

ANTI-GAY VIOLENCE AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF
SASKATCHEWAN: OCCURRENCES,
MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH
CONSEQUENCES, AND
PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS
OF SUPPORT SERVICES

A Thesis Submitted to the College of
Graduate Studies and Research
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Psychology
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By
Shelley L. Balanko

Fall 1997

© Copyright Shelley L. Balanko, 1997. All rights reserved.

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of the University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copy or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or make other use of material in this thesis, in whole or part, should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Psychology

University of Saskatchewan

9 Campus Drive

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

S7N 5A5

ABSTRACT

The present research documented the occurrence of anti-gay harassment and violence at the University of Saskatchewan (U of S), examined the mental and physical health consequences of this form of victimization, and assessed participants' use and perceptions of student support services to provide insight into the U of S campus climate for homosexual students. In Study 1, self-report questionnaires and telephone interviews with current or former U of S students indicated that anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence affects members of the U of S gay community adversely. Verbal harassment was the most common anti-gay behavior reported. Mental and physical health consequences of this victimization were: depression, anxiety, fear, isolation, helplessness, nausea, and fatigue. There was substantial underutilization of U of S support services, partially due to a fear of secondary victimization. Friends, family, and significant others were the most relied upon sources of support for dealing with an anti-gay experience.

Study 2 examined heterosexual students' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians and their perceptions of the U of S campus climate for homosexual students. Male and female students held somewhat positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians; however males had significantly less positive attitudes toward both gay men and lesbians than females. Also, students held significantly more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. The heterosexual students observed few overt signs of anti-gay attitudes on campus, but felt that the chance of an anti-gay attack on campus was likely. It is concluded that the U of S campus climate is perceived as potentially threatening for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals. Implications of the findings are discussed, including the impact of a non-affirming environment on the identity development of U of S students.

Future directions for research and recommendations for an evaluation of support services for gay sensitivity, a homosexuality education campaign, and institutional policy reform are presented.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to all who contributed to this research. The project could not have been conducted without the cooperation of Gays and Lesbians at the University of Saskatchewan, the USSU Women's Centre, and Student Counselling Services.

To the gay, lesbian, and bisexual community, for their trust and honesty. I admire their strength in the face of adversity.

To my thesis supervisor, Dr. Louise Alexitch, for her guidance, patience, and willingness to explore a controversial and sensitive topic.

Thank you to my committee members, Dr. Don Fischer and Dr. Gerry Farthing, for their openmindedness and shared wisdom.

To Trish Macfarlane and Dave Peniuk, for their assistance with data coding and analysis, as well as their limitless support and friendship.

Finally, to my family and friends, for providing me with unfailing love and encouragement.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents, Lawrence and Elizabeth Balanko. Without your continual love, support, and friendship none of my achievements would be possible. Your faith in my abilities inspires me to succeed. I am forever grateful and proud to be your daughter.

Shelley

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
PERMISSION TO USE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Homosexual Identity	3
Origins of Anti-gay Prejudice and Discrimination	6
Patriarchy	10
Cultural Heterosexism	12
AIDS	14
Summary	15
Consequences: Discrimination and Hate Crimes, and Health Issues	15
Occurrences of Anti-gay Violence	15
General Public	16
College/University Populations	17
Mental and Physical Health Consequences	19
Interventions	22
Social Support	25
The Current Projects	26
STUDY 1	28
Hypotheses	30
Method	32
Respondents and Sampling Strategy	32
Measures	33
Procedure	38
Administration	38
Pilot Study	40
Analysis	40
Results	41
Tests of Hypotheses	41
Additional Survey Findings	52
Campus Climate	52
Characteristics of Anti-gay Incidents	55
Disclosure of Sexual Orientation	59
Characteristics of Most Recent and Most Traumatic	
Anti-gay Experiences	60
U of S Support Services	63
Qualitative Interview Results	64

Summary of Results	66
Discussion	71
STUDY 2	74
Hypotheses	74
Method	75
Respondents and Sampling Strategy	75
Measures	75
Procedure	77
Administration	77
Pilot Study	78
Analysis	78
Data Preparation	79
Results	80
Order of Presentation Effects and Socially Desirable	
Response Bias	80
Tests of Hypotheses	81
Exploratory Results	84
Summary of Results	86
Discussion	87
GENERAL DISCUSSION	90
Main Findings	93
Challenges and Limitation of the Research	96
Challenges	96
Limitations	98
Conclusions, Implications, and Suggestions for Future Research	100
REFERENCES	105
TABLES	
1. Respondents Reporting Types of Anti-gay Behavior	43
2. Gender of Perpetrators per Incident	46
3. Frequencies of Support Source Utilization	49
4. Effectiveness Ratings for Support Sources	51
5. Number of Respondents Who Hid Their Sexual Orientation (SO)	53
6. U of S Climate Questions	55
7. Number of Participants Victimized by U of S Community Members	57
8. Number of Perpetrators per Incident	58
9. Victims Alone or With Others per Incident	58
10. Sexual Orientation Disclosure: Number of Participants Who Are “Out” and Age of “Coming Out”	61
11. ATLG Independent t-test Results Based on Female Random Samples	83
12. U of S Climate Questions Study 2	85

APPENDICES

A. Survey of Discrimination, Harassment, and Violence at the University of Saskatchewan (U of S)	114
B. Thesis Interview Questions	128
C. Information Letter: Survey of Discrimination, Harassment, and Violence at the University of Saskatchewan (U of S)	129
D. Most Distressing Symptoms Identified by the SCL-90-R	130
E. Written Accounts of Victimization Experiences	131
F. Attitude Questionnaire	132
G. Attitude Questionnaire: Information Letter	136

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary society is too often violent. Stigma, prejudice, and violence against women and minorities are commonplace. One minority group that is a target of prejudice, discrimination, and violence is the gay and lesbian population. Violence and aggression directed against individuals because of their sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation is often called “gay-bashing.” Gay-bashing is a criminal activity that is a type of “bias crime.” The criteria for bias crimes, according to Nardi and Bolton (1991) include:

the presence of verbal abuse or physical actions, threatened, attempted or carried out, directed against individuals or group, or an attack on their property, motivated, all or in part, by the actual or perceived ethnicity, race, national origin, religion, sex, age, disability, or sexual orientation of the target, with such acts intended to intimidate not just individuals per se, but the entire group to which the victim is thought to belong (p. 357).

These bias crimes or hate crimes, as they are commonly called, have serious mental health consequences for the victims. In particular, young adults who are gay and lesbian are at great risk for experiencing mental health problems as a result of anti-gay victimization.

Typical mental health consequences include feelings of social isolation, depression, anxiety, low-self esteem, and interpersonal problems (D’Augelli, 1993; Garnets, Herek, & Levy, 1990).

Early adulthood is the time that many homosexuals are grappling with issues surrounding “coming out,” and victimization during this critical developmental stage may be severely damaging. Consequently, knowing that the mental health consequences can be severe, it is essential that the occurrences of hate crimes against this subset of the population be investigated in order to ascertain the magnitude and consequences of the problem. University and college communities provide an excellent venue in which to study the impact of anti-gay violence among those individuals in early adulthood. Knowledge of the occurrences of anti-gay victimization and its resultant mental health consequences has important implications for policies and support services in higher educational institutions.

The purpose of this research endeavor was fourfold. First, the occurrences of anti-gay violence at the University of Saskatchewan were determined. Second, an index of the mental and physical health consequences of anti-gay victimization was obtained. Third, subjects’ perceptions of the University of Saskatchewan support services were assessed to determine their perceived effectiveness in dealing with anti-gay victimization. Finally, heterosexual students’ attitudes toward homosexuals were assessed to provide insight into the climate on campus for homosexual students. In order to fully understand the psychosocial context within which anti-gay incidents occur, it is important to understand homosexual identity formation, the origins of anti-gay prejudice and discrimination, and the consequences of this prejudice.

Homosexual Identity

Labeling those with a homosexual sexual orientation as “homosexuals” and referring to them as such, implies that this aspect of their individual identity is the most important and most defining personal characteristic. In this paper, homosexuals are referred to as a group; however, it should be stressed that homosexuals are as diverse a population as any minority or majority group. Moreover, sexual orientation is merely one aspect of an individual’s sexual identity which, in turn, is only one aspect of an individual’s self-concept (Shively & De Cecco, 1993). Sexual identity is comprised of one’s biological sex, gender identity, social sex-role, and sexual orientation. Biological sex is classified at birth, either male or female, by the appearance of one’s external genitalia. Gender identity is an individual’s basic conviction of being male or female, and it develops between birth and three years of age. Social sex-role refers to characteristics that are culturally associated with men or with women. Individuals are expected to behave in socially stereotypical ways that are associated with their biological sex. Finally, sexual orientation is defined as a physical and affectional preference for male and/or female sexual and emotional partners.

Homosexuals experience their sexual identity formation in the same context as do heterosexuals. Sexual identity formation is shaped by the wider culture and the sexual scripts that the culture provides. Troiden (1989) proposed a model which conceptualizes homosexual identity formation as a four-stage process. This process is not viewed as a linear progression, but as a process in which the stages overlap and recur throughout one’s lifetime at different times for different individuals. Troiden stressed that

homosexual identity is never fixed or absolute, but is always in the process of modification or “becoming.”

The four stages in Troiden’s model are sensitization, identity confusion, identity assumption, and commitment (Troiden, 1989). First, sensitization occurs before puberty, and individuals consider themselves as heterosexual. The childhood experiences during this stage sensitize the individual to a subsequent self-definition as homosexual. Feelings of marginality and perceptions of being different from one’s same-sex peers characterize this stage. Second, identity confusion occurs during puberty at which time individuals experience turmoil and inner confusion about their sexual status. During this stage, individuals consider that their feelings and behaviors may be regarded as homosexual. Consequently, adolescents begin to suspect that they may be homosexual. The stigma associated with homosexuality contributes to the confusion that homosexual adolescents experience at this time, as it discourages them from discussing their feelings with others and it makes them reluctant to face their emerging homosexual identity. Third, identity assumption occurs during or after late adolescence. During this stage, the homosexual identity becomes a self-identity, and the individual begins to tolerate and then accept his/her identity. They may also associate regularly with other homosexuals, experiment sexually, and explore the homosexual community and subculture. Finally, the fourth stage, commitment, involves adopting homosexuality as a way of life. This stage requires that the individual becomes self-accepting and comfortable with their homosexual orientation. The onset of the commitment stage is marked by entering a same-sex love relationship. At this point, disclosure of one’s homosexual identity to heterosexuals is

one way of assessing one's commitment to his/her homosexual identity. This process of disclosure is commonly referred to as "coming out." Troiden asserts that the stigma surrounding homosexuality exerts a powerful influence over the formation and management of homosexual identities; however, supportive family and friends may counteract this negative influence and facilitate homosexual identity formation throughout the stages.

Homosexuality carries a social stigma in our society. Martin (1982) suggested that the homosexual stigma is so discrediting that it precludes other social identities to which the homosexual individual is entitled. For example, some Christians believe that one cannot be a Christian and homosexual. Adolescents experiencing an emerging homosexual identity are faced with the realization that they may be part of one of the most despised groups in our society. In the face of this realization, individuals have three options: they can hide, they can attempt to change the stigma, or they can accept their homosexual identity and its stigma. Acceptance of one's homosexual orientation only occurs after much struggle and pain, for which the stigma is responsible. Therefore, hiding one's homosexual orientation is very common (Hetrick & Martin, 1987), because open homosexuality is often met with ostracism by family and friends, discrimination, harassment, and violence (Martin & Hetrick, 1988). Adolescents who choose to avoid "coming out" often delay complete homosexual identity formation until they are away from their parents and are in the "liberal" environment of higher learning institutions (D'Augelli, 1989).

However, hiding can have many deleterious consequences. The gay adolescent and gay adult who has not “committed” to their homosexual identity is forced to act a role. Acting a role causes one to continuously self-monitor, which can be very tiring and stressful. Hiding also strains the development of friendships and intimate relationships which leads to social and emotional isolation (Martin, 1982; Martin & Hetrick, 1988). Hetrick and Martin (1987) found that the continual deception involved in hiding one’s sexual orientation also results in self-hatred. The stress, fatigue, isolation, and self-hatred that result from hiding one’s sexual orientation can lead to mental health problems and suicide (Hetrick & Martin, 1987). A discussion of these problems will be presented in a later section of this paper.

Obviously, the individual faced with a developing homosexual identity is confronted with the challenge of stigma management (hiding one’s homosexuality) in addition to the challenges of typical physical and psychosocial development. Furthermore, although acute during early adulthood, the challenges imposed by an emerging homosexual identity continue to confront the individual throughout the life span, as issues surrounding “coming out” are ever present. Since the stigma associated with homosexuality impairs homosexual identity development, a discussion of the origins of this stigma and the functions it serves for its holders is warranted.

Origins of Anti-gay Prejudice and Discrimination

Understanding the basic mechanics of prejudice will assist in the understanding of prejudice, discrimination, harassment, and violence against homosexual persons.

Prejudice is defined as, “an adverse opinion or belief without just ground or before

acquiring sufficient knowledge” (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1988, p. 219). The purpose of prejudice is to maintain control or power over others (Aronson, 1992). Aronson (1992) cites four factors as the basic causes of prejudice: (1) economic and political competition among minority and majority groups, (2) displaced aggression, (3) personality traits, specifically an authoritarian personality, and (4) conformity to existing social norms. It is this last factor that has the most relevance for gay men and women.

Adherence to, and maintenance of, socially-constructed stereotypes is one means of conforming to social norms that foster prejudice. Prejudicial attitudes toward various minority groups are often a result of the negative stereotypes that the larger society holds about those groups (Mohr, 1989; Snyder & Miene, 1994). Stereotypes, however, do not work alone in creating prejudices. It has been argued by Esses, Haddock, and Zanna (1993), that intergroup attitudes are determined by an interplay between both cognitive and affective influences. Specifically, intergroup attitudes are formed by the joint influences of emotions, stereotypes, and symbolic beliefs.

First, with regard to emotional factors, affect, motivations, mood states, and arousal are but some of the factors that determine intergroup attitudes (Bodenhausen, 1993). For example, positive emotions can lead to positive stereotypes, and negative emotions can lead to negative stereotypes. It is important to note that even if stereotypes are positive, they are still inaccurate and misleading.

Second, stereotypes serve various functions for the individual as they may contribute to the maintenance of his/her prejudice for certain groups. For example, Snyder and Miene (1994) identify four functions that stereotypes fulfill. First, stereotypes

fulfill a cognitive function in that they help their holders reduce incoming information to a manageable size which lends a sense of predictability to the world. Second, stereotypes serve a psychodynamic function, where stereotypes serve to protect the holder's ego by providing a variety of ego defenses. For example, by using stereotypes that derogate an outgroup, individuals can make themselves feel better by making a downward comparison between one's own ingroup and the outgroup. Third, stereotypes provide a sociocultural function. In this instance, stereotypes serve to help the holder identify with their own social and cultural groups by defining what one is not. Finally, stereotypes fulfill a detachment and self-protection function. Stereotypes allow prejudicial attitudes to be maintained and discriminatory behavior to occur, because they allow the holder to dismiss, ignore, and detach themselves from the targets of these attitudes and actions.

Finally, symbolic beliefs are another cognitive component to the formation of intergroup attitudes (Esses et al., 1993). Symbolic beliefs are rooted in our basic values and norms, and reflect views about how society should be organized and operate (e.g., "Protestant Work Ethic"). In a study of the relative contribution of emotions, stereotypes, and symbolic beliefs to predicting attitudes toward social groups (English Canadians, French Canadians, Native Indians, Pakistanis, and Homosexuals), Esses et al. (1993) found that symbolic beliefs were most predictive of attitudes toward homosexuals. In addition, it was discovered that symbolic beliefs were most highly related to the attitudes toward other groups held by high authoritarians. For example, the symbolic belief that homosexuality is a threat to the family institution is highly related to negative attitudes toward homosexuals.

A review of the literature on prejudicial attitudes about homosexuals and homosexuality reveals that, in general, both males and females hold negative attitudes toward this population (D'Augelli, 1989; Herek, 1988; Qualls, Cox, & Schehr, 1992; Russell & Gray, 1992). Although attitudes are generally negative, there is some evidence that heterosexuals' attitudes toward homosexuals are contradictory. For example, Rayside and Bowler (1988) found that attitudes toward homosexuality were ambivalent in Canada. They conducted an analysis of various political polls from the late 1970's to the late 1980's. They found that Canadians were politically liberal by being supportive of equal rights for gay men and lesbians; however, there remained strong moral disapproval and condemnation of homosexuality. Norris (1991) also discovered a paradox in his study of anti-gay attitudes and behaviors at an American university, Oberlin College. He surveyed the entire campus community and found attitudinal support for working and socializing with gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals; on the other hand, he also found evidence of substantial discrimination, harassment, and violence against gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals at this same institution.

Despite the above contradictory findings, one finding consistently emerges in the literature on anti-gay attitudes: males are more negative in their attitudes toward gay men and lesbians than are women (D'Augelli, 1989; Herek, 1988; Qualls et al., 1992; Russell & Gray, 1992). Herek (1988) found that not only did males express more negative attitudes toward homosexuals in general, but their attitudes toward gay men were significantly more negative than their attitudes toward lesbians. D'Augelli (1989) assessed the attitudes of enrollees in a resident assistant training course at Pennsylvania

State University. The results showed that male and female subjects did not differ in their attitudes toward lesbians; however, males' attitudes toward gay men were significantly more negative than were females' attitudes. Male participants also made more abusive comments, were less supportive of legal protection for gays and lesbians, were more negative about exposure to gay material in courses and about learning from an openly gay instructor, as compared to female participants. Another study investigating gender differences in racial attitudes and attitudes toward homosexuals and gender roles was conducted by Qualls et al. (1992). The results revealed that women were more accepting of racial minorities, egalitarian gender roles, and homosexuals than were men.

From these results, it is evident that gender is associated with attitudes toward homosexuals, and specifically, that males express more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than females. A possible explanation for these findings may be found in the patriarchal account of anti-gay victimization.

Patriarchy

The young white male has been identified as the most common perpetrator of anti-gay violence (Berrill, 1990; Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1988; Comstock, 1991). Comstock (1991) explained this finding as being due to (1) the socially-constructed powerlessness of the adolescent, and (2) male gender role socialization. Comstock believed that anti-gay violence is rooted in a patriarchal belief system. Patriarchy is the "manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general" (Comstock, 1991, p. 96). He also states that capitalism has contributed to the

maintenance of this social system, as it too is based on inequalities between people, and that North American capitalist society is founded in the patriarchal social system.

