate with community organizations in Toronto with the aim of educating them about the CRBC's work and the issue of anti-gay/lesbian violence.

9.2(n) Institutional Alliances

The CRBC has built alliances with other groups in the community working to end hate. This has allowed for better communication between the 519 and groups in the Toronto Community. The strategy of building alliances helps to strengthen the power of the CRBC in the community through greater visibility. The strategy also lays the basis for ensuring greater accountability from within the infrastructure. The 519 needs to continue to support other organizations in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) in order to build alliances with groups working to end hate.

9.2(o) University of Toronto Sexual Harassment Office

While University of Toronto's Positive Space Campaign may send a message that University of Toronto is a safe place for lesbians and gays, it may also stifle debate and lead people to presume that the campus is safer than it really is (Brown, 1998:29). Sexual Orientation must be included in the University of Toronto equity policy in order to provide protection for sexual minority persons.
9.2(p) Community Policing

Community Policing in the Church-Wellesley community has created alliances with the gay Community as well as changed the ways in which lesbian women and gay men think about anti-gay/lesbian violence. Contradictions between community policing and the experiences of individuals who do not have social and political power within the gay community need to be documented and evaluated in order to understand the ways in which the gay community is being assimilated into the broader society.

Future research on community policing might focus on the victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence who have interacted with police to assess the attitudes of police, crown prosecutors, attorneys, and judges and the effects of these attitudes on sexual minorities who report bashings.

Toronto police claim that hate crime against lesbians and gays takes place in the downtown core but this does not take into consideration the experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence in other areas of the city. Lesbians and gay men may not feel safe reporting to police Divisions other than 52 Division, and therefore their victimization does not show up elsewhere. Researchers need to interview victims to assess the gaps in the system and evaluate whether police outside the downtown core are held accountable and trained to document anti-gay/lesbian violence.

9.2(q) Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Hate Crime Unit

The HCU reports significantly less anti-gay/lesbian violence than reports obtained by the 519. The HCU focuses on crimes which are likely to be prosecuted under the Criminal Code which precludes crimes of lessor degree. Change to the definition of hate crime from "solely" to "in part" would broaden the scope of hate crime categorization to allow for a variety of factors to be considered when laying a criminal charge. This change was implemented by the Metro Toronto Police Force in 1998. Follow-up needs to be done to assess whether broadening the definition affects statistical reports.

Discrepancies between statistics collected by police and community groups suggest that crimes of anti-gay/lesbian violence are only recognized by police when they are likely to be successfully prosecuted through the legal system. Lessor crimes which do not fall within the HCU mandate need to be documented as hate crimes in order to assess the full range of victimization reported.
Hate crimes based on gender are covered by the HCU mandate; yet, since 1993, there have been no official documented reports based on sex, in contrast to reports of assault against gay men based on sexual orientation. The discrepancy may be due to the fact that men have a stronger voice in the anti-gay/lesbian violence movement. Stranger violence is more easily dealt with. Women's experience of violence is ignored because of the perception it is "intimate" violence. Thus the gendered experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence is underrepresented in contrast to the male experience of violence. Hate crimes motivated by gender must be integrated with the analysis of anti-gay/lesbian violence and officially recognized by the HCU and the lesbian and gay community.

9.2(r) Police Services Board

The work of the 519 VAP coordinator on the Community Advisory Committee on Anti-Racism and Anti-Hate has led to increased pressure on the Police Services Board. This work needs to continue. Lobbying must continue to take place to influence the Police Services Board to monitor the Hate Crime Unit's acceptance and rejection of hate crime incidents based on sexual orientation.

9.2(s) B'nai Brith

B'nai Brith has recently included sexual orientation within their investigation of hate crime. Statistics and anecdotal data from victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence were included in their recent Toronto based report on antisemitism. Alliances with B'nai Brith are important for making the connections between antisemitism, racism, homophobia, and heterosexism.

9.2(t) Transgendered Community

The 519's alliances with the transgendered community through the Transgender Action Committee have facilitated a much needed linkage between the transgendered community and anti-gay/lesbian violence initiatives. There needs to be more acknowledgement of the specific needs and issues of the transgendered community in dealing with police, the medical system, and the 519 Centre.
9.2(u) Pride Day

Fundraising events and visibility at Pride Day should continue to raise the public's awareness about the work of the CRBC. These events work to create community alliances in Toronto that strengthen the linkages between grassroots women's organizations, gay and lesbian organizations, and the 519.

9.2(v) Self Defense Initiatives

Dyke and Gay male self defense has been offered at the 519 for several years. The course is offered at the 519 because it is considered to be a safe place for gay men and lesbian women. The effectiveness of this programme in terms of deflecting or limiting acts of anti-gay/lesbian violence has not been assessed. Perhaps follow-up procedures could be implemented in the programme to assess how participants have benefitted from the training, and whether they can now protect themselves and feel more empowered.

9.2(w) Education

The CRBC Education Sub-Committee created a workshop specifically focused on the experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence to make the connections between homophobia and heterosexism, and hate crime. The CRBC volunteers who are involved in the workshop mainly volunteer their time without compensation. Increased funding for such initiatives would enable the survival of such programme development.

9.2(x) Centralized Reporting

Discussion of the implementation of a centralized reporting location for the recording of hate crime on a Metro-wide level has taken place among CRBC participants. The pros and cons of this needs to be assessed in terms of whether it will be organized and run by grassroots activists or Metro Toronto Police, and how a centralized reporting unit would be funded if it were not somehow affiliated with Metro Toronto Police. Needs assessment and programme development could be done to assess the viability of such a project.
9.2(y) Corporate Sponsorship

Corporate sponsorship is lacking at the 519. Corporate sponsorship for anti-violence initiatives would work to increase the visibility of the CRBC in the community as well as allow businesses operating in the gay community to show their support.

