

In forthcoming issues:

- The condom debate—continuing controversy?
- Dentists and HIV positive patients
-



**Homophobic Crime and Domestic Violence:
Results from the 2004 *What Do You Need?* consultation**

During 2004 EHH Gay Men's Project undertook a service user consultation with gay and bisexual men regarding experiences of domestic violence and homophobic crime to gather data of use to the Hounslow Community Safety Partnership. Recruitment to the consultation was extended to lesbian and bisexual women and transgender people. This briefing provides a summary of the findings from the survey.

Between April & July 2004 the EHH Gay Men's Project distributed 1949 self-completion surveys using a range of methods:

- ♦ at static sites (gay pubs, local LGB youth groups, HIV services etc.);
- ♦ through outreach work (in local gay venues and HIV services);
- ♦ via postal and e-mailouts to existing customers;
- ♦ and online for completion by customers with internet access.

The sample

265 questionnaires were returned in total, giving a response rate of 14%.

86.4% of returns were from males, 12.8% from females, and 0.8% of unknown gender.

The age range of respondents was 19-82 years, giving an average age of 37.6 years.

77.7% of respondents identified as gay, 4.39% as homosexual, 10.6% as lesbian, 3.4% as bisexual, 0.8% as transgender and 1.9% as other.

11.3% of respondents identified as disabled and 11.7% identified as living with HIV.

In total 37.7% of the sample identified with an ethnic group other than White British and 10.2% of respondents identified their main language as something other than English. The majority of these languages were other European languages.

Some respondents gave multiple answers to certain questions, so the total of the proportions given is sometimes greater than 100%.

Experiences of homophobic incidents

A total of 110 (41.5%) of our respondents had been affected by a homophobic incident in the last year. 36.2% had experienced someone being homophobic towards them; 4.9% had witnessed a homophobic incident; and 0.4% had been homophobic to another person.

There were differences according to the gender of the respondent with 33% of female respondents experiencing someone being homophobic towards them in the last year compared to 39% of males; and 3% of female respondents witnessing and incident compared to 6% of males.

The gender of the other person involved was predominantly male (81% overall) for both male (83%) and female (60%) respondents. However, female respondents reported higher proportions of females involved in the incident (40% vs 17%).

Type of incident experienced

We asked respondents who had been affected by a homophobic incident in the last year (n=110) to indicate what type of homophobic incident they had been involved in last. Some respondents indicated multiple types of incidents therefore the total of the proportions of all types of incidents is greater than 100%. The most common type of incident reported was verbal abuse, which occurred in 85.5% of the incidents experienced in the last year, impacting on 35.5% of all respondents. Physical assaults are the second most common type of incident occurring in 27.3% of incidents in the last year, impacting on 11.3% of all respondents.

How long ago was the latest homophobic incident?

We then asked those respondents who had been affected by a homophobic incident in the last year (n=110) to indicate how long ago the most recent homophobic incident took place. Just over a quarter of respondents affected by an incident in the last year reported it happened in the last month (11% of all respondents). 55.5% of respondents experienced the latest incident in the last 6 months (23% of all respondents). 88.2% of respondents experienced the latest incident in the last year (37% of all respondents).

Levels of reporting & support

We asked those respondents who had been affected by a homophobic incident in the last year (n=110) whether they had reported the incident to anyone, and whether they had sought support. The majority of respondents experiencing a homophobic incident in the last year did not report it to anyone (60.9%), and the majority of them did not seek support following the incident (73.6%).

Confidence in reporting future incidents

We asked all respondents (n=265) to rate how confident they felt about reporting future incidents to a range of services on the scale of 0 (not confident) to 4 (very confident). The results show that the services in which respondents

have most confidence are LGBT Services/Community Groups. Victim Support and Other Voluntary Organisations also received average confidence levels above the midpoint mark of 2.0. The Police and Work received average ratings just below the mid-point at 1.9, and Housing received the lowest rating at 1.3.

Priorities for addressing homophobic crime

We asked all respondents (n=265) to rank in order of preference three options for addressing homophobic crime. The responses showed that the top priority for addressing homophobic crime is increasing the quality of generic services, the second priority is increasing local specialist support for LGBT victims, and the third priority was increasing choices of services for reporting incidents.