Individual families are headed by patriarchs, as is the economy. In this social system, the family fulfills the role of producer of new workers; therefore, normative heterosexuality is necessary for this enterprise. Within the family unit, adolescents are allocated the least status. Teenagers, in North American capitalist society, are a population in limbo. They are not needed to contribute to the capitalist enterprise until adulthood, and are peripheral to the normative world of marriage and the work world. Consequently, teenagers do not have any meaningful roles or challenges in this society. A result of this state of limbo is frequent acting-out behavior in an attempt to find relief from "boredom." Common acting-out behaviors include theft, vandalism, assault, sexual promiscuity, running away from home, etc. Comstock views this socially-constructed powerlessness of the adolescent population as a partial cause of the perpetration of anti-gay violence. He conceptualizes the remaining causes as due to gender role socialization.

In North American society, young males are taught to be physically aggressive and sexually dominant. Teenagers reinforce adherence to this stereotypical gender role behavior, and penalize deviations from expected gender role activities (Herek, 1993b). Because adolescent males are relatively powerless in society due to their current status, but are socialized to be dominant and powerful, this contradiction results in young males victimizing those with inferior status to themselves. Young males frequently commit violence against children, women their own age, members of minority ethnic or racial groups, and lesbians and gay men. Lesbians and gay men are viewed as legitimate targets

for violence, because they have the least value to a patriarchal society. Lesbians and gay men are devalued because, theoretically, they do not reproduce and are thought to violate the purpose of “family,” and therefore, contribute nothing to society.

Ultimately, Comstock conceptualizes anti-gay violence in North America as determined by political and economic factors (for a detailed review, see Comstock, 1991). The patriarchal economic and political structures create the social powerlessness of adolescent males, and they also identify gay men and lesbians as legitimate targets for abuse. Combined, patriarchal political and economic structures produce anti-gay victimization when the need to express male dominance is added to the equation.

Cultural Heterosexism

Another macroscopic account of anti-gay violence is presented by researchers who view cultural heterosexism as the root of anti-gay violence. Heterosexism is “an ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any non-heterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship, or community” (Herek, 1990, p.316). Heterosexism is manifested on a societal level, in customs and social institutions, and on an individual level, in attitudes and behaviors (Herek, 1990; Nardi & Bolton, 1991). In terms of the societal level, there are four major institutions that exhibit heterosexism: religion, law, psychiatry and psychology, and the mass media. First, Christian and Jewish religions define marriages heterosexually, homosexual behavior is condemned, and homosexual families are not recognized. The most frequent objection to homosexuality is based on religious moral beliefs. Second, the law also does not recognize the legitimacy of gay relationships (Bersoff & Ogden, 1991; Dressler, 1992), and little or no legal protection

exists for gays and lesbians in employment (Kitzinger, 1991; Long & Sultan, 1987; Poverny & Finch, 1989), housing (Rivera, 1987), and child custody (Dorsey Green, 1987; Falk, 1989; Long & Sultan, 1987). For example, homosexuals are excluded from protections regulating fair employment practices, housing discrimination, rights of child custody, immigration, inheritance, security clearances, public accommodations, and police protection. Third, the mental health fields, psychiatry and psychology, have historically viewed homosexuality as a pathology. Since the removal of homosexuality as a diagnosis from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual in 1973 (American Psychiatric Association, 1980); however, the professions have been working to remove the stigma associated with homosexuality (Melton, 1989). Finally, the mass media contributes to heterosexism through negative portrayals of homosexuality, and through the perpetuation of negative stereotypes about homosexuality (Herek, 1991).

As previously stated, heterosexism is also manifested on an individual level. Social attitudes about homosexuality are developed in childhood through social learning from family, peers, and the mass media. Ehrlich (1990) stated that “the habits of prejudice are communicated within the parental family” (p. 360). Herek (1990) identified three functions that are served by heterosexism. First, the value-expressive function allows individuals to affirm who they are by expressing significant personal values. For example, an individual may reject homosexuality as immoral, and thus, they are reinforcing their personal value of morality. Second, the social-expressive function allows individuals to gain approval from important others which results in a gain in self-esteem. To adolescents, peer approval is very important, and consequently, if peers

reject homosexuality then derogating homosexuals will gain approval and increased self-esteem may result. Third, anti-gay prejudice can serve a defensive function by reducing anxiety that may result from unconscious psychological conflicts (i.e. rejection of one's own latent homosexuality). For instance, if an individual felt same-sex attractions and feared that he/she may be homosexual, the individual could reduce his/her anxiety by rejecting homosexuality publicly. The public rejection of homosexuality helps the individual avoid an internal conflict by externalizing it to an acceptable target.

Psychologically, heterosexism acts on the individual level by defining homosexuality as a symbol of what one is not (Herek, 1993b). For example, young heterosexual males may use acts of anti-gay violence to reaffirm, in a highly visible way, their commitment to heterosexuality (Harry, 1990). The targets of aggression are specifically chosen for their symbolic status because they are perceived as acceptable targets of violence. Acts of anti-gay violence serve to fulfill an individual's need for control, affiliation, and social conformity (Ehrlich, 1990; Harry, 1990).

Essentially, one's family facilitates the development of prejudice, and social institutions legitimate appropriate targets for the expression of this prejudice (Ehrlich, 1990). Heterosexism on the societal and individual levels interact to create pervasive and resilient stigma, prejudice, discrimination, and violence against gays and lesbians.

AIDS

It is noted that the AIDS epidemic has a role in the perpetration of anti-gay violence. Nardi and Bolton (1991) state that AIDS has contributed to heightened homophobia and gay-bashing. For example, in 1989, the National Gay and Lesbian Task

Force (NGLTF) reported that although the trend in the statistics is small, there has been a steady increase in AIDS-related incidents. AIDS-related incidents of harassment and violence are those in which the perpetrators mention AIDS during the episode. It is proposed that AIDS has made the gay community more visible which may cause the increased likelihood of gays and lesbians being the targets of bias crimes. It is presumed that AIDS is more of an excuse for anti-gay violence rather than a cause (Berk, 1990; Nardi & Bolton, 1991). It is possible that as society becomes more educated and informed about AIDS, anti-gay prejudice and violence that is AIDS-related may decrease (Herek, 1991).

Summary

The review of the theories of the origins of anti-gay violence suggest that the individuals who commit violence do so because learned social beliefs are deeply rooted in social structure and social philosophy. Through an understanding of the origins of anti-gay prejudice and discrimination, researchers can then consider the consequences of this prejudice. Specific consequences include incidents of anti-gay discrimination and hate crimes, and effects on the mental and physical health of the victims of these incidents.

Consequences: Discrimination and Hate Crimes, and Health Issues

Occurrences of Anti-gay Violence

Much evidence indicates that anti-gay harassment and violence is a substantial social problem. Statistics for incidents of anti-gay violence are presented: (1) based on the general public, and (2) college/university populations.

General Public

In 1988, the NGLTF obtained information from 120 organizations in 38 states and the District of Columbia on incidents of anti-gay violence (Nardi & Bolton, 1991). The investigators compiled 7, 248 incidents of anti-gay harassment and violence. The most common type of incident was verbal harassment or threats of violence (77%), followed by physical assaults (12%). In addition, of the 7, 248 incidents, 6% were instances of vandalism, 3% were incidents of verbal and physical police abuse, 1% were homicides, and 1% were "other" incidents. It was noted that the findings are probably large underestimates because many of the participating organizations do not have systematic data collection procedures, and it is assumed that most incidents of anti-gay violence remain unreported. Further, it is important to recognize that the findings exclude other examples of anti-gay oppression such as suicide, discrimination in employment, child custody decisions, and discrimination in housing.

Comstock (1989) asserts that slightly more than half of all socially active (within the gay community) lesbians and gay men have experienced some type of anti-gay violence. Seven hundred surveys were distributed to gay/lesbian social and political organizations for distribution within the organization (Comstock, 1989). The results indicated that a higher percentage of gay men than lesbians reported victimization. Being chased/followed (36% men and 28% women) and having objects thrown at them (27% men and 14% women) were the most common forms of violence. From these results, it seems that anti-gay violence is a widespread problem.

College/University Populations

The statistics presented in this section describe the nature of the harassment and discrimination experienced by lesbian and gay college and university students. The statistics for this population are of special concern, because it is this population that is grappling with the final stages of homosexual sexual identity formation and issues of “coming out.” As previously noted, successful sexual identity formation can be prolonged or inhibited by a prejudiced society, and incidents of discrimination, harassment, and violence are blatant signs of an unaccepting society. Knowing that the mental health consequences of hiding and victimization are many, it is essential that the occurrences of hate crimes against this population be investigated in order to ascertain the magnitude of the problem, and its implications for support services in higher education settings.

Herek (1993a) conducted a study of anti-gay discrimination and violence at Yale University with gays and lesbians from the university community. With a sample size of 166, survey data revealed that 65% of the respondents had experienced verbal insults, 25% had been threatened with physical violence, and 42% had experienced some form of physical abuse because of their sexual orientation. Furthermore, 25% reported being chased, 19% had objects thrown at them, 12% experienced sexual harassment or assault, 10% had personal property damaged or destroyed, 5% had been beaten, 3% were spat upon, and 1% were assaulted with a weapon. Afraid of being assaulted, 39% of the respondents had modified their behavior (avoiding gay establishments, trying not to look

“gay,” etc.). Non-reporting of these incidents of harassment and violence was substantial, as 86% of the respondents did not report the incidents to authorities.

Using the same survey instrument, D’Augelli (1992) conducted a study at Pennsylvania State University. D’Augelli found that out of 121 respondents, 77% had been verbally insulted, 27% had been threatened with physical violence, 13% had personal property damaged or destroyed, 8% had objects thrown at them, 22% had been chased or followed, 3% were beaten, 2% were spat upon, and 1% experienced weapons assault. In addition, almost all of the respondents reported hearing derogatory anti-gay comments on campus. The most frequent perpetrators of the harassment and violence were other students, including roommates. Similar to Yale University, the gay and lesbian victims at Pennsylvania State University did not report the incidents; in fact, only 12% of the respondents reported any incident of harassment or violence to authorities.

Comstock (1991) provides an excellent summary of the occurrences of anti-gay harassment and violence on American college campuses. Based on college surveys done at Yale, Pennsylvania State, and Rutgers, Comstock obtained college averages of victimization. Specifically, 22% of the respondents were chased or followed, 15% had objects thrown at them, 11% experienced vandalism or arson, 4% were punched, hit, kicked, or beaten, 3% were spat at, and 1% experienced weapons assault.

From the results of these studies, it seems that anti-gay harassment and violence are not isolated incidents experienced by a select few in a particular geographic area. It also appears that non-reporting of these incidents is a common problem. The reasons identified by victims of anti-gay violence for non-reporting are associated with secondary

victimization. “Secondary victimization occurs when others respond negatively to a crime survivor because of his or her homosexual orientation” (Berrill & Herek, 1990, p. 401). Secondary victimizers may be the criminal justice system, federal and state legislation, criminal justice personnel, health care providers, the mass media, employers, friends, family, and others. Secondary victimization occurs when individuals and institutions condone the prejudice, discrimination, and violence that homosexuals experience. Secondary victimization also occurs when consequences arise from the victim’s sexual orientation becoming public knowledge. Such consequences may include eviction from housing, loss of employment, and loss of child custody. Consequently, fear of secondary victimization is a barrier that prevents gay and lesbian victims from reporting incidents of harassment and violence. More specifically, Comstock (1989) found that 67% of his respondents did not report the crimes against them, because they perceived the police as anti-gay. In addition, 40% did not want to risk public disclosure of their sexual orientation, 14% feared abuse from the police, 14% said they had no witnesses, and 9% felt that reporting the crime was not worth the trouble.

Anti-gay discrimination and violence is an ugly reality in contemporary North American society. It is important, therefore, to understand the mental and physical health consequences of this type of prejudice and discrimination.

Mental and Physical Health Consequences

The mental health consequences for victims of anti-gay prejudice, discrimination, harassment, and violence can be divided into two categories: (1) mental health problems

that arise from merely living within a heterosexist society, and (2) mental health problems that arise from victimization due to hate crimes.

Pervasive heterosexism forces gays and lesbians to hide their sexual orientation. This inability to self-disclose to family, friends, and the greater society is very stressful. Chronically hiding one's sexual orientation can create a difficult discrepancy between one's public and private identities (Garnets et al., 1990). The results of this stress are feelings of inauthenticity, social isolation, depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and interpersonal problems (D'Augelli, 1993; Garnets et al., 1990). Substance abuse problems, such as alcoholism, are also byproducts of living with the stress of belonging to a stigmatized group in today's society (Paul, Stall, & Bloomfield, 1991). Finally, all of these resultant problems are further compounded by a conspicuous lack of institutional support and positive gay role models (Gonsiorek, 1993; Morrow, 1993).

An additional challenge to homosexuals living within a heterosexist society is overcoming internalized homophobia (Garnets et al., 1990, Gonsiorek, 1993). Homosexuals are socialized within the same anti-gay environment as heterosexuals, and therefore, are equally bombarded with anti-gay information. Homosexuals have a formidable task in rejecting pervasive heterosexism, in order to develop a healthy identity that is free from self-hatred. Notably, it has been found that less internalized homophobia and high self-esteem are negatively related to a worsened mood state and avoidant coping (Nicholson & Long, 1990). Gay and lesbian adolescents, young adults, and those still struggling with an emerging homosexual identity are a population who are especially at

risk for developing mental health problems as a result of cultural heterosexism (Isay, 1989; Morrow, 1993).

Consequently, issues of “coming out” are very influential on the mental health of the gay or lesbian individual (Ross-Reynolds, 1988). As previously mentioned in the discussion of homosexual identity formation, these issues surrounding “coming out” are always present in the life of the homosexual person as they are continuously deciding to whom, if, and when they will disclose their homosexual identity. Often, the stress proves to be too great. For instance, a review of the literature suggests that suicide attempts may be much more common among gay and lesbian youth than in the general population (Gonsiorek, 1993; Proctor & Groze, 1994). It has been found that as many as 30% of all youth suicides may be related to issues of sexual orientation (D’Augelli, 1993; Hunter, 1990). In a survey of gay youth, Hammelman (1992) discovered that 48% of her respondents had seriously considered suicide, and that 70% of these individuals stated that sexual orientation contributed to, or was the main reason for, contemplating suicide. Heterosexism, therefore, has a significant negative impact on the mental health of gays and lesbians.

The deleterious effects of heterosexism are compounded by bias crimes. When an individual is victimized because of his/her sexual orientation, that individual’s sexual orientation becomes a source of pain rather than a source of intimacy and love (Garnets et al., 1990). The result is often feelings of self-blame, depression, and helplessness. The victim experiences physical and psychological symptoms. Some common symptoms are sleep disturbances, nightmares, headaches, diarrhea, uncontrollable crying, agitation and

restlessness, increased use of drugs, and deterioration of personal relationships.

Victimization causes stress because it decreases one's previous level of basic trust, it violates perceptions of the world as an orderly and meaningful place, and it leads to a questioning of one's own worth.

Research on the consequences of verbal victimization, the most common form of anti-gay violence, has revealed that it can be severely damaging. Verbal insults are a psychological form of violence, and they serve to remind its targets of the ever-present threat of a physical assault (Garnets et al., 1990). Verbal insults and threats reinforce the victim's sense of being an outsider, a member of a devalued minority, and a socially acceptable target for violence. Verbal victimization and the resulting threat of future victimization forces homosexuals to further restrict their lives.

A victim's response to victimization may be short-term or long-term, and the reactions will change with the passage of time (Greene-Cerio, 1989). It has been found that although most victims experience a successful recovery; the victimization is never completely forgotten (Garnets et al., 1990). There are many ways in which mental health professionals can aid homosexuals' recovery from chronic experiences with heterosexism and acute incidents of anti-gay violence.

Interventions

To assist homosexuals who are suffering from living within a heterosexist society, it is important for mental health professionals to be aware of their own heterosexist biases (Atkinson & Hackett, 1988; D'Augelli, 1993; Garnets et al., 1990; Gonsiorek, 1993; Hammelman, 1993; Ross-Reynolds, 1988; Shannon & Woods, 1991; Wertheimer, 1990).

Further, helping professionals should make themselves familiar with current and accurate information about homosexual identities, the gay community, and homosexual mental health concerns. Robinson (1994) identified the following as issues facing gay and lesbian youth: isolation, family problems, violence, sexual abuse, and sexually transmitted diseases. She asserts that school counsellors must be knowledgeable about these issues, and that they be sensitive to homophobia and institutional discrimination. More specifically, Robinson states that school counsellors must engage in seven practices: (1) be informed of the resources available to gay and lesbian youth, (2) accept the client as a whole person (avoid assuming the problem is invariably tied to sexuality), (3) use broad and open-ended assessments, (4) provide information about homosexuality in a nonthreatening manner (use bulletin boards, etc.), (5) facilitate an in-service training program to instruct educators about the diversity of homosexuality, (6) start a focus or support group for gay and lesbian adolescents, and (7) share the knowledge gained by working with gay and lesbian adolescents with others in the helping professions. Most importantly, mental health services must be provided in a gay-sensitive and gay-identified setting in order to be effective.

After an episode of acute victimization, mental health professionals must be prepared to offer crisis intervention, succeeded by follow-up interventions (Greene-Cerio, 1989). The main goal of crisis intervention is to reduce the negative affect that the victim is experiencing by helping them acknowledge the problem and by encouraging them to feel and express their anger (Garnets et al., 1990; Shannon & Woods, 1991). The second objective is to facilitate positive affect and mend the victim's self-confidence. It is

important for the victim to understand that the hate crime committed against them was not due to a personal flaw, but a result of the social context within which they live.

For instance, Greene-Cerio (1989) outlined treatment issues that deal specifically with incidents of campus violence. She identified three counselling approaches that are appropriate for use with campus populations: crisis intervention, psychotherapy or counselling, and outreach. First, crisis intervention has the task of returning the victim to a state of psychological equilibrium, and to make appropriate referrals to legal and medical services. For example, Greene-Cerio asserts that campus security and university counsellors are key individuals in crisis intervention, and that these individuals are crucial in giving the victim “credibility” with the police. Second, various forms of counselling and psychotherapy (group or individual) may be necessary to assist victims to deal with the emotional aftermath of victimization. Finally, outreach can be an effective counselling tool as counsellors can reach campus community members, who might otherwise remain hidden victims of violence, with programs such as discussion groups, crisis groups, and support groups.

Following crisis intervention, mental health professionals can assist in the victims’ recovery by acting as advocates (Garnets et al., 1990; Gonsiorek, 1993; Morrow, 1993; Shannon & Woods, 1991; Wertheimer, 1990). Helping professionals should act as advocates in helping clients identify various resources such as medical and legal assistance. Wertheimer (1990) describes an extensive victim services program, the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project. The project offers 24 hour crisis intervention, follow-up services, and advocacy services. The follow-up services include

short-term professional counselling, peer counselling, and group counselling. The advocacy services include police advocacy and court monitoring. Precinct accompaniments to facilitate the reporting of bias crimes are provided, and advocacy with prosecutors and court accompaniments are also available. Advocacy services, therefore, are essential in guarding against institutional secondary victimization.