9.3 Theoretical Frameworks

In order to challenge the sociocultural perspective which focuses on power and control, and the symbolic interactionist perspective that takes an individualistic approach to explaining anti-gay/lesbian violence, researchers should avoid focusing solely on psychological or personality traits. Since sexologists originally pathologized lesbian women and gay men, researchers need to be wary of how the past influences the present direction of anti-gay/lesbian violence research. Research needs to fit the population which is being studied. This means a reassessment of empirical and positivistic approaches that impose psychological theories and methodologies on research subjects and result in pathologizing both victims and perpetrators while ignoring how social institutions actively support and create anti-gay/lesbian violence. Alternatively, structural approaches which deny the role of individual agency in gay bashing must be challenged for their sociological essentialism. Research on anti-gay/lesbian violence needs to be guided by conflict theories which address power imbalances in society. Research needs to assess systems of power and control which endorse anti-gay/lesbian violence and normalize heterosexuality. This involves re-evaluating the impact of heterosexism at all levels of society.

9.4 Methodological Issues in Collecting Hate Crime Statistics

9.4(a) Police methods of collecting data

While the Metropolitan Toronto Police Service has been monitoring hate crime occurrences since 1993, their definition of hate crime limits the number of incidents actually documented. Federal legislation is needed to require all police forces to standardize the definition of hate crime used and to document and keep records of those pertaining to sexual orientation and report them to the public on an annual basis.

Assessment is needed of the different impact a Bias Crime Unit within a police department has on the reporting rates of anti-gay/lesbian violence compared to a community
programme such as the 519 Centre whose location is separate from police (Pepper & Holland, 1994).

**9.4(b) Hate Propaganda Laws in Canada**

While an improvement over the U.S system in which freedom of speech legislation protects hate propagandists, Canadian Hate Propaganda laws do not include sexual orientation as an identifiable group in need of protection, limiting this law as a source of data on the dissemination of hate propaganda directed at lesbians and gay men (Harvard Law Review, 1993:957-962; Rubenstein, 1992:19; Weinstein, 1994:345-384; Weinberg, 1993:299-319). The Canadian Hate Propaganda legislation should include sexual orientation as an identifiable group in need of protection within Section 3.19 of the Criminal Code.

**9.4(c) The United States Hate Crimes Statistics Act**

Uniform reporting across American states would allow for better tracking of hate crimes. The lack of uniform reporting procedures in each state makes it difficult to estimate the actual instances of hate motivated crime; however, the average annual statistics are comparable to the Canadian rates of victimization reported by Hate Crime Units. Gender should be included in the Hate Crime Statistics Act. Federal hate crime legislation must be passed in the United States to provide legal protection for sexual minorities.

**9.4(d) The National Lesbian and Gay Task Force and the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programmes**

Canadian and American lesbian and gay victim assistance programmes must coordinate to share their statistics on an annual basis in order that Canadian researchers and activists can assess rates of victimization across Canada.

**9.4(e) The General Social Survey (Canada)**

In Canada, statistics on crime are obtained from the general population through the General Social Survey (GSS) which is run every five years by Statistics Canada. The sexual orientation of respondents has never been obtained. Information gathered about sexual
orientation in future surveys could help to obtain a representative assessment of the prevalence and victim impact of crimes experienced by the sexual orientation population.


The Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS, 1993), which was a national study conducted in Canada, obtained information about women's lifetime experiences of violence from men. The study involved conducting intensive telephone interviews with a random sample of 12,300 women across Canada (Johnson, 1996). The sexual orientation of respondents was not determined. While questions focused on women's experiences of violence from men, the survey questions could be altered to encompass questions about same-sex relationships and the sexual orientation hate-related elements of violence in attacks. Since women in studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence have difficulty determining whether attacks are based on their sexual orientation or gender, focused questions could attempt to distinguish the overlapping and separate issues impacting on violence against women who are assumed to be lesbian.

9.4(g) EGALE National Survey

Equality for Lesbians and Gays Everywhere (EGALE) is presently surveying lesbians and gays across Canada through the purposive sampling method. One question in the survey asks about lifetime experiences of victimization. Distribution of the EGALE survey through lesbian and gay organizations and events, and communication via advertisements in lesbian and gay newspapers, means that those who are likely to respond are members of a lesbian or gay community. While national distribution may provide a higher than usual rate of response, it may also only represent those who are already highly represented in other surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Respondents self-select their involvement in the survey and this may bias the results in favour of educated white gay men. More effort needs to be made to obtain Canadian respondents from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. Community based research needs to adhere to the social science standards set out by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).
9.5 Recommendations for Future Surveys

Various groups were overrepresented in this survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Following other North American studies of anti-gay/lesbian violence which use the purposive sampling method, gay Caucasian men living in urban centres were overrepresented. There were slightly more women than men in this study which is unusual for studies of this kind. Bisexuals and heterosexuals were underrepresented in this study. Lesbian and gay youth and seniors were underrepresented in the study as were ethnic minorities, transgendered persons, those in the lower and higher income brackets, and those living in non-urban areas.

Future surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence should allow participants to self-identify their sexual orientation. Researchers need to make an effort to obtain youth and senior participants through outreach to lesbian and gay youth organizations and senior's groups. Participants from the ethnic minority community must be obtained in further studies so that the diverse experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence can be better understood. Those in the lower and higher income levels tend to be generally underrepresented in anti-gay/lesbian violence sample populations calling for more concerted efforts to reach people in these income brackets in further research studies and advocacy. The education level of participants was not obtained and this information could have provided more data on the class background of respondents. Sample populations from non-urban areas are needed to assess the specific risk factors of those living in rural areas, and to escape the problems of distance, isolation, and conservatism, in many rural regions. There need to be questions on children and custody in questionnaires on anti-gay/lesbian violence in order to determine the correlation between partnership status, parenthood, duration of relationship, and the likelihood of experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence. Also important to research is the impact of anti-gay/lesbian violence on children of lesbian and gay parents. Questions need to be asked about children, previous marital status, custody, childcare arrangements, and co-parenting in order to obtain further data on the family status of participants.