Experiences of domestic violence

A total of 74 (28.7%) of respondents had been personally affected by domestic violence. 21.5% had experienced violence towards them, 2.3% had been violent towards another person, and 4.9% had witnessed an incident of domestic violence.

For those respondents that had experienced domestic violence the survey asked who was the other person involved in the incident. The results were as follows: Partner – 20%; Ex-partner – 30%; Family member – 31%; House/Flat mate – 5%; Other – 19%.

All partners (n=15) who were involved in domestic violence were of the same gender as the respondents. Ex-partners (n=22) were also of the same gender as respondents except in one women's case (16.7% of females' ex-partners).

Family members (n=23) involved in DV were 78.3% male and 26.1% female. House/flatmates (n=4) involved in previous DV were 75% male and 25% female.

Other people involved in previous DV were 85.7% male and 14.3% female (all male respondents n=14). The definition of Others was varied and included friends (5), neighbours (3), ex-wife/lover (2), pubic/stranger (2), others (4).

Overall this shows a pattern that LGBT experience of domestic violence is split between relationships (mainly of the same gender) and family and other types where others involved are predominantly men, but also include women.

Of those respondents that had experienced domestic violence 52 (70%) had done so on more than one occasion.

Seriousness of most recent incident

We asked respondents who had experienced domestic violence how serious the most recent incident had been on a scale of 0 to 4, where 0 is Not Serious and 4 is Very Serious. The rankings were: 0 = 4%; 1 = 8%; 2 = 31%; 3 = 28%; 4 = 23%; No answer = 6%

Over 50% of respondents that had experienced domestic violence rated the seriousness of the last incident in the highest two categories.

Seeking Support

We asked respondents that had experienced domestic violence if they had sought support. 28 (38%) of those experiencing domestic violence responded that they had sought support, indicating that the majority of respondents did not seek support. We then asked where respondents had sought support from. The results show that the service least commonly used was the specialist LGBT domestic violence support organisation Broken Rainbow, followed by Homeless Persons Unit/Youth Workers/Refuge Helpline/and then by teacher/student services. The most common source of support was the Police followed by Friends. Other sources of support included DVIP (Hammersmith), Landlady, the Forum, Education Welfare Counsellor, Counselling, Gay Men's Groups, Survivor UK, Stonewall, Telephone Companies, GU Clinic.

We asked those respondents who had sought support to rate the response they received from a range of agencies, where 0 is Very Poor and 4 is Very Good. In terms of satisfaction of response from these services the picture is different. Youth workers, NHS Staff, Friends and other sources of support had average ratings above the halfway mark of 2. The lowest rated support came from religious leaders, social services, victim support and teachers/student services.

Priorities for domestic violence support improvement

We asked respondents to rank in order of importance three options for improving support to members of the LGBT community.

Option 1 was "to increase awareness of domestic violence in the LGBT community", and this ranked an average of 2.23. Option 2 was "to advertise and promote awareness of domestic violence support services in the LGBT community". This option ranked 1.86 on average. Option 3 was "to provide training to staff working in domestic violence support services to improve service delivery to the LGBT Community" and this got an average rank of 1.91.

This indicates that the highest priority identified by respondents is to advertise and promote awareness of domestic violence support services in the LGBT community, followed by providing training to domestic violence services to improve their service delivery to the LGBT community.

For further information on
Professional Briefings
from the EHH Gay Men's Project,
contact: Russell Fleet
c/o WLCC
137A Coningham Road
LONDON
W12 8BU
Phone: 020 8749 8429
Fax: 020 8743 8366
Email: russellfleet@btclick.com

Useful Contact Details:

Broken Rainbow (LGBT domestic violence agency)
07812 644 914
lgbtdv@btopenworld.com; www.lgbt-dv.org
GALOP (police matters and homophobic violence)
020 7704 2040
London Lesbian & Gay Switchboard (24 hours)
020 7837 7324
Pink Therapy Services (counselling)
020 7291 4480

PLEASE PHOTOCOPY AND PASS ON AS NECESSARY