Social Support

In addition to crisis intervention and advocacy services, victims of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence should be provided with family and peer support groups (Greene-Cerio, 1989; Gonsiorek, 1993; Morrow, 1993; Proctor & Groze, 1994). Exposure to supportive positive gay and lesbian role models will also aid victims in understanding their victimization, and it will help them combat their internalized homophobia. Cranston (1991) asserts that self-help groups comprised of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth are critical places for the development of youth empowerment. Empowerment has been found to be a necessary prerequisite to youths' ability to make healthy behavioral choices. Also, social support and self-acceptance are beneficial to mental health. For example, Hershberger and D'Augelli (1995) found that family support and self-acceptance were important mediator variables of the victimization and mental health-suicide relationship.

In general, social support has been found to be essential to maintaining adequate mental health among homosexual populations (Meyer, 1989). It appears that, outside of the context of victimization, social support is very beneficial to gay and lesbian individuals in helping them cope with life stress and with anti-gay victimization (Berger &

Mallon, 1993; Levy, 1992; Lott-Whitehead & Tully, 1993; Vincke & Bolton, 1994). For instance, Blaney et al. (1991) tested a stress-moderator model of distress in early HIV-1 infection among gay men, and found that social support was associated with less psychological distress. A review of the literature on homosexual support networks reveals that close friends are their primary source of social support, and that friends are usually a satisfying source of support (Berger, 1992; Berger & Mallon, 1993). Siblings, other family members, and others who know of an individual's homosexuality are also good sources of social support. For example, homosexual student groups may be an effective source of support. Townsend, Wallick, and Cambre (1991) conducted a survey of American medical schools with chapters of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual People in Medicine. The findings revealed that the typical function of a homosexual student group was socializing and discussion, and the fear of being openly gay was cited as the most frequent reason for the nonexistence of a support group.

Although anti-gay victimization has serious negative mental and physical health consequences, recovery is possible and there are many ways to facilitate recovery. It is essential that all ameliorative actions be implemented, because suicide and other negative outcomes commonly occur when the stress of victimization is too great.

The Current Projects

To reiterate, there were four goals of this research endeavor: (1) to document the occurrences of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at a midwestern Canadian university, the University of Saskatchewan; (2) to obtain an index of the mental and physical health consequences of this form of victimization at the University of Saskatchewan (3) to assess participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of support

services at the university; and (4) to provide insight into the University of Saskatchewan campus climate for homosexual students. The statistics on occurrences of anti-gay violence at American universities illustrate that it is a substantial problem. The literature on homosexual identity formation indicates that during late adolescence and early adulthood, homosexual individuals are grappling with issues surrounding their first “coming out” experiences. Furthermore, it was noted that living in a heterosexist society makes “coming out” difficult which leads most individuals to hide their emerging homosexual identity, and incidents of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence reinforce the necessity to hide one’s homosexuality. The serious mental health consequences of hiding one’s sexual orientation and being a victim of anti-gay violence were discussed as well. Finally, the literature on anti-gay attitudes illustrates that, in general, individuals hold negative attitudes toward homosexuals. The above factors point to the necessity of studying the occurrences of anti-gay violence in university communities, and more generally, to study the climate for homosexual students on university campuses. Specifically, it was of interest to determine whether the occurrences of anti-gay violence at the University of Saskatchewan are similar to those obtained at the American universities (Yale and Pennsylvania State) discussed previously. It was also the aim of this endeavor to assess heterosexual students’ attitudes toward gay men and lesbians to provide insight into the campus climate at the University of Saskatchewan. In the interest of achieving the above objectives, two studies were conducted.

STUDY 1

Study 1 was designed to achieve the first three objectives listed above. In this study, an occurrence of anti-gay victimization was defined as any incident of a verbal insult or threat, damage or destruction of personal property, having objects thrown at you, being chased or followed, being spat upon, being punched, hit, kicked, or beaten, being assaulted or wounded with a weapon, being sexually harassed or assaulted, and being treated unfairly or being discriminated against due to one's actual or perceived sexual orientation. Because the University of Saskatchewan is situated in the Canadian prairies, there was reason to believe that anti-gay violence might be a problem at the institution. A literature review by Blumenfeld and Raymond (1988) identified living in areas where negative attitudes toward homosexuality are the norm (e.g., the Canadian prairies, rural areas, and small towns) is associated with homophobia. However, it is a common Canadian perception that the nation is less violent than the United States; consequently, the rates of anti-gay victimization at the University of Saskatchewan may be comparable to, but not greater than those reported by the American universities described previously. Because of this perception, homophobia in Canada may take other forms that are less violent and more subtle.

The University of Saskatchewan (U of S) is a midsize university with approximately 20,000 students in degree enrollment during the Regular Session (September - April). The U of S is situated in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. Saskatoon is the largest city in the province of Saskatchewan with a population of approximately

200,000.

The legal situation for homosexual persons in Saskatchewan is better than that of some other provinces in Canada. The Canadian Human Rights Act does have protections against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (Canadian Human Rights Commission, personal communication, June 13, 1997). Saskatchewan's Human Rights Code and Regulations provides protections against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation as well (Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, personal communication, June 6, 1995). The following Canadian provinces and territories do not protect their residents from anti-gay discrimination: Alberta, Prince Edward Island, and the Northwest Territories (Canadian Human Rights Commission, personal communication, June 13, 1997).

Although the University of Saskatchewan does not have a general discrimination policy, the university is obligated to uphold the anti-discrimination policies delineated in "The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code and Regulations" (Dr. C. Pond, personal communication, June, 6, 1995). In addition, the university does prohibit discrimination, harassment, and violence against all individuals within its community according to "The University of Saskatchewan Students' Code of Conduct and Ethics." Although discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is not specifically mentioned in this document, it is implied by the document's inclusiveness. Furthermore, employees of the university are specifically prohibited from harassing others on the basis of sexual orientation by "The Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993."

There are numerous support services available on campus for an individual who has experienced any form of victimization. Examples of services include, university chaplains, Student Help Center, Student Counselling Services, and the Sexual Harassment Office. Support for homosexuals at the University of Saskatchewan is provided by “Gays and Lesbians at the U of S” (GLUS), a campus club that offers support and social activities to homosexual students, faculty, and staff at the university. Although homosexuals may not be highly visible at the U of S, they do exist, and may be in need of support services. The effectiveness of these and other services, however, in dealing with the specific and unique needs of victims of anti-gay prejudice or hate-crimes has not been determined. Given that victims may experience serious mental and physical health consequences, it is essential that the effectiveness of the support services is known, in order to ensure that these individuals are obtaining help.

Hypotheses

Based on the literature reviewed, eight hypotheses were made:

- (1) It was predicted that the rates of anti-gay victimization at the U of S would be comparable to the average rates of victimization found at the American universities (Yale and Pennsylvania State) discussed previously.
 - (1a) Specifically, verbal harassment would be the most common form of anti-gay victimization experienced, followed by threats of physical violence, being chased or followed, objects being thrown, sexual harassment/assault, property damaged/destroyed, being beaten, being spat upon, and weapons assault.

(2) It was also expected that there would be a greater proportion of male victims than female victims.

(3) It was anticipated that the vast majority of incidents would not have been reported.

(4) With regard to perpetrators, it was expected that Comstock's (1991) finding that males are most often the perpetrators of anti-gay violence would be replicated.

(5) With regard to mental and physical health consequences, it was expected that mental health symptoms may include: feelings of inauthenticity, feeling socially isolated, depression, anxiety, self-blame, helplessness, low self-esteem, feeling suicidal, and experiences with interpersonal problems. The physical health symptoms may include: sleep disturbances, nightmares, headaches, diarrhea, uncontrollable crying, agitation and restlessness, and increased use of drugs.

(6) The literature suggests that close friends are the source of social support on which homosexual persons most rely; therefore, it was predicted that friends would be the source of support most relied on after an episode of victimization.

(7) It was also predicted that friends would be viewed as the most effective source of support for dealing with anti-gay victimization.

(8) The amount of use and perceived effectiveness of specific U of S support services was unpredictable, as no research had been conducted in this area. Consequently, the project was exploratory in this respect. However, it was logical to expect that GLUS would be the service that was frequently used after anti-gay victimization, since it may be aware of, and sensitive to, gay and lesbian issues, and it is an agency which provides homosexual persons with support in general.

Method

Respondents and Sampling Strategy

A non-representative sample of gay men and lesbians from the University of Saskatchewan was obtained through convenience sampling. The sample included university students and alumni. As gays and lesbians are an invisible minority, it is virtually impossible to obtain a representative sample from this population. The results may be biased as only those self-selected gay and lesbian individuals who are “out” comprised the sample. GLUS, Student Counselling Services, and the USSU Women’s Centre aided in obtaining participants.

Eighty-one surveys were distributed to potential participants and 28 were returned which resulted in a 35% response rate. The sample consisted of 13 (46%) males and 15 (54%) females. The majority of the sample was exclusively homosexual ($n = 16$, 57%), and the remainder of the sample was bisexual ($n = 12$, 43%). Within the bisexual orientation, 7 (25%) participants were predominately gay/lesbian, 3 (11%) were predominately heterosexual, and 2 (7%) were equally gay/lesbian and heterosexual. The sample ranged in age from 18 to 36 years with an average age of 22.75 ($SD = 3.49$) years. The majority of the participants were undergraduates ($n = 23$, 82%), and the remainder were graduate/professional students ($n = 4$, 14%) and alumni ($n = 1$, 4%). Participants that were current U of S students had been students for a range of 1 to 6 or more years. The average duration of study at the U of S was 3.3 years, with the most frequent duration of study being 4 years ($n = 7$, 25%). The sole alumnus of the sample graduated in Spring, 1987. This individual’s responses were retained for analysis,

because he is currently involved with the U of S community as a staff person, and his responses were similar to those of the other participants. Consequently, this case was not deemed an outlier and was considered appropriate for inclusion in the analysis.

Measures

Four measures were used (See Appendix A). The first measure contained questions about incidents of discrimination, harassment, or violence at the University of Saskatchewan. The second measure assessed the perceived effectiveness of support services at the university, and the third measure pertained to demographic information and questions requesting information about “coming out” (e.g., age, to whom, etc.). The final measure asked about mental and physical health consequences of incidents of anti-gay discrimination and cultural heterosexism.

The first measure consisted of a survey, the Sexual Orientation Survey, developed by Herek (1993a), that was used at Yale and Pennsylvania State Universities. The reliability and validity of the survey was unreported. The survey was chosen because it has been used successfully by two independent researchers, Herek (1993a) and D’Augelli (1992), to assess anti-gay incidents in university communities, and the measure was deemed to possess face validity. There are fourteen questions (items 1-5, 7-11, 20, 20a) in the first measure and they vary in format: Likert-type scales, close-ended, and open-ended. It is important to note that for questions on this measure that pertain to an “average homosexual,” it was intended that participants base their responses on their personal perceptions of an “average homosexual.” The wording and the format of the items from Herek’s survey were revised to improve question clarity and quality. For

example, for questions 4 and 5, the response range was increased. Herek's response categories consisted of "never, occasionally, often"; these were changed to a 5-point Likert-type scale with the descriptors, "never, rarely, sometimes, frequently, always." Also, the wording of question 20 was changed for the sake of clarity. Herek's question was, "If you have been the target of harassment, threats, or violence based on sexual orientation, have you always reported it to an appropriate Yale official (e.g., dean, police, supervisor)?" The response options for this question were, "Yes, reported all incidents; No, did not report at least once." Question 20 was reworded as follows, "If you have been the target of harassment, threats or violence, based on sexual orientation, that was related to the U of S community, how often have you reported it to an appropriate U of S official (e.g., dean, campus security, police, professor)?" Additionally, the response options were made more specific, and they included, "reported all incidents; reported some incidents, never reported an incident, not applicable."

Items 6, and 12-17c were not included in the survey by Herek. These items were created by the present researcher based on findings in the literature reviewed. The purpose of the additional items was to supplement areas not covered by Herek's instrument. Specifically, Herek's survey did not assess the presence of anti-gay graffiti, the genders of the perpetrators of anti-gay incidents, the number of perpetrators of an anti-gay incident, whether the victim was alone during the anti-gay incident, what was the respondent's most recent anti-gay experience, when and where this experience occurred, and whether the event was related to the university community in any way. Participants were also asked to indicate what was their most traumatic anti-gay experience, when and

where this experience occurred, and whether the event was related to the U of S community.

The second measure, Support Service Information, contained questions devised by the student researcher. There were four questions assessing: (1) which U of S support services (if any) were utilized after an incident of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence (item 21), (2) how effective the services were (item 22), (3) if participants have an anti-gay experience, or another anti-gay experience, would they use a U of S support service (item 23), and (4) how the services could improve (item 24). Likert-type scales and open-ended question formats were used for these questions. The psychometric properties of these questions are unknown, because similar questions have not been addressed in the literature.

The third measure contained the demographic questions (items 25-32). The questions were also developed by the researcher. Questions regarding gender, sexual orientation, university status, and age were asked. In addition, questions pertaining to “coming out” were asked. Specifically, age at which participants “came out,” and to whom, was noted. Also, at the end of the survey, there was a statement indicating that participants may recount the details of a particular incident of harassment or unfair treatment should they have wished to do so. This statement is from Herek’s survey which was described previously.

The Symptoms Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R) (Derogatis, 1983) was the final measure in the study. The SCL-90-R is a 90 item self-report measure, and it was used to index the mental and physical health consequences that follow anti-gay victimization.

Participants responded on a Likert-Scale, ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely), about the extent to which they were distressed by various physical and psychological problems. This scale was chosen because it had direct relevance to the research project, it is easy to administer, easy to answer, and has satisfactory psychometric properties. For example, test-retest reliability for the SCL-90-R is .79 (Hafkenscheid, 1993). With regard to factorial validity, Carpenter and Hittner (1995) concluded that the SCL-90-R is best conceptualized as a unidimensional measure of psychological distress. Noh and Avison (1992) found evidence for concurrent validity; the SCL-90-R scores for samples of psychiatric patients and community members differed significantly, with the patient samples' scores being higher than the community samples' scores. From the psychometric analyses reviewed, the SCL-90-R appeared to be a reliable and valid measure, and thus, its use for research purposes was justified. It should be noted that the instructions for the SCL-90-R were modified in this research project. The instructions were changed to indicate to participants that they were to respond with reference to the most traumatic incident of anti-gay discrimination, violence, or harassment that they have experienced at the U of S. Specifically, the instructions read as follows:

Below is a list of problems people sometimes have. Problems can be physical or psychological. We are only concerned with those problems that you believe are caused by/related to your **most traumatic** anti-gay experience (as defined previously). You do not need to include those problems that you believe are unrelated to this most traumatic experience.

Please read each statement carefully, and fill in the circle that best describes **HOW MUCH THAT PROBLEM HAS DISTRESSED OR BOTHERED YOU BECAUSE OF YOUR MOST TRAUMATIC ANTI-GAY EXPERIENCE.** Fill in only one circle for each problem and do not skip any items. If you change your mind, erase your first mark carefully, and fill in the preferred response.

Given that the instructions for the SCL-90-R were changed in this study, the psychometric properties described above may not reflect the reliability and validity of the scale in this modified form. Use of the scale in this modified form was still justifiable, because the modified instructions ensured that participants would respond more precisely. Furthermore, the wording of the revised instructions paralleled the wording of the original instructions so it is unlikely that the reliability and validity of this measure were compromised. To provide validation for the SCL-90-R, the researcher wrote two open-ended questions to assess the emotional and physical symptoms of participants following their most traumatic anti-gay experience (items 18 and 19).

In addition to the survey questions, there were nine open-ended interview questions (see Appendix B). On the survey, participants were given the option of leaving their name and telephone number if they wished to be interviewed about their anti-gay experiences. These questions served as a guide for the semi-structured telephone interviews. The purpose of the questions was to allow participants the opportunity to provide more detailed and descriptive information about their anti-gay experiences. The questions inquired about: what the participant's life had been like since his/her most traumatic anti-gay experience at the U of S, how this event made him/her feel physically and emotionally, how the participant dealt with the event, why the participant did or did not use campus support services, what kinds of services the participant would like to use if he/she needs help dealing with anti-gay experiences again, and why the participant is not completely "out" at the university. In addition, participants were asked to describe the climate at the U of S for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals.

The interview questions were written by the researcher, and were based on the survey questions. The questions were written to elicit more descriptive responses about concepts or issues already addressed in the survey in the interest of obtaining rich qualitative data that will supplement the quantitative data provided by the survey.

Procedure

Administration. The first three measures were administered as a single questionnaire, and SCL-90-R was administered with a separate test form. Survey packages, consisting of the questionnaire and SCL-90-R test form, were distributed at GLUS meetings. GLUS participants were also asked to take additional survey packages to give to gay or lesbian friends who were also students or former students of the U of S, but who were not in attendance at the meetings or social events. A brief description of the research project was provided by the researcher at the meetings, and respondents were asked to volunteer to participate. Survey packages were also administered by Student Counselling Services to all clients who self-identified as gay or lesbian regardless of the type of counselling services being sought, and to the participants of the USSU Women's Centre "Women Loving Women Discussion Group." A brief description of the research project was presented to these potential respondents as well.

Because response to the survey was slow, an advertising campaign was then initiated. This involved advertising for participants on posters placed throughout the campus and at gay-identified locations in the community (bookstore, nightclub, and health services centre), placing a newspaper ad in the university paper, and posting notices on the campus computer bulletin boards. Those individuals who contacted the

researcher based on the advertising campaign were instructed to pick up a survey package at the Women's Centre.

All necessary information for informed consent was provided on an information letter that was attached to the questionnaire (See Appendix C). As participation was anonymous, no signed consent form was obtained; however, it was clearly stated in the information letter that a returned survey package would be interpreted as permission granted to use the responses as data. It was necessary that the survey be anonymous due to the sensitive nature of the questions. The information letter also provided a detailed description of the study, and the name and telephone number of the researcher and her supervisor should the participants have any concerns or questions about the study. Participants were provided with the telephone numbers of Student Counselling Services and Saskatoon's Gay and Lesbian Health Services (GLHS) in the event that they needed assistance dealing with the aftermath of recalling painful incidents. Finally, the information letter indicated that a summary of the results would be available to participants at the Women's Centre, Student Counselling Services, and GLUS.

The survey was in a self-report format and all necessary instructions were provided on the questionnaire and SCL-90-R test form. Respondents were instructed to place completed survey packages into a sealed envelope for return to the researcher via campus mail.