Most studies to date show that ethnic minority participants experience higher rates of victimization compared to Caucasian participants (Comstock, 1991). Ethnic diversity in the lesbian, gay, and bisexual community needs to be more actively studied so that the diverse experience of anti-gay/lesbian violence can be better understood.

In future surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence questions need to be asked about whether participants have been discriminated against in housing, employment, or some other area. Future
surveys need to ask participants about whether they are out to friends, family and acquaintances (Herek, 1992:284-285).

9.6 Recommendations for the Study of Fear of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

More research is needed on the ways in which gender intersects with heterosexism and homophobia to induce fear. Further research is needed on why women report experiencing more fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence than men, as well as the effects of fear on victims and the lesbian and gay community.

Women experience more fear based on their past experience of victimization and belief that they are potential targets for attack. More research could be done on whether there are differences in levels of fear experienced by women compared to men based on past experience of victimization, and how this impacts upon the lives of sexual minorities.

The relationship between lower income levels and fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence needs to be further investigated to uncover the variables intersecting with the increased fear this group experiences.

More research could be done on how the victimization of those between the ages of 15 to 29 is similar to or different from the experiences of the same age group in the general population.

The variables which impact on increased fear for those living in non-urban areas need to be further studied in order to assess victim needs.

Further research is needed on why social networks provided by a partner may provide a sense of security those who are single do not enjoy, leading them to perceive there is more potential for experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence.

Those who do not identify with a lesbian or gay community experience more fear of anti-gay/lesbian violence than those who do identify with a lesbian or gay community. More research on this population could be done to assess how community identification helps to provide a sense of security.

More research could be done on the effect of knowledge of attacks on other gays and lesbians and the community as a whole.
9.7 Recommendations for Prevention of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

The trends in victimization point to vulnerable groups within this sample. Gay men, those from low socio-economic backgrounds, those who are active in a lesbian or gay community, those between 15 to 29 years of age, and those who are not in a partnership, experience high percentages of victimization. Women experience victimization in categories which typically characterize female victimization. Those living in urban and rural areas show equal percentages of victimization. Caucasians experienced higher percentages of victimization compared to ethnic minorities; however, the low number of ethnic minorities in the sample suggest there is a need for more representative studies. These trends in victimization point to policy recommendations which focus on the needs of these vulnerable groups. Outreach needs to be done to these vulnerable groups to ensure that they are able to access information about victim services, police, and hospitals.

9.8 Recommendations for Future Research on Perpetrators and Locations of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence

More research is needed on the perpetrators and locations of anti-gay/lesbian violence to provide a comparison with these findings, and to provide a context for understanding the situations in which anti-gay/lesbian violence is experienced. The aim should be to improve upon existing policy and increase deterrents through policy formation within the workplace, schools, and other social institutions.

9.9 Recommendations for Future Study of the Reporting Experiences of Victims

Despite the fact that survey respondents reported high incidences of harassment and assault overall, the reporting rates to public agencies are quite low. Survey respondents' ratings of institutions such as hospitals and police are generally low. Even though similar trends are evident in other research, they are generally ignored in policy research. Institutions such as hospitals, police, universities, and the Canadian Bar Association need to reassess their policies and attitudes toward sexual minorities.

Fear of secondary victimization may prevent victims from reporting. More research could be done on how to decrease the secondary victimization that occurs. Respondents continuously reveal that their fear of secondary victimization impacts on their choices not to report anti-
gay/lesbian violence to institutions. Institutional policies need to change to reinforce that sexual orientation is a category in need of protection along with sex, race and ethnicity, ability, and religion.

9.10 Recommendations for Future Research on Gender and Victimization

The reports of victimization, which differ by gender and sexual orientation, suggest that differences are determined by gender rather than any other factor. Typically, women report sexual harassment more often than do men. Lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals -- all categories with large percentages of female respondents -- report sexual harassment and sexual assault higher or in one case, equal to gay men. Gay men report threats, objects thrown, and assault much more often than do lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals. The gender typicality of the victimization patterns suggest that gender is the causal variable rather than sexual orientation. More systematic analysis of the data needs to be done to assess the strength of the gender variable in the data-set.
CHAPTER TEN
CONCLUSIONS

I began the research process as a political activist and a volunteer at a community centre. The intent of this study was to: 1) document the experiences of victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence, 2) document the model of victim assistance developed at the 519 Church Street Community Centre and the institutional responses to anti-gay/lesbian violence from the Wellesley Central Hospital, the Toronto Hate Crime Unit, the University of Toronto, and the 519 Centre, 3) contrast the findings from a survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence distributed in Toronto with findings from other surveys of anti-gay/lesbian violence in Canada and the United States, 4) review the major theoretical sources which are used to explain anti-gay/lesbian violence, 5) explore and critique the methods used to collect data about hate-motivated crimes based on sexual orientation, 6) provide a research base for future study of anti-gay/lesbian violence, and 7) provide recommendations based on the findings for future research on anti-gay/lesbian violence.

The major theoretical sources on anti-gay/lesbian violence focus on social-psychological explanations influenced by structural functionalist, symbolic interactionist, and conflict theories. Gaps in the literature point to the lack of attention to the intersections of race, ethnicity, class, gender, and sexual orientation. In Herek's (1992) psycho-social analysis and Comstock's (1991) power control theory, male and female victims and perpetrators are undifferentiated. Like most criminogenic frameworks which are used to explain male violence theories of male aggression, struggles between men for socio-economic resources, and male role modelling are used to explain why some men gay bash while others do not. Differences are lost in these approaches and the intersections between the race, class, gender, and ethnicity of both perpetrators and victims are disconnected.

Conflict theorists focus on the social construction of systemic heterosexism and homophobia to make the links between anti-woman and anti-lesbian violence. The strength of this approach lies in its attempt to specify gender and to explore the ways in which violence against lesbians is both similar and different to violence against women in general. However, the risk in such an approach is to focus only on the gendered aspects of anti-lesbian violence. Researchers of anti-gay/lesbian violence need to focus on the forms of violence that are entrenched in our social systems (for example structural and systemic violence) and the powerful
effects they can have on the lives of sexual minorities (Irwin, Gregoric, Winter, 1997:100). Researchers need to stress that we live in a culture of violence, built on hierarchies in which the use of violence is legitimate. Anti-gay/lesbian violence is one more form of separation and control whereby divisions between people are reinforced. For these reasons the intersections between the various systems of oppression need to be explored in anti-gay/lesbian violence research in order to make stronger connections between anti-semitism, racism, classism, homophobia, and sexism.

I agree with Blumenfeld about the importance of making links between different forms of oppression as a way of bringing people of various social identities together (Blumenfeld, 1996:160). I suggest that the methods by which minority groups are discriminated against do show similarities in terms of the means by which power and control are enforced. The similarities across forms of oppression suggest that, unless these intersections are made, people will not see that the methods by which Jews and other groups are discriminated against are the same methods by which lesbians and gays have historically experienced prejudice that fosters the social acceptance of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Instead of conceptualizing lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered as a separate and discrete categorical group bound by their common interest in sexuality, there needs to be an examination of the similar means by which minority groups are violated and objectified with the aim of creating stronger alliances and working towards social justice and social change.
Chapter Three Endnotes

1. The 519 Church Street Community Centre operates the gay and lesbian bashing reporting line in Toronto. Statistics are for the period March 1990 to December 1995. Statistics for Montreal's gay bashing reporting line are from January to May 1993. They were compiled as part of a community study by Table de concertation des lesbiennes et des gais du grand Montreal (Hendricks, 1995). Historical documents are Bruner (1981), The Toronto Lesbian and Gay History Group (1981), Egale (1995), Canadian Bar Association (1995), Humphries and Miller (1983). The Toronto Hate Crime Unit's statistics are for the period 1993-1996. See Faulkner (1997) for the Toronto study (n=368); Samis (1995) for the Vancouver study (n=420); Kelner (1983) for the Winnipeg study; Project Affirmation (1995) for the Ontario study (n=1233); Bertrand (1986) (n=1000); and Smith (1993) for the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick (1990) studies (n=294 and n=176 respectively).

2. David Allison of Outrage reports that there is no published data on anti-gay/lesbian violence in the United Kingdom. Outrage reports that some police forces report sexual orientation crimes as a separate category.

3. "The Hate Crime Unit has been monitoring hate motivated crime occurrences since January 1993. The Metropolitan Toronto Police Services uses the following definition: A Criminal offence committed against a person or property that is based solely upon the victim's race, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, gender or disability.

4. The National Lesbian and Gay Task Force's 1986 report states that violence is anti-gay when "it is directed against persons or their property because: 1) they are lesbian or gay or perceived to be so; 2) they are associated with or advocate on behalf of gay and lesbian people. By this definition, victims and perpetrators of anti-gay violence can be anyone -- heterosexual or gay, young or old, male or female, strangers or acquaintances, and member of any race, class, or ethnic group. Although most victims of anti-gay violence are gay or lesbian, sometimes heterosexuals are attacked because they are mistakenly perceived to be gay or because of their association with someone who is gay." National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. 1986. "Anti-Gay Violence, Causes, Consequences, Responses." A White Paper by the Violence Project of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. (Kevin Berrill Director, Violence Project).

5. "Genocide is defined as the act of killing members of an identifiable group or of deliberately inflicting conditions on an identifiable group calculated to bring about the destruction of that group, in whole or in part. An identifiable group is defined as any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, religion, or ethnic origin. The offence is indictable, and may be prosecuted only with the consent of an Attorney General and is punishable by imprisonment not exceeding five years." Public incitement of hatred is defined as: "319. (1) Every one who, by communicating statements in any public place, incites hatred against any identifiable group where such incitement is likely to lead to a breach of the peace is guilty of (a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years; or, (b) an offence punishable on summary conviction. (2) Every one who, by communicating statements, other than
in private conversation, wilfully promotes hatred against any identifiable group is guilty of (a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years: or (b) an offence punishable on summary conviction." Martin's Criminal Code, 1998. "Part VIII - Offences Against the Person." S.319.

6. For an overview of the origins of hate propaganda provisions see The Report of the Special Committee on Hate Propaganda in Canada (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1966) (The Cohen Committee) and R. E. Hage. 1970. "The Hate Propaganda Amendment to the Criminal Code," 28 University of Toronto Faculty Law Review. 28(63).

7. Resistance to the inclusion of "sexual orientation" as a protected category led to the qualifier in the Act that "expresses congressional approval of 'American family life,' and disclaims any intent to promote homosexuality" (Jacobs & Eisler, 1997:114).

8. The UCR Training Guide lists the following factors to be considered by responding officers in determining whether the crime qualifies as a suspected bias incident: 1) Is the motivation of the alleged offender known? 2) Was the incident known to have been motivated by racial, religious, ethnic, or sexual orientation bias? 3) Does the victim perceive the action of the offender to have been motivated by bias? 4) Is there no clear other motivation for the incident? 5) Were any racial, religious, ethnic or sexual orientation bias remarks made by the offender? 6) Were any offensive symbols, words, or acts that are known to represent a hate group or other evidence of bias against the victim group? 7) Did the incident occur on a holiday or other day of significance to the victim's or the offender's group? 8) What do the demographics of the area tell you about the incident? Jacobs, James B. Barry Eisler. 1997. "The Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990." McShane, Marilyn. Frank P. Williams III eds. Victims of Crime and the Victimization Process. New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 122-123.

9. Dr. Herek is an Associate Research Psychologist at the University of California at Davis. Dr. Herek has published numerous scholarly articles on prejudice against lesbians and gay men, anti-gay violence, and AIDS-related stigma (Herek, Berrill, 1992:306-307). Dr. Herek's questionnaire is documented in the chapter on methodological issues in Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men, Gregory M. Herek and Kevin T. Berrill eds. Newbury Park: London: New Delhi:Sage. 270-281.