On the survey, respondents were given the option of leaving their name and telephone number if they wished to be interviewed about their anti-gay experiences. All participants wanting to be interviewed were contacted by the researcher. The interviews

were conducted by telephone to ensure anonymity. The interviews were semi-structured, and nine open-ended questions guided the interview. For those participants who wished to be interviewed, the terms of participant confidentiality outlined in the cover letter were reiterated to the participants over the telephone.

Pilot Study. The survey and the interview questions were pilot tested to determine whether the instructions were clear and the questions were understandable and answerable. Due to a small potential subject pool, pilot subjects were six peers of the researcher. The pilot subjects were instructed to respond as though they were gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Pilot participants were asked to comment on the face validity of the survey as well. The survey and interview questions were also reviewed for gay-sensitivity by counsellors at GLHS. Based on the comments of the GLHS counsellors and the pilot subjects, various revisions were made. For example, the term “anti-gay” was defined as an inclusive term to refer to negative incidents directed at lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. Response options for various questions were expanded to include a “not applicable” option. Finally, response scale descriptors were attached to the mid- and end-points of each scale to increase ease of interpretation. Overall, the survey was deemed easy to understand and answer, and it was regarded as inoffensive to potential gay, lesbian, and bisexual participants. Consequently, the survey had adequate face validity and was appropriate for research use.

Analysis

The analyses for this study were entirely descriptive. The survey data were analyzed using SPSS statistical package for Windows (version 6.0). Descriptive statistics

such as frequency counts, means, modes, and ranges were calculated to determine whether the data supported the above hypotheses. The qualitative data obtained from the survey and the semi-structured interviews were coded and analyzed for emergent themes¹. A second coder, a graduate student with ample experience in qualitative data analysis, independently analyzed the qualitative data as well. Inter-rater reliability was estimated with an examination of each coder's analysis. To maximize objectivity, a third graduate student, with qualitative data coding experience, compared the similarity of the themes identified for each open-ended question, written account, and interview. The number of themes that were similar were contrasted with the number of themes that differed. A percentage of total agreement was calculated. The frequency of agreement was divided by the total number of themes identified. Overall, the researcher and the second coder identified 79% of the same themes for the entire qualitative analysis.

Results

The results are presented in three sections. First, the results for each hypothesis are presented. Second, additional survey findings are described, and third, the written accounts and qualitative interview data are presented. A summary of results is presented as well.

Tests of Hypotheses

In this section, findings are presented in order of the hypotheses. Each hypothesis is stated followed by a description of the analyses conducted.

¹ Emergent themes from qualitative data were not quantified due to the very small number of participants endorsing each theme.

1. Rates of anti-gay victimization at the U of S would be comparable to those found at the American universities (Yale and Pennsylvania State).

1a. Specifically, verbal harassment would be the most common form of anti-gay victimization experienced, followed by threats of physical violence, being chased or followed, objects being thrown, sexual harassment/assault, property damaged/destroyed, being beaten, being spat upon, and weapons assault.

A total of 11 (39%) participants in this study were victims of an anti-gay incident. Frequencies were tabulated to determine the percentage of the sample that had experienced the above forms of anti-gay violence. There were three categories which respondents could choose for each type of incident. The three categories were: never, once, and twice or more. The categories “once” and “twice or more” were collapsed to provide the percentage of the sample that had ever experienced each type of anti-gay behavior. Table 1 presents the findings of the American universities compared to the findings of the present study. The frequencies revealed that verbal insults were the most common form of abuse ($\underline{n} = 10$, 36%), proceeded by being chased or followed ($\underline{n} = 6$, 22%), being threatened with physical violence ($\underline{n} = 4$, 14%), having personal property damaged or destroyed ($\underline{n} = 1$, 4%), objects being thrown ($n = 1$, 4%), and being sexually harassed or assaulted ($\underline{n} = 1$, 4%). Among this sample, no one had experienced being punched, hit, kicked, or beaten, being assaulted or wounded with a weapon, or being spat upon.

Table 1

Respondents Reporting Types of Anti-gay Behavior

Type of Incident	American Universities			U of S (<u>N</u> = 28)
	Herek (1993a) (<u>N</u> = 166)	D'Augelli (1992) (<u>N</u> = 121)	Overall (<u>N</u> = 287)	
Verbal insults	106 (65)	93 (77)	(71)	10 (36)
Threats of Physical Violence	42 (25)	33 (27)	(26)	4 (14)
Chased/Followed	42 (25)	27 (22)	(24)	6 (22)
Objects Thrown	32 (19)	10 (8)	(13.5)	1 (4)
Sexual Harassment/Assault	20 (12)	-	(12)	1 (4)
Property Damaged/Destroyed	16 (10)	17 (13)	(11.5)	1 (4)
Beaten	8 (5)	3 (3)	(4)	0
Spat Upon	5 (3)	2 (2)	(2.5)	0
Weapons Assault	2 (1)	1 (1)	(1)	0

Note. A dash indicates that the data were unavailable. The numbers in parentheses refer to the percentage of participants, and the percentages are based on the total sample size in each study.

The results of the present study parallel those of the American studies in that the types of anti-gay behaviors that are most common in the American samples are the same behaviors that are most common in the present sample. Although Hypothesis 1a was supported, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported because the rates of anti-gay behaviors experienced among this sample were less than the rates found in the American universities. There was a greater percentage of American participants that had experienced all forms of anti-gay violence identified. Furthermore, no one among the present sample had experienced being punched, hit, kicked, or beaten, being assaulted or wounded with a weapon, or being spat upon.

2. There would be a greater proportion of male victims of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence than female victims.

Frequencies were tabulated to determine whether males did outnumber females as victims. Within the total sample of 28 (15 females and 13 males), there were six men (21%) and five women (18%) that had an anti-gay experience. Males marginally outnumbered females as victims.

3. The majority of anti-gay incidents would not have been reported.

Fifty-four percent of the total sample ($n = 15$) did not respond to this question because they did not have any anti-gay experiences, and they were instructed to omit this question. Two participants responded to this question, even though they had not experienced anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence, and therefore, their responses were not included in the analysis.

Responses indicated that 9 (82%) of the 11 participants that had an anti-gay experience had never reported an incident of anti-gay harassment, threats, or violence to U of S officials such as the campus security. Furthermore, only one individual reported some of his/her anti-gay experiences, and none of the respondents reported all incidents. Finally, one respondent selected the “not applicable” response option. It is apparent that substantial non-reporting of anti-gay incidents occurs at the U of S, and the rate of non-reporting is similar to that found at the American universities (87%).

Reasons for not reporting an incident were obtained in an open-ended question. The themes that emerged included: not being concerned enough about the incident, fear of negative reactions, not having the energy to fight or worry about the experience, feeling that reporting the incident was not worth the effort, not knowing where to go for help, and worrying about the burden of proof. The most frequent reason for not reporting anti-gay experiences was fear of negative reactions from the authorities (e.g., campus security) ($n = 4$, 36%).

4. Males would most often be the perpetrators of anti-gay violence.

Respondents that had anti-gay experiences had the opportunity to describe the characteristics of a maximum of five anti-gay experiences that were related to the U of S community. For each incident, respondents could indicate the number of perpetrator(s), the gender(s) of the perpetrator(s), and whether they (the victims) were alone, with one other person, or with two or more other individuals at the time of the incident.

Frequencies indicate that males were perpetrators most often. Table 2 illustrates the

number of respondents indicating that their perpetrators were male, female, or both male and female.

Table 2

Gender of Perpetrators per Incident (N = 11)

Incident	Male	Female	Male and Female
1	10 (91)	0	1 (9)
2	4 (36)	0	0
3	2 (18)	0	0
4	0	0	1 (9)
5	1 (9)	0	0

Note. The numbers in parentheses refer to the percentage of participants in each category based on the number that had an anti-gay experience.

Inspection of the percentages presented in Table 2 indicates that males were the perpetrators of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence more often than females. In fact, females were not identified as perpetrators unless they were acting with fellow male perpetrators.

5. With regard to mental and physical health consequences of anti-gay experiences, it was expected that mental health symptoms might include: feelings of inauthenticity, feeling socially isolated, depression, anxiety, self-blame, helplessness, low self-esteem, feeling suicidal, and experiences with interpersonal problems. The physical health symptoms may include: sleep disturbances, nightmares, headaches, diarrhea, uncontrollable crying, agitation and restlessness, and increased use of drugs.

Only 11 respondents (39% of the sample) completed the SCL-90-R scale that was used to assess mental and physical health consequences. There was too much missing data to justify the calculation of the subscale scores and global indices. The SCL-90-R required participants to indicate the extent to which they were distressed by various mental and physical symptoms because of their most traumatic anti-gay experience. The response categories “moderately,” “quite a bit,” and “extremely” were collapsed to determine those symptoms that were most distressing. The three most distressing symptoms are presented in Appendix D. Other highly distressing symptoms/situations included feelings of fear, perceiving others as unfriendly, feeling like one is being watched, and not feeling comfortable being watched.

This hypothesis was also tested by content analyzing the responses pertaining to mental and physical health consequences. Ten participants (36%), of the total sample, provided a response to the question about mental health consequences. The themes that emerged from the analysis are similar to the symptoms identified as most distressing on the SCL-90-R; these included feelings of fear, anxiety, anger, isolation, violation, helplessness, and depression. An additional theme included a desire to deny one’s gay identity.

The themes that emerged from the responses to the question about the physical effects of an anti-gay experience contained some of the same themes identified as mental health consequences. The themes included: nausea, anxiety, depression, fatigue, and anger. Thirty-nine percent ($n = 11$) of the respondents provided an answer to this

question. The physical symptoms expressed by this sample are dissimilar to those expected.

6. Friends would be the source of social support most relied upon after an episode of victimization.

Participants were asked to indicate to whom or to where they turned to gain support in dealing with their anti-gay experiences. Table 3 provides the number of respondents that sought support from various target sources of support. The percentages in Table 3 are based on the number of participants that had an anti-gay experience and were instructed to answer this question ($n = 11$). Table 3 reveals that friends were the source of support most relied upon for dealing with an anti-gay incident. Ninety percent ($n = 10$) of those who had an anti-gay experience reported turning to a friend to deal with an incident of discrimination, harassment, or violence. The next most common sources of support were: significant other ($n = 6$, 55%), family ($n = 4$, 36%), GLUS ($n = 3$, 27%), and the Women's Centre ($n = 2$, 18%). Participants also had the opportunity to identify other sources of support that were relied upon to deal with anti-gay incidents. Three other sources of support were identified: a Department Head, GLHS, and the Sexual Assault Center.

7. Friends would be perceived as the most effective source of social support for dealing with victimization.

Each source of support was rated on a five-point Likert-type scale. The response options were: 1 = Very Ineffective, 2 = Somewhat Ineffective, 3 = Neither Ineffective nor Effective, 4 = Somewhat Effective, and 5 = Very Effective. Table 4 presents the mean

Table 3

Frequencies of Support Source Utilization (N = 11)

Support Source	Percentage of Utilization
Friend	10 (90)
Significant Other/Partner	6 (55)
Family	4 (36)
University Chaplains	0
GLUS	3 (27)
Student Help Center	0
Student Counselling Services	0
Sexual Harassment Office	1 (9)
Faculty Member	1 (9)
Supervisor	1 (9)
Health Care Provider	0
Campus Security	0
Aboriginal Students' Centre	0
International Student Advisor	0
Services for Students' with Disabilities	0
Women's Centre	2 (18)
USSU	0
U of S Alumni Association	0
Unclassified Students' Advisor	0

Note. The numbers in parentheses refer to the percentage of participants in each category

based on the number that had an anti-gay experience.

effectiveness rating for each support source. From the values in Table 4, a significant other ($M = 4.28$) was rated as the most effective source of support for dealing with an anti-gay experience, and thus, the hypothesis is not supported by the data. The mean for effectiveness of a significant other falls closest to the Somewhat Effective rating point. The next most effective sources of support were: GLUS ($M = 4.25$), a friend ($M = 4.18$), the Women's Centre ($M = 4.00$), and family ($M = 3.33$). The "other" sources of support identified by the participants were rated highly in their effectiveness as well. These three sources of support are not included in Table 4, because each was identified by only one participant. GLHS and the Sexual Assault Center were rated as "very effective" (5.00) and the department head was rated as "somewhat effective" (4.00).

8. GLUS would be a source of support that was frequently used after anti-gay victimization, since it may be aware of, and sensitive to, gay and lesbian issues, and it is an agency that provides homosexual persons with support in general

Frequencies indicate that GLUS was the fourth most relied upon source of support among 19 support sources (refer to Table 3). Twenty-seven percent ($n = 3$) of the participants that had an anti-gay experience turned to GLUS after an episode of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence. The three sources of support that were more relied upon were: a friend ($n = 10$, 90%), a significant other/partner ($n = 6$, 55%), and family ($n = 4$, 36%). Although individuals were the most frequently relied upon sources of support, GLUS was the most relied upon group or organization for dealing with anti-gay experiences.

Table 4

Effectiveness Ratings for Support Sources

	Support Source	Effectiveness	
		<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<u>Personal Support</u>	Friend	4.18	.75
	Significant Other/Partner	4.28	1.50
	Family	3.33	1.51
<u>University Services</u>	University Chaplains	0	0
	GLUS	4.25	.50
	Student Help Centre	0	0
	Student Counselling Services	0	0
	Sexual Harassment Office	4	0
	Faculty Member	4	0
	Supervisor	4	0
	Health Care Provider	0	0
	Campus Security	0	0
	Aboriginal Students' Centre	0	0
	International Student Advisor	0	0
	Services for Students with Disabilities	0	0
	Women's Centre	4	1.41
	USSU	0	0
	U of S Alumni Association	0	0
	Unclassified Student's Advisor	0	0

Note. Ratings range from "1" to "5" with the higher number indicating greater effectiveness.

Additional Survey Findings

In addition to the questions that pertained specifically to the stated hypotheses, numerous survey questions were designed for exploratory purposes. The questions pertained to the following areas: (1) the U of S campus climate (2) characteristics of anti-gay incidents, (3) disclosure of sexual orientation, (4) characteristics of most recent and most traumatic anti-gay experiences, and (5) U of S support services.

Campus Climate. The U of S campus climate for gay, lesbian, and bisexuals was assessed with seven questions. First, hiding one's sexual orientation from U of S community members was investigated. Table 5 presents the number of respondents who hid their sexual orientation from various U of S community members because of the possibility of a negative reaction. Over half of the participants hid their sexual orientation from undergraduate students (79%), university faculty (54%) and staff (50%). From an inspection of Table 5, the majority of participants hid their sexual orientation from a variety of community members because of the possibility of a negative reaction from these individuals. Participants had the opportunity to identify "other" campus community members from which they hide their sexual orientation such as Huskie team coaches ($n = 1$, 4%) and parents ($n = 1$, 4%).

Anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence led 43% ($n = 12$) of the participants to modify their behavior at the U of S, while 57% ($n = 15$) of the sample responded that they have not changed the way they behave. Common behavior changes included: avoiding public displays of affection with one's partner, avoiding socializing with openly homosexual individuals, editing homosexual content from conversations or

Table 5

Number of Respondents Who Hid Their Sexual Orientation (SO)

U of S Member	Hid SO	N/A
Roommate	6 (21)	12 (43)
Undergraduate Student	22 (79)	0
Graduate Student	13 (46)	8 (29)
University Staff	14 (50)	4 (14)
Faculty Member	15 (54)	5 (18)
University Administrator	11 (39)	8 (29)
Registrar's Office Personnel	3 (11)	15 (54)
Health Care Provider	9 (32)	9 (32)
College Dean	5 (18)	18 (64)
University Counsellor	5 (18)	15 (54)
Department Head	7 (25)	13 (46)
Job Supervisor	8 (29)	14 (50)
Campus Security	7 (25)	13 (46)
"Other"	2 (8)	-

Note. The numbers in parentheses refer to the percentage of participants based on the total sample size ($N = 28$). N/A refers to the number of participants for whom hiding from the target was not applicable (e.g., participants may not have had contact with the target).

speaking very quietly, attempts not to “look gay”, becoming withdrawn and quiet, being more openly gay, not walking alone on campus, and not revealing one’s sexual orientation to campus police.

Table 6 presents the frequencies for four questions that assessed the U of S climate for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals. The following percentages are based on the total sample size ($N = 28$). As noted in Table 6, responses to Question 1 show that 50% ($n = 14$) of the participants feared for their safety at the U of S “sometimes”, and 46% ($n = 13$) rarely or never feared for their safety. For Question 2, fifty percent ($n = 14$) of the sample had heard demeaning remarks about bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men frequently or always, 39% ($n = 11$) “sometimes”, and 11% ($n = 3$) rarely or never. For Question 3, anti-gay graffiti had been seen frequently or always by 50% ($n = 14$) of the sample, “sometimes” by 43% ($n = 12$), and rarely or never by 11% ($n = 4$) of the participants. In the opinion of the participants, for Question 4, the chances that an average gay, lesbian, or bisexual at the U of S would be the target of discrimination, harassment, threat, or attack were likely ($n = 19$, 68%), “neither unlikely nor likely” ($n = 5$, 18%), and unlikely ($n = 2$, 7%). The final question assessing the U of S campus climate asked about the number of individuals that the participants knew personally who had been victims at the U of S. Many participants knew between one and three ($n = 12$, 43%), or “more than three” ($n = 6$, 21%) members of the U of S community that had been physically attacked on campus because of their known or assumed sexual orientation. Notably, 36% ($n = 10$) of the participants did not know anyone who had been physically attacked at the U of S because they were known/assumed to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

Table 6

U of S Climate Questions

Questions	Distribution of Responses					<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5		
1. How often have you feared for your safety at the U of S because of the threat of anti-gay violence?	8	5	14	-	-	2.22	.89
2. How often have you heard other members of the U of S community make belittling/demeaning remarks about bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men?	1	2	11	12	2	3.43	.88
3. How often have you seen anti-gay graffiti at the U of S?	1	2	12	10	3	3.43	.92
4. In your opinion, what are the chances that an average bisexual, lesbian, or gay man at the U of S will be the target of discrimination, unfair treatment, anti-gay harassment, threats of violence, or physical attack?	-	2	5	17	2	3.73	.72

Note. For items 1 to 3, 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = frequently, 5 = always. For item 4, 1 = very unlikely, 2 = somewhat unlikely, 3 = neither unlikely nor likely, 4 = somewhat likely, 5 = very likely.

Characteristics of Anti-gay Incidents. Four additional questions assessed the characteristics of anti-gay incidents at the U of S. Participants were asked which U of S community members had actually treated them unfairly or harassed them because of their sexual orientation. Table 7 presents the number of participants who had been victimized by various U of S community members. The percentages in Table 7 are based on the number of participants that had an anti-gay experience ($n = 11$), and thus, were instructed to respond to this question. An inspection of the values in Table 7 indicates that most of these participants were victimized by undergraduate students (64%, $n = 7$) and/or University staff members (36%, $n = 4$).

The remaining three questions asked participants to describe three characteristics of a maximum of five anti-gay experiences/incidents. The three characteristics included: number of perpetrators, gender(s) of perpetrators, and whether the victim was alone or in the presence of others at the time of the incident. It was already noted that males were most often the perpetrators of anti-gay incidents (refer to Table 2). Table 8 presents the number of perpetrators for each of five possible incidents. Table 8 indicates that the majority of anti-gay incidents were perpetrated by either one or two individuals, and not groups of three or more. Table 9 presents the number of participants that were alone, with one other person, or with two or more others at the time of each anti-gay incident. An inspection of the values in Table 9 reveals that most anti-gay incidents occurred when the victim was alone.

Table 7

Number of Participants Victimized by U of S Community Members (N = 11)

U of S Member	Number Victimized
Roommate	2 (18)
Undergraduate Student	7 (64)
Graduate/Professional Student	1 (9)
University Staff	4 (36)
Faculty	2 (18)
University Administrator	0
Registrar's Office Personnel	0
Health Care Provider	2 (18)
College Dean	0
University Counsellor	0
Department Head/Chair	0
Job Supervisor	0
Campus Security	0

Note. The numbers in parentheses refer to the percentage of participants in each category based on the number that had an anti-gay experience.

Table 8

Number of Perpetrators per Incident (N = 11)

Incident	Number of Perpetrators			
	1	2	3	4+
1	2 (18)	4 (36)	2 (18)	2 (18)
2	3 (27)	2 (18)	1 (9)	0
3	2 (18)	0	0	0
4	0	0	1 (9)	0
5	0	0	1 (9)	0

Note. The numbers in parentheses refer to the percentage of participants in each category based on the number that had an anti-gay experience.

Table 9

Victims Alone or With Others per Incident (N = 11)

Incident	Alone	With 1 other	With 2+ others
1	7 (64)	3 (27)	1 (9)
2	5 (45)	0	1 (9)
3	2 (18)	0	0
4	0	1 (9)	0
5	0	0	1 (9)

Note. The numbers in parentheses refer to the percentage of participants in each category based on the number that had an anti-gay experience.

Disclosure of Sexual Orientation. Participants were asked to describe how comfortable they felt disclosing their sexual orientation to the majority of the people at the U of S, and how important it was to disclose their sexual orientation to those around them. Other questions concerning sexual orientation pertained to issues of “coming out.” Participants were asked to identify to whom they first “came out.” Also, participants indicated to whom, from a list of target persons/groups, they “came out,” and at what age they “came out” to each target. The following percentages pertaining to disclosure of sexual orientation are based on the total sample size ($N = 28$).

Most respondents ($n = 13, 46\%$) reported that they felt uncomfortable disclosing their sexual orientation to the majority at the U of S, 39% ($n = 11$) felt comfortable, and 14% ($n = 4$) were “neither uncomfortable nor comfortable.” The mean comfort rating was 2.89 ($SD = 1.52$) which is close to the midpoint of the scale (“neither uncomfortable nor comfortable”).

With regard to the importance of disclosing their sexual orientation, most participants ($n = 13, 46\%$) felt that it was important, 32% ($n = 9$) felt disclosure of their sexual orientation was “neither unimportant nor important”, and the remaining 21% ($n = 6$) felt disclosure was unimportant. The mean importance rating was 3.29 ($SD = .98$) which is close to the midpoint (“neither unimportant nor important”).

When asked to whom did they first “come out,” the majority of the sample ($n = 18, 64\%$) said a friend. Other responses included: significant other ($n = 5, 18\%$), mother ($n = 2, 7\%$), sister ($n = 2, 7\%$), and counsellor ($n = 1, 4\%$).

The final question assessing disclosure of sexual orientation asked participants to indicate to whom, from a list of target persons/groups, they “came out” and at what age did they “come out” to each target person/group. Table 10 presents the number of the participants that “came out” to each target, the average age, and age range for “coming out” to each target. All of the participants in this study were “out” to some extent. The percentages in Table 10 reveal that the majority (>50%) of the sample had disclosed their sexual orientation to friends (homosexual/bisexual and heterosexual), the gay community, siblings, significant others, mothers, fellow students, and fathers. Less than half of the sample had disclosed their orientation to professors, counsellors/therapists, and the community at large. The greatest number of participants had disclosed their sexual orientation to their homosexual/bisexual friends ($n = 27$, 96%), and the fewest participants disclosed their orientation to professors ($n = 9$, 32%). The ages of disclosure to the above targets ranged from 14 to 34 years. Based on the average age of disclosure, participants disclosed their sexual orientation to fathers at the youngest age ($M = 19.67$) and they disclosed to siblings at the oldest age ($M = 21.06$). Most coming out experiences of this sample occurred in late adolescence and early adulthood.

Characteristics of Most Recent and Most Traumatic Anti-gay Experiences.

Participants that had an anti-gay experience were asked to describe their most recent experience. The following percentages are based on the 11 participants that had an anti-gay experience. The most common type of incident was a verbal attack ($n = 9$, 82%), followed by discrimination ($n = 2$, 18%), being followed ($n = 1$, 9%), being spat at ($n = 1$, 9%), and sexual harassment ($n = 1$, 9%). The most recent anti-gay experiences of this

Table 10

Sexual Orientation Disclosure: Number of Participants Who Are “Out” and Age of
“Coming Out”

Target Person/Group	Number “Out”	Age of “Coming Out”		
		<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Range
significant other	17 (61)	20.56	3.54	16-30
sibling	18 (64)	21.06	2.62	17-26
mother	17 (61)	19.76	2.61	14-24
father	14 (50)	19.67	2.72	14-24
homosexual/bisexual friends	27 (96)	20.18	2.65	16-27
heterosexual friends	26 (93)	19.69	2.28	16-25
fellow students	16 (57)	20.63	2.66	17-25
professors	9 (32)	20.78	2.49	18-25
counsellor/therapist	10 (36)	20.90	5.63	15-34
gay community	23 (82)	19.74	1.91	17-25
community at large	12 (43)	20.92	2.58	17-27

Note. The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentage of participants in each category based on the total sample size (N = 28).

sample occurred between March, 1996 and January, 1997. September, 1996 ($n = 4$, 36%) was the most frequent time for recent anti-gay experiences among this sample. The locations of the most recent anti-gay experiences were buildings on campus (Arts Tunnel, Physics Building, Louis' Pub, a classroom, a photography lab, and Place Riel) and off campus places (8th Street, and a "straight bar"). The most common place for a recent anti-gay incident was the Arts Tunnel ($n = 3$, 27%). Eighty-two percent ($n = 9$) of the participants indicated that their most recent anti-gay experience was related to the U of S, often because the perpetrators were U of S students ($n = 6$, 55%). Other U of S-related anti-gay experiences occurred on campus ($n = 4$, 36%), the perpetrator was a faculty member ($n = 1$, 9%), or the incident occurred during a U of S class ($n = 1$, 9%).

Participants were also asked to comment on their most traumatic anti-gay experience. Five participants (45%) reported that their most traumatic experience was also their most recent anti-gay experience, and six individuals (55%) indicated that their most traumatic experience was a different event. The most common traumatic incident was a verbal attack ($n = 6$, 55%). Other most traumatic experiences included being followed ($n = 4$, 36%), physical assault ($n = 1$, 9%), discrimination by a professor ($n = 1$, 9%), and threats of assault or violence ($n = 1$, 9%). Participants' most traumatic anti-gay experiences occurred between November, 1994 and November, 1996. September, 1996 was also the most frequent time for the participants' most traumatic experiences. The most common location of the traumatic experiences occurred on campus ($n = 7$, 64%) in the Arts Tunnel, a classroom, between the Education Building and the Arts Building, Memorial Union Building (MUB), Louis' Pub, and in the tunnel between Place Riel and

MUB. The most traumatic experiences off-campus ($n = 3, 27\%$), occurred at: a straight bar, 22nd Avenue, and on Meewasin Trail near Deifenbaker Centre. The most common location for a traumatic anti-gay experience was the Arts Tunnel ($n = 3, 27\%$). Thirty-six percent ($n = 4$) of the participants reported that their most traumatic anti-gay experience was U of S-related, and 18% ($n = 2$) indicated that it was not. U of S-related traumatic events were events that occurred on campus ($n = 3, 27\%$) and the perpetrators were students ($n = 3, 27\%$). Finally, one participant (9%) indicated that his/her most traumatic anti-gay experience was related to the U of S because the perpetrator was a University professor.

U of S Support Services. Two questions assessed participants' use and perceptions of support services. When asked whether they would use a U of S support service to deal with an anti-gay experience, 46% ($n = 13$) of the total sample indicated that they would and 32% ($n = 9$) indicated that they would not. Participants were asked to provide reasons for not using U of S support services. Responses included: a lack of trust, feeling able to deal with the event by oneself, preferring to rely on other sources (e.g., friends, family, GLHS), perceiving the services as insensitive to gay issues, being unaware of the support services, perceiving the services as homophobic, and a preference for gay-oriented services to protect against further victimization.

Finally, all participants were asked to indicate what the various support services could do to better serve victims of anti-gay experiences. Eighteen (64%) participants who provided a response expressed a desire for the support services to advertise the types of services offered, their location, and that they address gay issues. Furthermore,

they would like these services to employ staff who are trained in gay issues and who are gay-sensitive. Other suggestions include an anti-homophobia policy for the U of S, and a general education/awareness campaign about homosexuality for the U of S community. It was also indicated that it would be helpful if the telephone number for campus security was posted at numerous locations on campus. Participants also expressed a need for legal assistance, and a gay and lesbian resource centre to provide referrals to gay services. It was noted that some support services should coordinate their activities, such as GLUS and campus security, to design a program to deal with anti-gay violence. Support groups such as GLUS should also advertise and ensure that they have current contact information available. Finally, it was suggested that there be a gay liaison to work with campus security and other support services, and an “anti-homophobia in the workplace” workshop was suggested for campus security as well.

Qualitative Interview Results

This section of the Results describes the themes from participants’ written accounts of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence as well as the themes identified in the qualitative interviews. Two participants provided a written description of their anti-gay experiences at the U of S on the back of the survey. Both written accounts are presented in Appendix E to illustrate the experiences and feelings of the participants. The written accounts were content coded and analyzed. Both written accounts indicate that the participants perceive the U of S community as negative toward homosexuals. The written accounts also reveal that the participants recognize that their sexual orientation must be hidden or there will be negative consequences from U of S

community members. In terms of mental health consequences, one participant expressed that she felt fear, rage, and stress. The other participant indicated that she felt very disappointed by her anti-gay experiences and is now distrustful of others because of her experiences. The participants also felt limited in their expressions of homosexuality by U of S community members who are openly heterosexist.

The qualitative interviews were content coded and analyzed for emergent themes. Six participants left their names and telephone numbers to be interviewed. Five of the six participants were interviewed; one participant could not be reached. There were nine questions that guided the interview; however, participants that had no anti-gay experiences were only asked four questions, as the questions specifically pertaining to anti-gay experiences were omitted. Of the five interviewees, only one had an anti-gay experience. The five interviewees were asked to describe the climate at the U of S for homosexuals, what support services they would like in dealing with an anti-gay incident, what deterrents exist at the U of S that prevent one from being totally open about one's sexual orientation, and to make comments about the research project.

Regarding the climate at the U of S for homosexuals, the major theme that emerged was that the climate is not entirely positive or negative, but neutral due to a lack of awareness and education about gay and lesbian issues. Interviewees expressed a desire for support services that would be approachable, gay-sensitive, and have staff that are trained in gay and lesbian issues. Specific services mentioned were support groups, a resource phone number to provide information and referrals, and legal services. With regard to deterrents to being completely out about one's sexual orientation, there was a

range of opinions. Some interviewees indicated that there are no deterrents to being completely out about their sexual orientation on campus, and others said they feared negative reactions such as rejection. One interviewee stated that being out about his sexual orientation is a personal matter, and that he is not completely out because it is a private issue and not due to any deterrents at the U of S. Finally, the interviewees made comments about the research project: they believed that the survey was thorough, there was appreciation that the study was being conducted, and it was hoped that the research would promote information about homosexuality on campus to help change the climate for the future.

One interviewee had an anti-gay experience and, in addition to the questions asked of the other interviewees, he was asked to comment on what his life has been like since the incident, what emotional and physical consequences arose from the experience, how the event was dealt with, and why campus support services were not utilized to help deal with the aftermath of the experience. This individual experienced verbal abuse. The interviewee stated that there were no life changes, and no lasting emotional or physical effects of the anti-gay experience. The anti-gay experience was dealt with by talking with friends who provided advice and support, and U of S support services were not utilized because friends were perceived as a sufficient and immediate source of comfort and advice.

Summary of Results

Thirty-nine percent ($n = 11$) of the sample had been victims of an anti-gay experience. The first hypothesis was that the rates of anti-gay victimization at the U of S

would be comparable to those found at American universities (Yale and Penn State). This hypothesis was partially supported by the data. The rates of victimization at the U of S were considerably lower than the rates at the American universities; however, the pattern of victimization at the U of S was similar to the American universities in that verbal harassment, threats of physical violence, and being chased or followed were the three most common forms of anti-gay behavior.

The second hypothesis was supported, because males marginally outnumbered females as victims of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence. Most occurrences of anti-gay behavior were not reported to the appropriate U of S officials, and the rate of non-reporting was similar to that at the American universities. Consequently, the third hypothesis was supported by the data. Common reasons for non-reporting were: not being concerned enough about the incident, fear of negative reactions, not having the energy to fight or worry about the experience, feeling that reporting would not be worth the effort, not knowing where to go for help, and worrying about the burden of proof. Hypothesis four was supported by the data, because males were most often the perpetrators of anti-gay incidents.

Fifth, the mental and physical health consequences of anti-gay occurrences experienced by this sample included feelings of fear, anxiety, anger, isolation, violation, helplessness, nausea, fatigue, and depression. An additional theme included a desire to deny one's gay identity. Some of the symptoms identified as physical health consequences were also identified as mental health consequences. The mental health consequences obtained closely resemble those described in the literature, whereas the

physical health consequences obtained appear to be of less severity or intensity than those in the literature.

The sixth hypothesis was supported by the data, because friends were the source of social support most relied upon for dealing with an anti-gay experience. The seventh hypothesis that friends would also be rated as the most effective source of support, was not supported. Significant others were rated as the most effective source of support followed by GLUS and friends. It is important to note that the differences among the mean effectiveness ratings for the preceding support sources are of negligible practical significance. Finally, it was hypothesized that GLUS would be a frequently used support source. This hypothesis was supported, because GLUS was the fourth most relied upon support source, preceded only by friends, significant others, and family. Notably, GLUS was the most relied upon group or organization that provides support services.

The additional survey findings and the qualitative written accounts and interview data will be summarized together. The qualitative data support the survey findings. The data depict the climate at the U of S for homosexuals as ranging from neutral to negative. The majority of the participants hid their sexual orientation from undergraduate students, faculty, and university staff persons. The majority of participants “sometimes” fear for their safety at the U of S. Also, hearing demeaning remarks about gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals and seeing anti-gay graffiti is common, because only one participant had “never” heard these remarks or seen the graffiti. The majority of participants felt that it is “somewhat likely” that an average lesbian, gay male, or bisexual will be the target of an anti-gay attack. Furthermore, half of the sample knew of at least two other individuals

that had been a victim of an anti-gay incident because they were assumed/known to be homosexual or bisexual. Finally, 43% of the participants changed their behavior because of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence. Behavioral changes included avoiding public displays of affection with one's partner, avoiding socializing with openly homosexual individuals, editing homosexual content from conversations, attempts not to "look gay", becoming withdrawn, being more openly gay, not walking alone on campus, and not revealing one's sexual orientation to campus police.

Anti-gay occurrences at the U of S have a number of characteristics. First, most of the participants had been victimized by undergraduate students. Perpetrators were usually male, and they committed the anti-gay behaviors either alone or with one other perpetrator. Finally, participants were most often alone at the time of victimization.

Most participants felt that disclosure of their sexual orientation was important, but most participants also felt uncomfortable disclosing their sexual orientation to others at the U of S. Participants felt that there are few deterrents to being "out" on campus, except fear of negative peer reactions (e.g., rejection). The majority of participants first disclosed their sexual orientation to a friend. More than half of the sample had disclosed their sexual orientation to friends (homosexual/bisexual and heterosexual), the gay community, siblings, significant others or mothers, fellow students, and fathers. Less than half of the sample had disclosed their orientation to professors, counsellors/therapists, and the community at large. Most of the coming out experiences of the sample occurred in late adolescence and early adulthood.

Participants also described the characteristics of their most recent and most traumatic anti-gay incidents. For both the most recent and most traumatic experiences, the most frequent type of incident was a verbal attack. The most common time for both the most recent and most traumatic experiences among this sample was September, 1996. The most recent anti-gay experiences occurred between March, 1996 and January, 1997. Participants' most traumatic experiences occurred between November, 1994 and November, 1996. Most of the recent and traumatic events occurred on campus, and the most frequent location was the Arts Tunnel. Finally, most of the recent and traumatic experiences were related to the U of S, because these events were committed by U of S students and/or occurred on campus.

With regard to support services, 46% of the participants indicated that they would use a U of S support service to deal with an anti-gay experience, but 32% of the total sample reported that they would not. Among the reasons for not wanting to use U of S support services were: feeling able to deal with the event by oneself, preferring to rely on other sources (friends, family, GLHS), perceiving the services as insensitive to gay issues, being unaware of the support services, perceiving the services as homophobic, and a preference for gay-oriented services to protect against further victimization. Participants then indicated what services should do to better serve the needs of anti-gay victims. Some suggestions were for the support services to advertise the types of services offered. Furthermore, they would like these services to employ staff who are trained in gay issues and who are gay sensitive. Other suggestions include an anti-homophobia policy for the U of S, and a general education/awareness campaign about homosexuality. Participants

expressed a need for legal assistance, and a gay and lesbian resource centre to provide referrals to gay services.

Discussion

The findings of Study 1 indicate that some U of S students/former students have experienced anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at the U of S. Furthermore, these individuals have been adversely affected by these experiences, both mentally and physically. Verbal harassment was the most common form of anti-gay behavior experienced, and although verbal harassment is considered relatively benign, it too had some mental and physical effects. The mental health consequences among this sample are similar to the symptoms described in the literature (e.g., depression and anxiety) (D'Augelli, 1993, Garnets et al., 1990). Notably, these adverse consequences are affecting the participants during the later phase of homosexual identity formation ("coming out"). Consequently, the anti-gay experiences may be preventing the adoption of a healthy homosexual identity.