Chapter Four Endnotes

10. The CUAV has eight paid staff people: an executive director, two client advocates who work both with domestic violence and anti-gay/lesbian violence, a hot line coordinator, a community organizer, a Speaker's Bureau coordinator, a fiscal coordinator, and a program coordinator while Toronto's one VAP position is 30 hours per week (Herek, 1992:242). The New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project (AVP) provides short term crisis intervention counselling, policy advocacy and court monitoring, and referral to help crime victims identify various forms of assistance and victim entitlements (Wertheimer, 1992:231).

11. Normandeau and Leighton outline the ingredients of the "New Blue Line" of community policing. First, the role or mission of the police in Canadian society is that of peace officers
rather than law enforcement officers involved with crime control. Police become routinely rather than exclusively responsible for the reduction and prevention of crime, the promotion of public order, and individual safety. Secondly, the police adopt a strategy of community consultation. Thirdly, the police strategy involves a proactive approach to policing in which police anticipate future calls by identifying local crime and disorder problems. Fourth, a problem-oriented policing strategy is developed that assesses crime and order problems and their underlying causes. A variety of proactive and reactive policing tactics may be used depending on the neighbourhood. A fifth aspect is crime prevention activities which attempt to respond to the underlying causes of problems. Sixth, police attempt to foster inter-agency cooperation. Seventh police personnel operate as information managers who engage in "interactive policing" by routinely exchanging information on a reciprocal basis with community members through formal contacts and informal networks. The eighth factor is to develop tactics to reduce the unfounded fear of being victimized. This is based on the claim of criminologists that fear of crime outweighs the likelihood of experiencing serious crime. Ninth, police are encouraged to become career generalists rather than specialists. Andre Normandeau and Barry Leighton. 1993. "A Growing Canadian Consensus: Community Policing." James Chacko and Stephen E. Nancoo eds. Community Policing in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc, 1993: 27-34.

Chapter Five Endnotes

12. The Violence Against Women Survey (1993) is a random sampling of women 18 years of age and older who reported ever being in these situations. Source: the Violence Against Women Survey, Statistics Canada. 1993. For more information, see VAWS: Survey Highlights 1993 (uncatalogued).

13. Vancouver respondents (Samis, 1995) were asked "how many other lesbians, gay men or bisexuals in the lower Mainland do you know who have been harassed, physically attacked, murdered because of their sexual orientation?" However Samis does not report the findings for this question in his thesis. Smith (1993) did not ask this question in the Nova Scotia questionnaire; neither did New Brunswick (1991) or Comstock (1991).

14. Platt (1990) found that of 234 participants (113 males and 121 females) surveyed from 26 States, D.C., and Canada, 94 percent state they knew of others who had been victimized. The District of Columbia Lesbian and Gay Task Force (1988) sample of 395 respondents (male unknown and female unknown) found that 56 percent know of others who have been victimized. Vermonters for Lesbian and Gay Rights (1987), a sample of 133 (75 females and 58 males) report 89 percent know of others who have been victimized. Wisconsin Governor's Council on Lesbian and Gay Issues (Wisconsin, 1985) a sample of 213 (138 males and 75 females) report 85 percent knew others who were victimized. Steinman and Aurand's (1985) study in Maine of 323 gays and lesbians (176 males and 147 females) report 85 percent know others who are victimized. And the National Lesbian and Gay Task Force study of eight cities in the U.S. of 2,074 participants (NGLTF, 1984) (1,420 males and 654 females) state that 84 percent know others who have been victimized (Berrill, 1992:21-22).

15. In his comparison of U.S. studies Comstock found that according to yearly income, the greatest and smallest percentages of victims are in the middle-income and upper-income groups.
There was a small percentage difference across groups. He found that differences according to class background are small with the highest percentage of victims coming from upper-class backgrounds, the lowest coming from middle-class backgrounds. However, Comstock also found that among women, more of those from lower-class backgrounds reported incidents of violence (Comstock, 1991:37).

16. Smith reports that nine percent of Nova Scotia lesbians, gay men and bisexuals had been denied employment, four percent had been denied promotion, and eight percent had been fired because of their perceived sexual orientation (Smith, 1993:25). These figures compare with findings in the New Brunswick (1990) study in which a total of 49 percent experienced some type of employment discrimination because of their sexual orientations; 19 percent had been denied employment, six percent had been fired, 26 percent had been asked about their sexual orientation at work, 11 percent had been threatened at work because they reported discrimination, and eight percent had been pressured to resign from work. In terms of housing, seven percent of the New Brunswick respondents have been denied a lease or rental, or have been evicted, because of their sexual orientation (NBCHRR, 1990:31). Vancouver (1995) show higher percentages of discrimination due to sexual orientation compared to New Brunswick statistics. Twenty-one percent of Vancouver respondents believe they have not been hired due to their sexual orientation, 20 percent believe they have been passed over for promotion, 20 percent believe they have been fired, 22 percent claim to have suffered performance discrimination, and 11 percent believe they have lost clients or customers because they are gay, lesbian or bisexual. Women seem to face slightly more discrimination than men in each of the categories (Samis, 1995:76). Four percent of Vancouver respondents have experienced discrimination related to purchasing a house and 24 percent have experienced rental-related discrimination. Twenty-seven percent of females have faced rental discrimination due to sexual orientation, compared to 24 percent of male respondents. A full 43 percent of males and 63 percent of females believe they could experience housing discrimination in the future due to sexual orientation (Samis, 1995:77).

Chapter Seven Endnotes

17. In Comstock's study victims of violence were asked to remember to most serious incident of physical assault and to provide information about the genders, ages, racial identities, and behaviours of perpetrators. Comstock's study is based on 117 reported incidents. Comstock, David. 1991. "Empirical Data on Perpetrators." Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men. New York: Columbia University Press. 58.

18. In 1979 Project Understanding in Winnipeg, Manitoba found that the practice of on-duty police officers to calls for assistance by lesbian and gay victims is to: refuse to intervene to protect victims or to apprehend the perpetrators, minimize the seriousness of the incident, blame the victims, and verbally harass or physically abuse the victims (Kelner, 1979). Samis reports that 52 percent of Vancouver respondents who could have reported incidents to police had done so while 47.7 percent had not. A comparison between the hate crime data of the Vancouver police is not available because, unlike their Toronto and Ottawa counterparts, they do not make their hate crime data available to the public for any purpose, including academic research (Samis, 1995:110).
19. Vancouver survey results illustrate that 44.2 percent of respondents who have reported anti-gay/lesbian violence to police rate the performance of the police positive, while 59.5 percent rate the performance of the police positive, while 59.5 percent rate the attitude of the police positive. While many of the Vancouver respondents gave police a positive rating it was also found that those who conform to lesbian or gay stereotypes are 26 percent less likely to positively rate police which suggests that the more queer one looks or acts the less likely one is to be treated well by police (Samis, 1995:109).

20. Of those victims in Comstock's survey who reported incidents to police, 51 percent found police helpful, 67 percent found police indifferent, 23 percent found police hostile, 19 percent found police competent, and five percent found them physically abusive. Women were more likely to find police indifferent, hostile, and physically abusive while men were more likely to find police helpful, courteous, and competent. Visible minorities were more likely to find police indifferent, hostile, and physically abusive, while Caucasians were more likely to find police helpful and competent (Comstock, 1991:159-160).

21. Comstock reports that by contrast with American statistics for reporting rates in the general population, the percentage of lesbians and gays who do not report is higher. Sixty-four percent of crime victims in the general population do not report to police. In Comstock's survey, 73 percent of the respondents had never reported an incident to police. Of those who had been victims of very serious anti-gay/lesbian violence, 58 percent said they had never reported an incident to police (Comstock, 1991:158).

22. Altogether, anti-gay/lesbian crimes documented by police in five U.S. cities escalated by 43 percent from 1990 to 1991. However the crimes documented by police are much lower than those reported to lesbian and gay victim services. Reasons for the low number of reports is that statistics to lesbian and gay organizations are taken from suburban as well as outlying areas. Meanwhile law enforcement data reflect only those crimes reported to city police. Another factor is that some episodes reported by victims to local groups do not fit the legal definition of a crime, and therefore are not counted by police. Underreporting to police is often due to fear of retaliation by offenders, or exposure that could lead to discrimination. Many victims decline to come forward because they anticipate a hostile or indifferent response from police. Local groups also maintain that police frequently fail to properly identify, classify, and investigate reported anti-gay crimes because of prejudice, poor training (or no training), or a desire to avoid the publicity and extra work associated with handling bias crimes (NGLTF, 1991:12).

23. Samis (1995) reports that 95 respondents provided a wide range of reasons why they did not, or felt they could not report incidents to police. Fifty-three percent feared secondary victimization from police, 22 percent of respondents feared secondary victimization from people/institutions other than police, 12.6 percent listed other reasons for not reporting to police, and 11.6 percent perceived that police disregard anti-gay/crime and therefore would not report to police. Samis concludes that a majority (75.8 percent) who have experienced serious anti-gay/lesbian violence in Greater Vancouver do not report these incidents to police out of fear of secondary victimization, while 11.6 percent believe that since police give little priority to these crimes they are not worth reporting (Samis, 1995:114).
24. Comstock (1991) reports that 67 percent of respondents would not report to police because they perceived police to be anti-gay or anti-lesbian. Forty percent feared being outed as a result of reporting an incident to police. Fourteen percent feared abuse from police if they reported an incident. Fourteen percent did not have witnesses, and nine percent did not think that reporting would be worth their while. Comstock compared these statistics with the general population and found that only six percent of all crime victims do not report because they think the police would not be concerned and three percent do not report for fear of police insensitivity (Comstock, 1991:159-160).

25. Five percent of Vancouver respondents had been beaten by police. Six percent of men and four percent of women had been beaten by police because they were gay, lesbian, or bisexual. As well, 18 percent of respondents indicated they had been harassed by police because of their sexual orientation, including 20.9 percent of males and 19.1 percent of women (Samis, 1995:80-83). Nova Scotia (1993) and New Brunswick (1991) respondents also reported harassment and assault by police (as discussed in the chapter on stranger violence) however the reporting behaviour of participants was not assessed.

26. The NCAVP (1996) states that 28 percent of the 1,316 reported bias-crime victims in 1996 were injured. A high percentage of victims were injured in an assaultive incident: 73 percent of the assaultive offenses resulted in an injury to the victim. Of the injured victims, 35 percent suffered serious injury or death. Thirty-three percent of victims needed medical attention but did not receive it, 51 percent were treated in Emergency or on an out-patient basis and 15 percent were hospitalized as in-patients (NCAVP, 1996).

27. The only other non-criminal justice data come from a study conducted by the Table de Concertation des Lesbiennes et des Gais du Grand Montreal. This study was conducted over a three month period. Over the period of the study 54 reported incidents were documented. Over half of the incidents involved violence. Acts of aggression were the most frequent category of incident reported. Almost all (83 percent) of the victims were gay men. Almost half of the incidents resulted in physical trauma, and one-quarter resulted in material loss of some kind (Roberts, 1995:33).

28. The most commonly reported victimization reported to the NGLTF from 1985 to 1989 in order of seriousness is verbal harassment or threats of violence, physical assaults or objects thrown, vandalism, police harassment, police abuse, homicides, arson/bombings, and "other." (Berrill, 1992:36).

29. Offences reported to the NGLTF from 1985 to 1989 reveal that reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence have increased dramatically since 1985 in the United States. For example, the number of anti-gay/lesbian violence incidents reported by local groups to the NGLTF increased from 2,042 in 1985 to 7,031 in 1989 (Berrill, 1992:36-37).