According to the gay, lesbian, and bisexual participants of this study, the climate at the U of S is not affirming of homosexuality. Some participants cite ignorance of homosexuality as the cause of the somewhat negative campus climate. Living within the seemingly intolerant U of S community has forced the majority of the participants to hide their sexual orientation, because they feel that although disclosure of their sexual orientation is important, they do not feel comfortable disclosing to the majority at the U of S. The somewhat negative nature of the U of S climate for homosexuals is further reinforced by participants' knowledge of other gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals who have

been victimized at the U of S or by a U of S community member. Overall, the quantitative and qualitative findings of this study are very similar to those found by Herek (1988) and D'Augelli (1992) in their studies of anti-gay prejudice on college/university campuses.

Participants also felt little institutional support for their sexual orientation as evidenced by their reluctance to report anti-gay incidents to U of S officials, and their unwillingness to utilize U of S support services. Participants not only fear primary victimization on campus, but they also fear secondary victimization should they seek help for dealing with anti-gay experiences. A preference for support from those who are aware of one's sexual orientation, and supportive of it, was exhibited by participants. In order for participants to feel comfortable utilizing campus support services, it is necessary that these groups/agencies make it explicit that they are gay-sensitive and gay-affirmative.

It is important to view these interpretations and conclusions with caution, because the generalizability of this study is limited (refer to the General Discussion for a more detailed review of the limitations). Only 28 participants were obtained through convenience sampling. The results may be biased as only those participants who were sufficiently "out" about their sexual orientation to obtain a survey comprised the sample. Consequently, the findings may be an underestimate of the actual frequency of anti-gay occurrences at the U of S. Alternatively, the survey findings may present an overestimate of the occurrences of anti-gay victimization at the U of S, because individuals who are "out" about their sexual orientation may be more visible targets for victimization. However, either interpretation supports the finding that the U of S campus climate is

somewhat negative toward homosexuals. A larger sample size would have been preferable so that correlational analyses could have been conducted to explore the relationships among gender, anti-gay experiences, fear for personal safety, expectations of anti-gay experiences, and behavioral changes to avoid anti-gay experiences.

The interview data may be biased as well, because only one interviewee had an anti-gay experience, and thus, this perspective is underrepresented in the qualitative interview data. This individual's anti-gay experience did not affect him greatly, and it would have been preferable to interview victims that had been affected to a greater extent as well. Obtaining both points of view would have provided a more complete qualitative data set. In the interest of obtaining a more complete understanding of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at the U of S, a survey of heterosexual students' attitudes toward homosexuals was conducted.

STUDY 2

The fourth objective of this research endeavor was to survey heterosexual students' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. Assessing students' attitudes provides another perspective for understanding the climate at the University of Saskatchewan for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. Study 1 provided a homosexual perspective, and Study 2 provided the heterosexual perspective. The results of Study 2 supplement those of Study 1 to supply a more complete understanding of the U of S campus climate for homosexuals. The heterosexual perspective of Study 2 eliminates a potential bias in the conclusions of this research. It is important to understand the climate in which gay, lesbian, and bisexual students live, so one is aware of the influences affecting their development, mental and physical health, and their support networks.

Hypotheses

Based on the findings of the anti-gay attitude literature reviewed (D'Augelli, 1989; Herek, 1988; Qualls et al., 1992; Russell & Gray, 1992), there were three hypotheses. (1) It was predicted that both male and female heterosexual students would have negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. (2) Heterosexual male students would hold more negative anti-gay attitudes than heterosexual female students, and (3) these male students would also have more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians.

Method

Respondents and Sampling Strategy

A sample of 322 undergraduates was obtained from Introductory Psychology, and an advanced Psychology course, Community Psychology. The majority of participants were obtained at Mass Testing sessions of Introductory Psychology.

Of the 322 participants, 307 (199 females and 108 males) participants were retained for the analyses. Seven participants were excluded because of substantial missing data, and eight others were excluded because of their sexual orientation (homosexual or bisexual). The participants ranged in age from under 18 years to over 25 years. The mode age was 18 years ($n = 103$). The majority of the sample was affiliated with the College of Arts and Science ($n = 239$); other participants were affiliated with Commerce ($n = 17$), Agriculture ($n = 10$), Physical Education ($n = 7$), Education ($n = 4$), Pharmacy ($n = 4$), Engineering ($n = 4$), and 21 participants were Unclassified students. Finally, participants had been U of S students for a range of one to six or more years. The modal duration of university attendance was one year ($n = 222$).

Measures

The materials used in this study consisted of a questionnaire containing four measures (see Appendix F). The first measure was the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale (Herek, 1988). The ATLG scale is a 20 item scale with two 10-item subscales: Attitudes Toward Lesbians (ATL) and Attitudes Toward Gay Men (ATG). The scale is in a Likert format, and participants reply on a nine-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 9 = strongly agree) the extent to which they disagree/agree with a

series of statements. The ATLG scale score values have a possible range of 20 (extremely positive) to 180 (extremely negative). The scale midpoint is 100 (neutral). The possible scale score range for the two subscales, ATL and ATG, is 10 (extremely positive) to 90 (extremely negative). The subscales' midpoint is 50 (neutral). The scale has satisfactory psychometric properties: Cronbach's alphas = .90 for the ATLG, .91 for the ATG, and .90 for the ATL. Furthermore, the scale correlates significantly in the expected directions with attitudes toward sex roles, traditional family ideology, dogmatism, perceived agreement by friends, and positive contact with any lesbians or gay men to provide evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. Notably, the ATLG has not been linked to a socially desirable response set.

The second measure in the questionnaire was a short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SDS) to assess the presence of a socially desirable response set. The SDS was included to rule out the response bias as a possible confound. The short-form used consists of 10 items from the original scale. The SDS requires that participants respond whether they believe the statements are true or false. The SDS has a possible range of scores from 0 to 10. The short-form was used instead of the full length scale to limit the amount of time and effort asked of the participants. The short-form has satisfactory psychometric properties: Cronbach's alpha = .88, and it correlates highly with the full length scale, $r = .96$ (Fischer & Fick, 1993).

Four questions that were presented in the survey of Study 1 comprised the third measure. These questions assessed the presence of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at the University of Saskatchewan. Specifically, participants were asked to

comment on how often they had heard other members of the U of S make belittling remarks about bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men, and how often they had seen anti-gay graffiti. Participants were also asked about the number of members of the U of S community that they know personally who have been an anti-gay victim. Finally, participants were asked about the chances that an average gay, lesbian, or bisexual person at the U of S would be a target of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence.

The fourth measure included the demographic questions necessary to describe the sample. Questions pertaining to gender, sexual orientation, age, college affiliation, and duration of attendance at the U of S were asked.

Procedure

Administration. The majority of questionnaires were administered during two Mass Testing sessions of Introductory Psychology. During Mass Testing sessions, students were provided with research materials from a variety of research projects, including this one, so they could learn about psychological research by participating in it. Students were provided with one course credit for their participation. Participants that volunteered during their Community Psychology class were asked to pick up a survey package at the end of class, and return it to the researcher at the end of their next Community Psychology class. The participants recruited in this manner were not provided with course credit for their participation.

All participants were provided with a cover letter, questionnaire, and a computer answer sheet. As participation was anonymous, no signed consent form was obtained; however, it was clearly stated in the cover letter that a returned questionnaire would be

interpreted as permission granted to use the responses as data. All the necessary information for informed consent, including terms of confidentiality, was provided on the cover letter (see Appendix G). The cover letter also provided a detailed description of the study, instructions for completing the questionnaire, and it contained the names and telephone numbers of the researcher and her supervisor so additional information could be obtained and concerns could be addressed. The cover letter also indicated when and where a summary of the results could be obtained. Participants were instructed to retain the cover letter for their records, and place completed questionnaires into a sealed envelope for return to the researcher at the end of the Mass Testing session or at the end of their next Psychology class.

It is important to note that the SDS and the ATLG were counterbalanced to control for order of presentation effects; consequently, half of the sample received a questionnaire with the SDS presented first and the ATLG second, and the other half of the sample completed the ATLG first and the SDS second.

Pilot Study. Study 2 was not pilot tested, because the ATLG and SDS had been used in previous studies successfully. Furthermore, the four questions of measure three were pilot tested in Study 1, and they were found to be easily understood and answerable.

Analysis

The data were analyzed using the SPSS statistical package for Windows (version 6.0). The analyses consisted of descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics included frequencies, means, medians, modes, and ranges, and Pearson product-moment correlations. The inferential statistics included independent and dependent

sample t-tests, and ANOVAs. These tests were conducted to investigate mean differences on the SDS, ATLG, and ATL and ATG subscales. Seven planned comparisons of means were conducted, and the Bonferroni t was calculated to estimate the maximum probability of a Type-I error. When using an alpha level of .05 for each comparison, the maximum probability of an experimentwise Type-I error was .01. As well, the effect size for the statistically significant findings was calculated with omega squared (ω^2) to provide information as to the strength or the magnitude of the relationship tested.

Data Preparation. Before the analyses were conducted, the data were screened for outliers, missing data, and for violations of the assumptions of ANOVA (normality and homogeneity of variance). Examination of scale scores revealed that both the SDS (range = 0-10, $M = 4.065$, $SD = 1.98$) and ATLG (range = 20-173, $M = 77.39$, $SD = 38.99$) had appropriate scale ranges and means. Furthermore, both ATLG subscales had appropriate ranges and means (ATL: range = 10-88, $M = 34.48$, $SD = 18.45$; ATG: range = 10-90, $M = 42.92$, $SD = 22.03$). No outliers were identified.

Missing data were minimal and scattered randomly among participants and across ATLG items. There was no missing data for the SDS scale items. Only 18 participants had missing data on the ATLG scale, and the maximum number of missing values for any one participant was 4. Missing data for ATLG items was replaced with the individual's median subscale score. The median subscale score was selected as the replacement value, because it most accurately reflected the participant's trend in responding for each subscale. Respondent's total scale median was not used as the replacement value because

participants may have had very different attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians, and thus, their total scale median value may not accurately represent their trend in responding to a particular subscale item. Each individual's mean subscale score was not used as the replacement value because replacement with a true rating scale value was desired.

The distribution of the ATLG total scale scores and the ATL and ATG subscale scores were slightly positively skewed. An examination of the skewness and kurtosis values revealed that the distributions were not substantially non-normal, because the values did not greatly differ from zero. Given that the assumption of normality was met, it was deemed appropriate to conduct the main analyses on the untransformed data.

Finally, reliability analyses were performed on the ATLG scale, and for the ATL and ATG subscales. The total scale and subscales were found to have high Cronbach alpha values (ATLG = .95, ATL = .90, ATG = .93). The reliability of the SDS was moderate: KR20 = .58; Guttman split-half reliability of .61.

Results

The findings will be presented in three sections. First, the results of the tests for the presence of order effects and the presence of a socially desirable response bias will be presented. Second, the findings for each hypothesis are presented. Finally, the results of exploratory analyses are described. A summary of the results is presented as well.

Order of Presentation Effects and Socially Desirable Response Bias

There were two forms of the survey because the presentation of the SDS and ATLG were counterbalanced. The first analysis conducted was to determine whether

there was an order of presentation effect between the two forms of the survey (Form A, $n = 152$, and Form B, $n = 155$). The presence of order effects was tested with a t-test for independent samples. Participants scores on the ATLG scale on Form A ($M = 75.37$, $SD = 38.68$, range = 20 - 173) were compared with participants scores on the ATLG scale on Form B ($M = 79.38$, $SD = 39.33$, range = 20 - 172). The result was non-significant ($t(306) = -.90$, $p = .368$). The results of the t-test for independent samples indicated that there was also no significant difference between the SDS scores on Form A ($M = 4.48$, $SD = 3.64$) and Form B ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.95$), $t(232) = 1.59$, $p = .114$. Due to the non-significant differences, it was concluded that the order of the presentation of the two scales did not influence the scale scores. All of the following analyses were conducted on the total data set in which Form A and Form B datasets were merged.

The presence of a socially desirable response bias was tested with a Pearson product-moment correlation. The Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test for any association between SDS scores ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.98$) and ATLG scores ($M = 77.39$, $SD = 38.99$). The correlation was found to be non-significant ($r = -.02$, $p = .723$). Therefore, socially desirable response bias was considered not to be an influence on the ATLG scores in this sample.

Tests of Hypotheses

Each hypothesis will be presented first, followed by a description of the analysis conducted.

1. Both male and female heterosexual students would have negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

To test this hypothesis, descriptive analyses were performed on the ATLG scale. The mean ATLG score based on the entire sample was 77.39 ($SD = 38.99$). The total scale scores ranged from 20 to 173. The mode score was 36, and the median was 72. This sample had somewhat positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians.

The range of ATL scores in this sample was 10 to 88. This sample also had positive attitudes toward lesbians, because the ATL subscale scores were quite low ($M = 34.48$, $SD = 18.45$, $Mdn = 31$, mode = 10). Finally, the participants ATG scores ranged from 10 to 90, and the participants' attitudes toward gay men were somewhat positive ($M = 42.92$, $SD = 22.04$, $Mdn = 41$, mode = 10) as well.

2. Heterosexual male students would hold more negative anti-gay attitudes than heterosexual female students.

This hypothesis was tested with an ANOVA analysis by gender on the ATLG scale scores. The ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference between females' ($M = 70.97$, $SD = 36.83$) and males' ($M = 88.94$, $SD = 40.42$) attitudes toward lesbians and gay men², $F(1, 306) = 15.55$, $p < .001$. Males had significantly more negative attitudes than females. It should be noted, however, that there was a substantial difference between the number of males ($n = 108$) and females ($n = 199$) in this analysis. To compensate for this large discrepancy, this hypothesis was tested three more times.

² Levene's test for homogeneity of variance was conducted for each ANOVA in this study. All results were non-significant, and thus, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated in these analyses.

Independent t-test analyses were conducted by gender for the ATLG scores with three random samples of 108 females from the pool of 199. Three random samples of 108 females were chosen in order to compare males and females with equal sample sizes. For the three analyses, the males' ATLG mean equaled 88.94, and the standard deviation was 40.42. The results of the three analyses, presented in Table 11, confirmed the initial finding that there was a significant difference between males' attitudes and females' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

Table 11

ATLG Independent t-test Results Based on Female Random Samples

Random Sample	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
A	74.15	35.76	2.85	106	.005
B	69.52	33.51	3.85	106	.0005
C	72.07	36.24	3.23	106	.005

Based on the initial ANOVA, the effect size was found to be very small, $\omega^2 = .05$.

3. Heterosexual male students would hold more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians.

To test this hypothesis, a paired samples t-test was conducted. The results support the hypothesis, because there was a significant difference between the males' ATLG subscale scores (M = 38.48, SD = 19.54) and their ATG subscale scores (M = 50.47, SD = 22.68), $t(107) = 9.88$, $p < .001$. Males were significantly more negative toward gay men than toward lesbians.

Exploratory Results

The third hypothesis of this study was that males would hold more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. This hypothesis was confirmed. To determine whether this same finding was true for females, an exploratory paired samples t-test was conducted on females' ATL and ATG subscale scores. The results indicated that females, as well, were significantly more negative toward gay men ($\underline{M} = 38.69$, $\underline{SD} = 20.57$) than toward lesbians ($\underline{M} = 32.29$, $\underline{SD} = 17.55$), $t(198) = 8.81$, $p < .001$. An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the difference scores between males' and females' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men were significantly different. Males' difference scores ($\underline{M} = 12.00$, $\underline{SD} = 12.62$) were significantly greater than females' difference scores ($\underline{M} = 6.41$, $\underline{SD} = 10.26$), $F(1, 306) = 17.61$, $p < .001$. That is, males were more negative toward gay men than toward lesbians to a greater extent than were females. Calculation of ω^2 revealed that this effect size was very small, .06.

Other exploratory results pertain to the four questions that assessed the presence of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at the University of Saskatchewan. These questions were also asked on the survey in Study 1, and they provide an indication of the climate at the U of S for homosexuals. Table 12 presents the frequencies for these questions. Half of the participants ($\underline{n} = 154$, 50%) had heard anti-gay remarks rarely or never, 33% ($\underline{n} = 103$) heard these remarks "sometimes", and 17% ($\underline{n} = 51$) heard remarks frequently or always. The majority of participants had never or rarely seen anti-gay graffiti ($\underline{n} = 201$, 65%) while others had sometimes seen graffiti at the U of S ($\underline{n} = 62$, 20%), and only 15% ($\underline{n} = 46$) had frequently seen graffiti. Finally, slightly more than half

Table 12

U of S Climate Questions Study 2

Question	Distribution of Responses					<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5		
1. How often have you heard other members of the U of S community make belittling/demeaning remarks about bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men?	83	71	103	47	4	2.41	1.08
2. How often have you seen anti-gay graffiti at the U of S?	135	65	62	39	7	2.08	1.16
3. In your opinion, what are the chances that an average bisexual, lesbian, or gay man at the U of S will be the target of discrimination, unfair treatment, anti-gay harassment, threats of violence, or physical attack?	23	58	65	127	32	3.29	1.12

Note. For items 1 and 2, 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = frequently, 5 = always.

For item 3, 1 = very unlikely, 2 = somewhat likely, 3 = neither likely nor unlikely, 4 = somewhat likely, 5 = very likely

of the sample ($n = 159$, 52%) felt that the chances that an average bisexual, lesbian, or gay man at the U of S would be a target of anti-gay behavior are likely. The remaining participants felt that the chances of victimization would be unlikely ($n = 81$, 26%) or “neither unlikely nor likely” ($n = 65$, 21%). Another question asked about the number of individuals the participants knew who had been victimized on campus. The majority of participants did not know anyone personally ($n = 270$, 88%) that had been a victim of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence; however, 10% ($n = 32$) of the participants knew one individual that had been an anti-gay victim at the U of S.

Summary of Results

The analyses of Study 2 revealed that there was no order of presentation effect for the SDS and ATLG scales, and that the socially desirable response bias may not have been an influence on the attitude scale scores.

Two of three hypotheses were supported by the data. The first hypothesis was not supported by the data, because the participants did not have negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. The second hypothesis, however, that males would have more negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men than females, was supported. It is important to note that, although statistically significant, this effect was found to be very small. Third, it was hypothesized that males would have more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians, and this too was supported by the data.

The exploratory analyses indicated that females, too, had significantly more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. However, males were more

negative toward gay men than toward lesbians to a greater extent than females. This effect was also found to be very small.