30. While reports of anti-gay/lesbian violence are less seldom documented by police, the NGLTF found that police in five large American cities had increased their documentation of crimes involving sexual orientation 41 percent from 1990 to 1991 (Berrill, 1992:37. This trend is different from that found in Toronto's HCU collection of statistics on hate crimes based on sexual orientation. Since 1993 when the Toronto Police force began collecting statistics based on hate
motivated crime, sexual orientation has constituted an annual average of ten percent of the crimes documented (Berrill, 1992:37).

31. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1998 (S.1529/H.R. 3081) encourages federal and state cooperation to fight hate crimes. These proposed amendments in the federal criminal civil rights Statute (18 USC S.245) add coverage for bias crimes based on sexual orientation, gender, and disability and eliminate the highly restrictive jurisdictional requirements for prosecuting hate crimes based on race, national origin or religion. These important changes would provide a limited but crucial basis for federal authority to respond to acts of prejudice resulting in death or bodily injury. The existing Statute, Section 245, covers acts of violence based on race, national origin or religion or colour under the existing S.245 Statute. These important changes would provide a limited but crucial basis for federal authority to respond to acts of prejudice resulting in death or bodily harm. Many States lack comprehensive hate crime laws. Section 1529/H.R. 3081 would begin to bring uniformity to the categories covered under current federal hate crimes law. The Wiesenthal Center. 1998. "Report from the Wiesenthal Centre and the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence." 119 Constitution Ave, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. (202) 544-7893. (Internet site).
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APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1

COVERING LETTER

July 2, 1995

Dear Participant:

This survey has been developed by the Community Response to Bashing Committee, sponsored by the 519 Church Street Community Centre and the Mayor’s Sub-Committee on Lesbian and Gay Issues in Toronto. The Community Response to Bashing Committee is comprised of community members who are concerned about the violence and harassment lesbians and gay men experience. Your participation in filling out this survey will help us to gather data to show how widespread the problem of violence and harassment is. Your participation will also help to substantiate the need for funding for victim assistance programmes and changes to policy on hate crimes.

The completion of the survey should hopefully only take ten minutes of your time. We have taken precautions to ensure questionnaire information will be kept absolutely confidential. For example, the surveys will be collected in a sealed container and completed surveys will be stored in a safe place in a locked cabinet. We will make every attempt to ensure that any personal stories you might add will be edited to ensure anonymity.

The results of this survey will be available to the community through the Victim Assistance Programme at the 519 Church Street Community Centre. Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible, but no later than August 15, 1995. For more information on this survey, or the work of the Community Response to Bashings Committee, please contact Karen Baldwin, c/o The 519 Church Street Community Centre, at the above address.

If you should have any questions about the survey while completing it, please feel free to approach one of our volunteers. We will be glad to assist you in any way that we can. We would also welcome any feedback you may have on the survey.

Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX 2

SURVEY OF ANTI-GAY/LESBIAN VIOLENCE

Please answer as many questions as you feel comfortable with. The questions have been worded with care, and more complete surveys will be most helpful to our research. Your responses are completely anonymous. Space has been left if you wish to make more detailed comments, or you can use the back pages of the survey.

If you would like to describe in detail one or more of your experiences with harassment, discrimination, or violence, please do so on a separate page and enclose with this questionnaire.


*If you complete this survey at home, please mail it to the 519 by August 15, 1995.

1. How often have you experienced the following kinds of incidents because someone presumed you to be a lesbian or gay man during the past year or since the age of sixteen?

0 - Never
1 - Once
2 - Twice or More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Past Year</th>
<th>Since 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Had verbal assaults directed at you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Been threatened with physical violence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Had your personal property damaged or devastated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Had objects thrown at you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Been chased or followed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Been spat upon?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Been punched, hit, kicked, or beaten?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Been assaulted or wounded with a weapon?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Been sexually harassed (without assault)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Been sexually assaulted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Been harassed by police (without assault)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Been beaten or assaulted by police?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did the person(s) make reference to HIV/AIDS in any of the incidents?

Yes  No  Not Applicable

3. If you have been harassed or assaulted as described in question #1, was someone with you at the time of the incident(s)?

Yes  No  Not Applicable

4. Please describe where the incident(s) occurred, and who the perpetrators were:
5. Have you reported an incident of harassment, threats or violence based on sexual orientation to the 519's Lesbian and Gay Bashing Reporting Line?

Yes  No  Not Applicable

6. If you have not reported an incident to the Bashing Reporting Line, why not?

7. If you have been the target of harassment, threats, or violence based on sexual orientation, have you reported it to police (check one)?

___ Not applicable, I have not been the target of harassment, threats, or violence

___ Yes, I reported all incidents

___ No, I have not reported anything to the police

8. If there has been at least one incident that you have not reported to the police, why didn't you report it to police?

If you responded no or not applicable to question #7, please skip to question #11.

9. If you have reported anti-gay harassment, threats, or violence to the police, how would you describe their response to you? Please state "yes" or "no" for each item.

Were the Police:

Sensitive?  Abusive?
Indifferent?  Efficient?
Hostile?  Helpful?
Threatening?  Homophobic?
Professional?  Racist?
Supportive?  Sexist?
Other?  Other?

10. How would you rate the overall response of the police? (circle one)?

Poor  Fair  Average  Good  Excellent

11. If you have experienced anti-gay/lesbian violence, did you seek medical attention?

Yes  No  Not Applicable

12. If you answered "no" to question #11, why did you not seek medical attention after experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence?

If you answered "no" or "not applicable" to question #11, please skip to question #17.
13. If you sought medical attention, did you go to:

___ Emergency (please state which hospital(s))
___ Family Physician?
___ Walk-In-Clinic?
___ Other? (specify)

14. If you sought medical attention did you go:

Immediately  Within 48 Hours  After 48 Hours

15. If you were treated in a hospital emergency department after experiencing anti-gay/lesbian violence, how would you describe their response to you? Please state "yes" or "no" for each item.