Analysis of the exploratory questions assessing the U of S campus climate for homosexuals indicated that anti-gay remarks were heard infrequently by half of the sample, and that the other half of the sample heard these remarks at least sometimes. Anti-gay graffiti was rarely or never seen on campus. Furthermore, the majority of the sample did not know anyone, personally, who had been a victim of anti-gay behavior. Finally, slightly more than half of the participants felt the chances that an average homosexual or bisexual person would be attacked at the U of S likely.

Discussion

Heterosexual students' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians is one indicator of the U of S campus climate for gay, lesbian, and bisexual university community members. The attitudes exhibited by this sample were somewhat positive, but both male and female heterosexual students' had less positive attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. This finding is dissimilar to the results of a series of studies by Herek (1988). He found that males held consistently more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians, and that females' attitudes did not differ significantly according to the gender of the target.

Herek (1988) accounted for the gender differences in his studies with a functional framework. Individual attitudes toward gay men and lesbians serve various psychological functions: value-expressive, social-expressive, experiential-schematic, and defensive. Within this functional framework, Herek conceptualized the gender differences as being

due to the differences in cultural constructions of gender. Males have more negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians because heterosexuality is explicitly tied to masculinity. Heterosexual males reject gay men because of the need to affirm their masculinity. Accordingly, heterosexual females are less likely to reject homosexuals because heterosexuality is less central to female gender-identity, and thus, they may experience less social pressure to express anti-gay attitudes. Perhaps, the females in this study experience more social pressure to reject male homosexuality than those in Herek's studies, and this may account for females having more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians, as well.

The questions directly assessing the climate at the U of S revealed an interesting contradiction. Participants reported that they were infrequently exposed to overt signs of anti-gay attitudes (hearing anti-gay remarks, seeing anti-gay graffiti) and that they did not know anyone who had been the victim of an anti-gay incident. Despite their positive attitudes and witnessing few overt signs of anti-gay attitudes, the participants indicated that it is likely that an average gay man, lesbian, or bisexual would be the victim of an anti-gay incident at the U of S. The basis for this contradiction is puzzling. Perhaps, students in this study feel that others at the U of S have less favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gay men, even though they do not hear or see evidence of others' negative attitudes. Alternatively, the socially desirable response bias may be operating even though it was not found to be significantly associated with participants' attitude scores. However, the SDS was not a highly reliable measure of this bias for this sample, and thus, the presence of the response bias cannot be excluded with certainty.

The results of this study must be interpreted with caution due to limited generalizability. Although numerous colleges were represented in this sample, the majority of the participants were Arts and Sciences students. Also, the majority of the participants had only attended the U of S for one year. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the entire U of S community, as students from other colleges and durations of attendance are not represented, and other U of S community members (faculty and staff) are unrepresented. However, given that the college of Arts and Sciences is the largest college at the U of S, the results may be indicative of how a portion of the campus community perceives homosexuals. Additionally, it was not the intent of this research project to generalize the findings to other Canadian universities or to the city of Saskatoon which surrounds the U of S. A more detailed description of this study's limitations follows in the General Discussion.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The General Discussion presents an integration of the findings of Study 1 and Study 2, a review of the major research findings, a description of problems and limitations of the research, plus conclusions, implications, and directions for future research. Study 1 provided a homosexual perspective to the campus climate for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals at the U of S. Study 2 assessed heterosexual students' perceptions of the climate for homosexual students. When combined, the findings of Study 1 and Study 2 provide a multidimensional evaluation of the campus climate at the U of S for gay male, lesbian, and bisexual students.

There were some notable differences between the studies' findings. First, the campus climate appeared to be somewhat negative for homosexuals in Study 1, and somewhat positive in Study 2. For example, anti-gay remarks were heard frequently by the homosexual participants, but only rarely among the heterosexual participants. In addition, anti-gay graffiti was observed frequently by the participants in Study 1, but observed rarely by the heterosexual students in Study 2. Finally, the majority of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students knew others who had been victims of anti-gay behavior at the U of S, but the majority of the heterosexual participants did not know anyone that had been victimized because of their assumed or known sexual orientation. These

differences may be due to homosexuals being sensitized to anti-gay attitudes and behaviors because these are salient in their personal lives, whereas heterosexuals may not be cognizant of these attitudes and behaviors because they have no immediate bearing on their lives.

Although there were some contrasts between the findings of Study 1 and Study 2, there were some similarities as well. For example, the participants in both studies felt that it is likely that an average gay, lesbian, or bisexual person would be attacked at the U of S. This finding presents an interesting contradiction for the findings of Study 2. In Study 2, the participants expressed somewhat positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, and they had observed few overt signs of anti-gay attitudes at the U of S. Despite these findings that may depict a tolerant environment, the participants in Study 2 felt that the chances of an anti-gay attack were likely. It is interesting to note that the paradox in the Study 2 findings parallels Norris' (1991) report of attitudinal support for homosexuality at Oberlin College coupled with evidence of anti-gay behavior at this same institution. It is possible that the heterosexual students in Study 2 are similar to the Canadians in the study by Rayside and Bowler (1988). These researchers reported that Canadians expressed politically liberal attitudes toward homosexuality, but exhibited strong moral condemnation of homosexuality. It is possible that this difference between political attitudes and moral beliefs is the reason why the participants in Study 2 exhibited somewhat positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, but still believed the chance of an anti-gay attack on campus is likely. These students may have reported politically liberal attitudes, but recognized that they (or others) behave on the basis of moral beliefs.

Speculatively, moral beliefs may be a better predictor of anti-gay behaviors than political attitudes.

Study 1 found that males were most often the perpetrators of anti-gay behavior. This is congruent with Study 2's finding that males had more negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians than females. These findings could be interpreted as supporting Herek's (1993b) assertion that males are the most frequent perpetrators of anti-gay behavior because males need to exert their dominance and power more than women. If one accepts the premise that young males' need to exhibit domination and control is socially-constructed, then Comstock's (1991) belief that anti-gay violence is rooted in a patriarchal belief system may be supported by these findings as well. To reiterate, Comstock asserts that anti-gay violence is due to two factors: (1) the socially-constructed powerlessness of the adolescent, and (2) male gender role socialization. Although young women are equally, if not more, socially powerless as young men, males are socialized to demonstrate dominance. This difference in the socialization of males and females may account for the finding the males are the most common perpetrators of anti-gay behavior.

Study 1 also confirmed that males were more often the victims of anti-gay incidents than females. A parallel finding in Study 2 is that both male and female heterosexual students had more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians.

Finally, Study 1 participants indicated that there are few deterrents to being completely "out" about their sexual orientation at the U of S, and this is consistent with the somewhat positive attitudes exhibited by the heterosexual participants in Study 2. There is, however, some contradiction in the findings of Study 1. Even though some

participants felt that there are few deterrents to being “out” on campus, there was evidence of substantial hiding, fear for personal safety, and actual occurrences of anti-gay behaviors at the U of S.

In sum, the U of S campus climate may be perceived as potentially threatening for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals. Although a subset of the U of S population exhibits somewhat positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, both homosexual and heterosexual participants felt that the chances of an anti-gay attack were likely at the U of S. The results of Study 1 more clearly illustrate the intolerance of the U of S community, and the results of Study 2 do not completely dispel this perception. Although numerous colleges were represented in the Study 2 sample, the majority of the participants were Arts and Sciences students. Also, the majority of the participants had only attended the U of S for one year. Therefore, the results of this study should be cautiously generalized to the greater U of S community, as students from other colleges and durations of attendance are not represented, and other U of S community members (faculty and staff) are unrepresented.

Main Findings

Although it is not as large a problem at the U of S as reported by a few American universities, anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence still affects some members of the U of S gay community adversely, and it limits their freedom. The gay, lesbian, and bisexual participants reacted in a characteristic manner to their anti-gay experiences (e.g., hiding, non-reporting behavior, fearing for personal safety, mental and physical distress). It is important to note that the negative experiences and the resultant consequences

described in this research were affecting gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals during the formative stages of their homosexual identity (Troiden, 1989). Specifically, the stages of homosexual identity assumption and identity commitment may be most difficult for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students on campus. Consequently, adoption and maintenance of a healthy homosexual identity may be negatively influenced by the somewhat intolerant U of S climate. The heterosexual students' somewhat positive attitudes, coupled with their perceptions that an anti-gay attack at the U of S is likely, does not substantially alter the image of the U of S campus climate as being somewhat non-affirming. Despite the challenging climate, however, gay male, lesbian, and bisexual students' homosexual identity formation on campus may be facilitated by their personal support networks. Troiden (1989) asserts that the support of family and friends may counteract the negative influences during these developmental stages. Study 1's findings revealed the participants relied on family, friends, and significant others for dealing with anti-gay experiences and that this support was perceived as effective.

With regard to anti-gay behavior at the U of S, the pattern of behavior is similar to the patterns reported in the general population and college/university populations described at Yale University (Herek, 1993a), Pennsylvania State University (D'Augelli, 1992), and by the NGLTF (Nardi & Bolton, 1991). It is important to highlight the role of verbal harassment. Verbal harassment is often perceived as innocuous, but it can be severely damaging (Garnets et al., 1990). Verbal harassment reinforces the notion that one is a member of a despised minority and that the threat of an attack is ever present. Consequently, verbal harassment contributes to emotional problems such as depression

and anxiety, and it encourages its victims to further restrict their lives. In this study, verbal harassment was the most common form of anti-gay behavior experienced, and it was the most frequent traumatic and recent anti-gay experience as well. Consequently, the occurrences and impact of verbal harassment on the U of S community need to be addressed.

Another notable finding is the substantial underutilization of U of S support services by the homosexual participants. These participants gained support from those with whom they have the greatest intimacy (e.g., friends, family, significant others, GLUS). This finding is consistent with the literature indicating that individuals who are aware of one's sexual orientation are the most effective sources of social support (Berger, 1992; Berger & Mallon, 1993). By seeking support from those who are aware of one's sexual orientation, and are accepting of it, victims are assured that they will not experience secondary victimization. The fear of meeting further negative reactions when seeking help for dealing with anti-gay experiences was identified as a major reason for not reporting anti-gay incidents and not utilizing U of S support services. This fear of secondary victimization was the main reason for non-reporting of anti-gay experiences by American college participants as well (Herek, 1993a; D'Augelli, 1992; Comstock, 1991).

Although homosexual participants perceived little institutional support for their sexual orientation, they expressed a willingness to use U of S support services in the future: but before doing so, participants indicated that services need to explicitly advertise that their services are gay-sensitive and that their support providers have been

educated about gay issues. In this way, fears of secondary victimization would be allayed.

Participants also expressed a desire for campus-wide education about homosexuality. Some participants indicated that intolerance of homosexuals may be due to ignorance about homosexuality in general. Perhaps, a more educated community would be more tolerant, and thus, gay men, lesbians, and bisexual persons on campus could be less fearful and have more freedom.

Finally, it is important to note that anti-gay victimization is a current problem at the U of S, because the most recent event reported by a participant occurred in January, 1997. Interestingly, during data collection in January, the U of S newspaper, The Sheaf, published one article by a gay man describing deterrents to being “out” at the U of S, and appealing to other gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals to speak out and “come out” about their homosexuality in spite of their fears (Keller, 1997). In this same issue, two letters were published that expressed intolerance toward homosexuality (McDonald, 1997; Meaden, 1997). These examples illustrate that the non-affirming campus climate is a current phenomenon, and not a problem of the past.

Challenges and Limitations of the Research

Challenges

The major challenge encountered in conducting this research was obtaining participants for Study 1. Data collection for Study 1 spanned four months. A sample size of 100 was initially desired. When planning the research, GLUS was consulted and they indicated that obtaining 100 respondents would be feasible. As surveys were

returned very slowly, it became apparent that this was an overestimate. From discussions with GLUS members and members of the Women's Centre who were instrumental in survey distribution, it is possible that members of the gay community were not sufficiently motivated to complete and return the surveys. It is possible that those individuals who are not "out" on campus were too frightened to obtain and complete a survey for fear that they would be identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual. It is also possible that anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence is not a serious enough issue for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals at the U of S, or perhaps members of the gay community were reluctant to complete the survey for fear that they would be further victimized by offensive questions/terminology within the survey or they feared exposure in the survey report. Finally, gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals at the U of S may have been uninterested in participating in research because they are over-researched due to the university's reliance on students for subjects in numerous research projects. The difficulties encountered in obtaining participants highlights the challenges involved with conducting research with an invisible minority. Consequently, if obtaining large samples of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals is difficult, then qualitative methodologies may be better suited for conducting research with this population.

In addition, prank phone calls to the Women's Centre and the researcher occurred during data collection for Study 1. The advertising campaign requested that interested individuals contact the Women's Centre or the researcher by telephone to receive a survey. There were approximately five prank phone calls. The prank calls consisted primarily of false intentions to participate. These contacts indicated that at least a few U

of S community members consider homosexuality something to be embarrassed about or ridiculed.

Limitations

As noted, in the Discussion sections of each study, these results have limited generalizability due to the unrepresentative nature of the samples. Consequently, the findings of Study 1 and Study 2 should be interpreted with caution. Furthermore, Study 1 had a very small sample size ($N = 28$) which also necessitates cautious interpretation and generalization of its results. In addition to this diminished external validity, there are potential threats to the internal validity of these studies.

The threats to the internal validity of Study 1 and Study 2 concern the biases inherent with using face valid self-report measures. First, participants in both studies may have experienced evaluation apprehension, and thus, were motivated to exhibit the positive self-presentation bias (Baron & Byrne, 1991). For example, in Study 1, the participants may have minimized the impact of their anti-gay experiences in the interest of appearing psychologically healthy. In Study 2, although the socially desirable response bias was deemed to not significantly influence participants' attitudes, the self-presentation bias cannot be totally discounted. It is likely that participants were aware that it is politically incorrect to have prejudicial attitudes toward minority groups, and consequently, they may have been motivated to express slightly more positive attitudes than they actually hold.

The findings obtained with the SCL-90-R in Study 1, should be interpreted with caution due to the alteration of the instructions for this scale. It was noted in the

Measures section that the instructions were revised to ensure that participants responded more accurately. There was substantial missing data on this scale, which may have been due to this revision. Consequently, the reliability and validity of the SCL-90-R may also have been compromised by this revision. Therefore, the scale's global indices and subscale scores could not be calculated. However, it is important to note that the most frequently distressing symptoms identified on the SCL-90-R are similar to those reported for the open-ended questions assessing mental and physical consequences. Therefore, there is reason to suggest that participants completed the SCL-90-R appropriately, and that the SCL-90-R assessed mental and physical health symptoms among this sample.

The reliability and validity of the Sexual Orientation Survey, used in Study 1 have not been assessed. It is possible that the measure does not assess occurrences of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence as intended, or that it does not measure these issues consistently. The measure has face validity; however, future research should assess the reliability and validity of the SCL-90-R with the altered instructions.

Another threat to the internal validity of this research endeavor may have been history effects. For Study 2, approximately one week prior to data collection, the campus newspaper, The Sheaf, published articles pertaining to homosexuality on campus. It is possible that these articles may have sensitized the participants to the issue of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence on campus. Therefore, participants may have been motivated to express more positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians in this study. Although history effects are plausible, it is possible that the participants in Study 2 may have been unaffected by The Sheaf's publications.

Conclusions, Implications, and Suggestions for Future Research

Based on the findings of Study 1 and Study 2, it is concluded that education about homosexuality, in general, is necessary for the U of S community. It is hoped that decreasing the ignorance about homosexuality on campus will foster accepting attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. Aronson (1992) described prejudice as power over others. Furthering our understanding of the power of anti-gay prejudice for its holders will enable the community to promote attitude change. Emotions, symbolic beliefs, and stereotypes have been found to foster prejudice (Esses et al., 1993). Investigation of the functions of stereotypes (cognitive, psychodynamic, sociocultural, self-detachment/self-protection) (Snyder & Miene, 1994), emotions, and symbolic beliefs surrounding homosexuality would also help promote climate change. By educating individuals with prejudicial attitudes, not only about homosexuality, but about the functions of their beliefs and how they are created and maintained, attitude change may be possible.

It has been noted that changing the climate for homosexuals will decrease the internalized homophobia that they experience (Garnets et al., 1990). With pervasive attitude change, it is possible that gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals at the U of S could become less fearful and more open about their sexual orientation. From the increased openness, it is hoped that members of the U of S gay community will feel more able to report anti-gay behaviors and utilize U of S support services for dealing with these incidents. It is also recommended that the campus community receives education about identifying anti-gay behavior in themselves and others, as well as the impact of anti-gay behavior on its victims. Specifically, an emphasis on the detriments of verbal harassment

should be made. A potential outcome of this sort of educational campaign could be a reduction in the occurrences of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at the U of S. A byproduct of a reduction in anti-gay occurrences may be the facilitation of healthy gay-identity adoption and maintenance for homosexuals on campus. It is also concluded that, where applicable, U of S support services should explicitly identify themselves as gay-sensitive and as employing support providers that are trained to address gay issues.

With regard to future research, it is recommended that before an educational campaign is developed, a campus-wide homosexuality learning needs assessment be conducted. The results of the learning needs assessment could provide a strong foundation for education program planning. It would also be beneficial to study heterosexuals' perceptions of what attitudes, words, and behaviors are "anti-gay." Understanding how heterosexuals define "anti-gay" could provide insight into their homosexuality educational needs, and it could be a sensitization process for those individuals involved in the research, as well.

Finally, it is recommended that existing U of S support services be evaluated for gay-sensitivity and preparedness to address the needs of gay, lesbian, and bisexual clients. Services could be evaluated on the extent to which they follow Robinson's (1994) seven practices for working with gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. As stated previously, the seven practices include: (1) being informed of the resources available to gay men, bisexuals, and lesbians, (2) accept the client as a whole person (avoid assuming a problem is invariably tied to sexuality), (3) use broad and open-ended assessments, (4) provide

information about homosexuality in a nonthreatening manner (e.g., bulletin boards), (5) facilitate an in-service training program to instruct educators about the diversity of homosexuality, (6) start a focus or support group for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals, and (7) share the knowledge gained by working with gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals with others in the helping professions. Once it is determined the extent to which U of S services employ these practices, planning for service improvement could be conducted. Importantly, self-help groups have been identified as especially empowering (Cranston, 1991), and some participants in Study 1 requested this sort of service. Consequently, if this type of support is not being offered by any U of S services, it should be seriously considered during service planning. It is important to note that, despite the current university budget reductions, this sort of evaluation would be inexpensive to implement. Furthermore, the potential mental and physical health benefits would far outweigh the monetary costs of an evaluation. The U of S should be proactive in its gay-oriented policies and services, as this would send an empowering message of acknowledgment and acceptance.