Were the Hospital Staff:

Sensitive? Abusive?
Indifferent? Efficient?
Hostile? Helpful?
Threatening? Homophobic?
Professional? Racist?
Supportive? Sexist?
Other? Other?

16. How would you rate the overall response of the hospital (circle one)?

Poor  Fair  Average  Good  Excellent

17. Has the possibility of anti-gay/lesbian harassment or violence affected how you act or behave (circle one)?

Not at all  Somewhat  Greatly

How has it affected the way you act? (use the back of page if needed.)

18. How many people do you know personally who have been verbally harassed, threatened with violence, or physically attacked because they were assumed to be lesbian/gay?

None  One  Two or Three  More than Three

19. Have you experienced anti-gay/lesbian harassment or violence more since June 1994 than in previous years?

Yes  No

Comments:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

20. Please indicate your sex (circle one):  FEMALE  MALE

21. Do you consider yourself transgender? YES  NO

22. What is your date of birth (month/day/year)? ________________

23. How do you identify your racial/ethnic background?

24. What is your gross annual income?

25. Please indicate your sexual orientation:
   Lesbian  Gay  Bisexual  Heterosexual

26. What (if any) community within the lesbian and gay communities do you identify with?

27. Do you currently share a household with a partner/lover?
   Yes  No

28. Do you live in Metro Toronto?  
   Yes  No

   If you do not live in Metro Toronto, where do you live? ________________

29. What is your postal code? ________________

THANKYOU!

Appendix 3

The Ethical Review for the Survey

Informed consent was given in the form of a covering letter which allowed participants to decide whether they wished to participate in the survey. Participants were told that the research was being done for the 519 Church Street Community Centre and that the data would be public property. A copy of the finished report would be stored in the Toronto Lesbian and Gay Archives and the data-set would remain the property of the 519 Church Street Community Centre. The covering letter stated my intent to use the data for thesis research. The Executive Director of the 519 Church Street Community Centre as well as the Coordinator of the Victim Assistance Programme reviewed the survey and provided administrative consent to its distribution. As well, both were on site on Pride Day in 1995.

The anonymity of research subjects was protected through various methods: no names were obtained from participants on the questionnaire, code numbers were used to identify the surveys, surveys were locked and kept in a secure location, and identifiable information in the questionnaire responses was edited to protect the anonymity of the participants. A "Resource List" including local contacts and reading material was provided.

The Ethical Review for the Interview

The ethical requirements surrounding the interview process ensured that written consent was obtained from the participants. I contacted potential interview subjects through the snowball method. I spoke with them over the telephone and explained my thesis research and the reasons for my interest in interviewing them. I then arranged a time to meet for a taped interview. I provided a letter of introduction which asked for permission to tape record the interview which they were asked to sign. I gave them the option of using their name in my thesis. All interviewees provided me with permission to use their names in the thesis. The taped interviews were transcribed verbatim. I provided the transcribed documents to the interviewees for their editing. Participants were allowed to remove themselves from the study at any point. For reasons of security one participant refused to sign the consent form but gave me verbal permission to interview him as long as I returned a copy of the taped interview to him which I did. This process may speak to the existing distrust between police and the lesbian and gay community. I provided the name of my supervisor and a contact telephone number in the letter of introduction and I retained the signed consent forms.

The Ethical Review for the Field Research

The 519 Church Street Community Centre's ethical review process involved two ethical issues. At that time the Coordinator of volunteers provided me with permission to document my experience of volunteering for the purpose of fulfilling course requirements at the University of Toronto.

The second ethical issue arose around the use of survey data for my thesis research. I asked the 519 Centre's Community Response to Bashing Committee (hereafter the CRBC) if the survey
data could be used for thesis research. The 519 Committee reviewed the procedures involved in the distribution and collection of data through the survey and found that the ethical procedures followed were sound and protected the anonymity of the research subjects. The survey distribution was overseen by two sociology students, as well as the Coordinator of the Victim Assistance Programme. The 519 Centre gave me written permission to use the data obtained from the survey for my thesis research providing that I adhere to the ethical requirements of the CRBC and the Ethical Review Protocol of the University of Toronto. The Committee also requested that the data from the second year of data collection be shared with the 519 Church Street Community Centre. As well, the Committee requested that the data be stored at the Lesbian and Gay Archives. The report written from the 519 Church Street Community Centre and the Department of Justice has been catalogued at the Toronto Lesbian and Gay Archives and University of Toronto libraries (Faulkner, 1997).
APPENDIX 4

LESBIAN AND GAY BASHING REPORT*

Please read to caller: All the information you provide to us will be recorded and forwarded to the police for investigation. If you wish to remain anonymous, we will respect that decision, however we will forward the information about the attack to the police.

Today's Date: ________ Initial _____ Faxed to 52 Division ______

Name: self _____ on behalf of someone else ______

Address:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Phone #: __________________________

Date/Time of Incident: __________________________

Location of Incident:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Description of Suspect(s):

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Is the suspect your partner, ex-partner?

________________________________________________________

Description of Weapons:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Direction of Travel of Suspect(s):

________________________________________________________

Were you verbally abused during the incident? What did the suspect(s) say? Did they identify you as gay or lesbian?

________________________________________________________
If the assaulter is your partner/ex-partner, have they assaulted you before?
Yes _________ No _________

Description of Previous injuries
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Description of Present Assault:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If you were injured, describe the injuries.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Was anything stolen?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Have you reported this to the police? Yes ____ No ____
If not, can you tell me why not?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If yes, what was their response?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Officer(s)
________________________________________________________________________

Badge # ___________________________ Division ___________________________

Are there any other facts that we should know about?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

* This report is written by the Lesbian and Gay Bashing Line volunteers and staff at the 519 Church Street Community Centre, Toronto, Ontario. M4Y 2C9.