Slater (1993) suggests six steps by which university communities can alter their climate for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. She asserts that only a campus-wide commitment will be able to produce a substantial change, and that this will involve a sustained effort. Slater also warns that without a genuine commitment backsliding will occur. First, universities must provide non-ambivalent administrative leadership which would require the inclusion of sexual orientation in the official affirmative action statements and all other published documents. Second, the university administration such

as the president must establish a funded working committee to explore the campus climate and make specific recommendations. This committee should be comprised of students, faculty, staff, and administration, and both heterosexual and gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals. A formal document describing the campus situation regarding homosexuality, major campus issues, and recommended solutions would be produced by this committee. Third, this working committee needs to become a permanent committee mandated to carry forth its goals, once the background work has been completed. Fourth, universities must support a student organization which is recognized by the university and is sponsored by a gay/lesbian/bisexual faculty or staff member. This organization would be a part of the student support network and it could promote speakers, discussion and support groups, and social events. Fifth, a confidential mechanism for handling stress/fears, complaints or problems should be formed. This mechanism should include the publication of the names of contact persons who are known to be gay supportive and knowledgeable of homosexual lifestyles. These contact individuals could act as sounding boards and resource persons, but they would not have the power to remedy problem situations. Finally, a publicized official mechanism for dealing with anti-gay violence must exist. As such, university campus security personnel need training to handle issues related to sexual orientation in a respectful, sensitive, and confidential manner. Slater suggests that universities should consult national and local gay and lesbian community centres for assistance in changing their campus climate.

If resources permit, the U of S should seriously consider following Slater's steps for reducing heterosexism within a campus community. If a commitment of that nature is

not feasible, at a minimum, the recommendations for education and service evaluation must be followed.

It is equally important that the support needs of the U of S gay community are met as the needs of other minority groups with special needs. It is critical that an evaluation of support service gay-sensitivity be conducted before the services advertise themselves as being so, in order to guard against possible secondary victimization.

Ultimately, it is important that action be taken to ameliorate the problem of anti-gay attitudes and behaviors at the U of S, because *any* occurrence of anti-gay victimization is unacceptable and harmful.

Prejudice is not only learned but it also serves many purposes. Homophobia-like racism, sexism, anti-Semitism, etc.-- is a form of prejudice. It may be deliberate and blatant or unconscious and unintentional. It is harmful not only to those who are victims of it, but also to those who hold it (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1988, p. 267).

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Aronson, E. (1992). Causes of prejudice. In Baird, R.M., & Rosenbaum, S.E. (Eds.), Bigotry, prejudice, and hatred: Definitions, causes, & solutions (pp. 111-124). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Atkinson, D.R., & Hackett, G. (1988). Counselling non-ethnic American minorities (pp. 73-114). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Baron, R.A., & Byrne, D. (1991). Social psychology: Understanding human interaction (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berger, R.M. (1992). Passing and social support among gay men. Journal of Homosexuality, 23(3), 85-97.
- Berger, R.M., & Mallon, D. (1993). Social support networks of gay men. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 20(1), 155-174.
- Berk, R.A. (1990). Thinking about hate-motivated crimes. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5(3), 334-349.
- Berrill, K.T. (1990). Anti-gay violence and victimization in the United States: An overview. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (3), 274-294.
- Berrill, K.T., & Herek, G.M. (1990). Primary and secondary victimization in Anti-gay hate crimes: Official response and public policy. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (3), 401-413.

Bersoff, D.N., & Ogden, D.W. (1991). APA amicus curiae briefs: Furthering lesbian and gay male civil rights. American Psychologist, 46(9), 950-956.

Blaney, N.T., Goodkin, K., Morgan, R.O., Feaster, D., Millon, C., Szapocznik, J., & Eisdorfer, C. (1991). A stress-moderator model of distress in early HIV-1 infection: Concurrent analysis of life events, hardiness, and social support. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 35(2), 297-305.

Blumenfeld, W.J., & Raymond, D. (1988). Looking at gay and lesbian life. New York: Philosophical Library.

Bodenhausen G.V. (1993). Emotions, arousal, and stereotyping judgements: A heuristic model of affect and stereotyping. In Mackie, D.M., & Hamilton, D.L. (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception (pp. 13-38). New York: Academic Press.

Carpenter, K.M., & Hittner, J.B. (1995). Dimensional characteristics of the SCL-90-R: Evaluation of gender differences in dually diagnosed inpatients. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 51(3), 383-390.

Comstock, G.D. (1989). Victims of anti-gay/lesbian violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4 (1), 101-106.

Comstock, G.D. (1991). Violence against lesbians and gay men. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cranston, K. (1991). HIV education for gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth: Personal risk, personal power, and the community conscience. Journal of Homosexuality, 22(3-4), 247-259.

D'Augelli, A. (1989). Homophobia in a university community: Views of prospective resident assistants. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 546-552.

D'Augelli, A. (1992). Lesbian and gay male undergraduates' experiences of harassment and fear on campus. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7 (3), 383-395.

D'Augelli, A. (1993). Preventing mental health problems among lesbian and gay college students. The Journal of Primary Prevention, 13 (4), 245-261.

Derogatis, L.R., (1983). SCL-90-R manual II, clinical psychometric research, Towson, Md: NCS Assessments.

Dorsey Green, G. (1987). Lesbian mothers: Mental health considerations. In Bozett, F.W. (Ed.), Gay and lesbian parents (pp. 188-198). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Dressler, J. (1992). Judicial homophobia: Gay rights biggest roadblock. In Dynes, W. R., & Donaldson, S. (Eds.), Homosexuality: Discrimination, criminology, and the law (pp. 79-88). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Ehrlich, H. J. (1990). The ecology of anti-gay violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (3), 359-365.

Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In Mackie, D.M., & Hamilton, D.L. (Eds.) Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception (pp.137-166). New York: Academic Press.

Falk, P.J. (1989). Lesbian mothers: Psychosocial assumptions in family law. American Psychologist, 44(6), 941-947.

Fischer, D.G., & Fick, C. (1993). Measuring social desirability: Short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, *53*, 417-424.

Garnets, L., Herek, G.M., & Levy, B. (1990). Violence and victimization of lesbians and gay men: Mental health consequences. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, *5* (3), 366-383.

Gonsiorek, J.C. (1993). Mental health issues of gay and lesbian adolescents. In Garnets, L.D., & Kimmel, D.C. (Eds.) Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences (pp. 469-485). New York: Columbia University Press.

Greene-Cerio, N. (1989). Counselling victims and perpetrators of campus violence. In Sherrill, J.N., & Siegel, D.G. (Eds.), Responding to violence on campus: New directions for student services, no. 47, (pp.53-63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hafkenscheid, A. (1993). Psychometric evaluation of the Symptom Checklist (SCL-90) in psychiatric inpatients. Personality and Individual Differences, *14*(6), 751-756.

Hammelman, T.L. (1993). Gay and lesbian youth: Contributing factors to serious attempts or considerations of suicide. Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy, *2* (1), 77-89.

Harry, J. (1990). Conceptualizing anti-gay violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, *5* (3), 350-358.

Herek, G.M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. The Journal of Sex Research, *25*(4), 451-477.

Herek, G.M. (1990). The context of anti-gay violence: Notes on cultural and psychological heterosexism. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (3), 316-333.

Herek, G.M. (1991). Stigma, prejudice, and violence against lesbians and gay men. In Gonsiorek, J.C., & Weinrich, J.D. (Eds.), Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy (pp. 60-80). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Herek, G.M. (1993a). Documenting prejudice against lesbians and gay men on campus: The Yale sexual orientation survey. Journal of Homosexuality, 25 (4), 15-30.

Herek, G.M. (1993b). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychological consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. In Garnets, L.D., & Kimmel, D.C. (Eds.), Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences (pp. 316-330). New York: Columbia University Press.

Hershberger, S.L., & D'Augelli, A.R. (1995). The impact of victimization on the mental health and suicidality of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths. Developmental Psychology, 31(1), 65-74.

Hetrick, E.S., & Martin, A.D. (1987). Developmental issues and their resolution for gay and lesbian adolescents. Journal of Homosexuality, 14, 25-43.

Hunter, J. (1990). Violence against lesbian and gay male youths. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (3), 295-300.

Isay, R.A. (1989). Being homosexual: Gay men and their development. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.

Keller, J. (1997, January 16). Speaking with your real voice. The Sheaf, p. 10.

Kitzinger, C. (1991). Lesbians and gay men in the workplace: Psychosocial issues. In Davidson, M.J., & Earnshaw, J. (Eds.), Vulnerable workers: Psychosocial and legal issues (pp. 223-240). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Levy, E.F. (1992). Strengthening the coping resources of lesbian families. The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 73(1), 23-31.

Long, G.T., & Sultan, F.E. (1987). Contributions from social psychology. In Diamant, L. (Ed.), Male and female homosexuality: Psychological perspectives (pp.221-236). New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

Lott-Whitehead, L., & Tully, C.T. (1993). The family lives of lesbian mothers. Smith College Studies in Social Work, 63(3), 265-280.

Martin, A.D. (1982). Learning to hide: The socialization of the gay adolescent. Adolescent Psychiatry, 10, 52-65.

Martin, A.D., & Hetrick, E.S. (1988). The stigmatization of the gay and lesbian adolescent. Journal of Homosexuality, 15, 163-183.

McDonald, G.W. (1997, January 16). Homosexuality is not part of lifestyle. The Sheaf, p. 7.

Meadon, D.R. (1997, January 16). Special rights not special. The Sheaf, p. 6.

Melton, G.B. (1989). Public policy and private prejudice: Psychology and law on gay rights. American Psychologist, 44(6), 933-940.

Meyer, J. (1989). Guess who's coming to dinner this time? A study of gay intimate relationships and the support for those relationships. Marriage and Family Review, 14(3-4), 59-82.

Mohr, R.D. (1989). Gay basics: Some questions, facts, and values. In Baird, R.M., & Rosenbaum, S.E. (Eds.), Bigotry, prejudice, and hatred: Definitions, causes, & solutions (pp. 167-182). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Morrow, D.F. (1993). Social work with gay and lesbian adolescents. Social Work, 38(6), 655-660.

Nardi, P.M., & Bolton, R. (1991). Gay-bashing: Violence and aggression against gay men and lesbians. In Baenninger, R. (Ed.), Targets of violence and aggression (pp. 349-400). New York: North-Holland.

Nicholson, W.D., & Long, B.C. (1990). Self-esteem, social support, internalized homophobia, and coping strategies of HIV+ gay men. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58(6), 873-876.

Noh, S., & Avison, W.R. (1992). Assessing psychopathology in Korean immigrants: Some preliminary results on the SCL-90. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 37, 640-645.

Norris, W.P. (1991). Liberal attitudes and homophobic acts: The paradoxes of homosexual experience in a liberal institution. Journal of Homosexuality, 22(3-4), 81-120.

Paul, J.P., Stall, R., & Bloomfield, K.A. (1991). Gay and alcoholic: Epidemiologic and clinical issues. Alcohol Health and Research World, 15(2), 151-160.

Poverny, L.M., & Finch, W.A. (1989). Integrating work-related issues on gay and lesbian employees into occupational social work practice. Employee Assistance Quarterly, 4(2), 15-29.

- Proctor, C.D. & Groze, V.K. (1994). Risk factors for suicide among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youths. Social Work, 39(5), 504 - 513.
- Qualls, R.C., Cox, M.B., & Schehr, T.L. (1992). Racial attitudes on campus: Are there gender differences? Journal of College Student Development, 33, 524-529.
- Rayside, D., & Bowler, S. (1988). Research note: Public opinion and gay rights. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 25(4), 649-660.
- Rivera, R.R. (1987). Legal issues in gay and lesbian parenting. In Bozett, F.W. (Ed.), Gay and lesbian parents (pp. 199-227). New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Robinson, K.E. (1994). Addressing the needs of gay and lesbian students: The school counsellor's role. The School Counsellor, 41, 326-332.
- Ross-Reynolds, G. (1988). Intervention with the homosexual adolescent. In: Sandaval, J. (Ed) (1988). Crisis counseling, intervention, and prevention in the schools. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Russell, P.A., & Gray, C.D. (1992). Prejudice against a progay man in an everyday situation: A scenario study. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22(21), 1676-1687.
- Shannon, J.W., & Woods, W.J. (1991). Affirmative psychotherapy for gay men. The Counselling Psychologist, 19 (2), 197-215.
- Shively, M.G., & De Cecco, J.P. (1993) Components of sexual identity. In Garnets, L.D., & Kimmel, D.C. (Eds.), Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences (pp. 80-88). New York: Columbia University Press.

- Slater, B.R. (1993). Violence against lesbian and gay male college students. Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 8(1/2), 177-202.
- Snyder, M., & Miene, P. (1994). On the functions of stereotypes and prejudice. In Zanna, M.P., & Olsen, J.M. (Eds.) The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium volume 7 (pp. 33-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Troiden, R.R. (1989). The formation of homosexual identities. Journal of Homosexuality, 17(1/2), 43-73.
- Townsend, M.H., Wallick, M.M., & Cambre, K.M. (1991). Support services for homosexual students at U.S. medical schools. Academic Medicine, 66(6), 361-363.
- Vincke, J., & Bolton, R. (1994). Social support, depression, and self-acceptance among gay men. Human Relations, 47(9), 1049-1062.
- Wertheimer, D.M. (1990). Treatment and service interventions for lesbian and gay male crime victims. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (3), 384-400.

Appendix A

Survey of Discrimination, Harassment, and Violence at the University of Saskatchewan (U of S)

This survey consists of four sections. Section I contains questions about disclosing your sexual orientation and incidents of discrimination, harassment or violence related to the U of S community. Section II asks you to indicate mental and physical health consequences of your most traumatic victimization experience. Section III asks about U of S support services and their effectiveness in dealing with anti-gay incidents. Section IV asks you to provide descriptive information about yourself. Please do not put your name or any personal identifying information on the survey to maintain your anonymity.

Note: The term “anti-gay” incident is meant to be an inclusive term referring to negative incidents directed at lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals.

Section I: The following questions ask you to report about disclosing your sexual orientation, and about incidents of discrimination, harassment, or violence at the U of S. Please circle the number of the appropriate response alternative for each question or respond in the space(s) provided.

The first questions pertain to the general climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at the U of S.

1. How comfortable do you feel disclosing your sexual orientation to the majority of the people around you at the U of S?

Very uncomfortable	Somewhat uncomfortable	Neither uncomfortable nor comfortable	Somewhat comfortable	Very comfortable
1	2	3	4	5

2. How important is it that you disclose your sexual orientation to the people around you?

Very unimportant	Somewhat unimportant	Neither unimportant nor important	Somewhat important	Very important
1	2	3	4	5

3. Has the possibility of a negative reaction at the U of S, ever led you to hide your sexual orientation from:

	Yes	No	Not applicable
a) A roommate?	1	2	3
b) An undergraduate student?	1	2	3
c) A graduate/professional student?	1	2	3
d) A member of the University staff?	1	2	3
e) A faculty member?	1	2	3
f) A University administrator?	1	2	3
g) Registrar's Office Personnel?	1	2	3
h) A health-care provider at RUH or Student Health?	1	2	3
i) Your college dean?	1	2	3
j) A University Counsellor?	1	2	3
k) Your department head/chair?	1	2	3
l) Your supervisor at a University job?	1	2	3
m) Campus security?	1	2	3
n) Other: _____ (Please Specify)			

4. How often have you feared for your safety at the U of S because of the threat of anti-gay violence?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always
1	2	3	4	5

5. How often have you heard other members of the U of S community (e.g., students, faculty, staff persons, etc.) make belittling/demeaning remarks about bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always
1	2	3	4	5

6. How often have you seen anti-gay graffiti at the U of S?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always
1	2	3	4	5

7. How many other members of the U of S community do you know personally who have been harassed, threatened with violence, or physically attacked at the U of S because they were known/assumed to be lesbian/gay/bisexual?

None	One	Two or Three	More than three
1	2	3	4

8. Have you modified your behavior at the U of S in any way because of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence? (e.g., avoided certain locations, stopped walking with others who are gay/lesbian/bisexual, etc.)

Yes	No
1 (go to 8a.)	2 (go to 9)

8a. If "Yes", how have you changed your behavior?

9. In your opinion, what are the chances that an average bisexual, lesbian, or gay man at the U of S will be the target of discrimination, unfair treatment, anti-gay harassment, threats of violence, or physical attack?

Very unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Neither unlikely nor likely	Somewhat likely	Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

An anti-gay experience is defined as any occurrence of a verbal insult or threat, damage or destruction of personal property, having objects thrown at you, being chased or followed, being spat upon, being punched, hit, kicked, or beaten, being assaulted or wounded with a weapon, being sexually harassed or assaulted, and being treated unfairly or being discriminated against due to one's actual or perceived sexual orientation.

If you have never had an anti-gay experience, as defined above, please skip to question 23, in Section III, located on page 13.

The following questions pertain to describing specific anti-gay experiences that you may have had.

10. Please indicate which of the following individuals **have actually treated you unfairly or harassed you** at the U of S because of your sexual orientation:

	Yes	No	N/A or Don't Know
a) A roommate?	1	2	3
b) An undergraduate student?	1	2	3
c) A graduate/professional student?	1	2	3
d) A member of the University staff?	1	2	3
e) A faculty member?	1	2	3
f) A University administrator?	1	2	3
g) Registrar's Office Personnel?	1	2	3
h) A health-care provider at RUH or Student Health?	1	2	3
i) Your college dean?	1	2	3
j) A University Counsellor?	1	2	3
k) Your department head/chair?	1	2	3

	Yes	No	N/A or Don't Know
l) Your supervisor at a University job?	1	2	3
m) Campus security?	1	2	3
n) Other: _____ (Please Specify)	1	2	3

11. How often have you experienced the following at the U of S because someone knew or assumed you to be a bisexual, a lesbian, or gay man?

	Never	Once	Twice or more
a) Had verbal insults directed at you?	0	1	2
b) Been threatened with physical violence?	0	1	2
c) Had your personal property damaged or destroyed?	0	1	2
d) Had objects thrown at you?	0	1	2
e) Been chased or followed?	0	1	2
f) Been spat upon?	0	1	2
g) Been punched, hit, kicked, or beaten?	0	1	2
h) Been assaulted or wounded with a weapon?	0	1	2
i) Been sexually harassed or assaulted?	0	1	2

12. For each incident(s) of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence, related to the U of S community, that you have experienced, please indicate the number of perpetrators, the gender of the perpetrators, and whether you were alone or with others at the time of the incident.

	# of perpetrators: (circle one)				gender of perpetrators: (circle one)			you were: (circle one)		
	1	2	3	4+	M	F	M & F	alone	with 1 other	with 2+ others
Incident 1										
Incident 2										
Incident 3										
Incident 4										
Incident 5										

The following questions pertain to your most **recent** anti-gay experience.

13. What was the most recent anti-gay incident that you experienced? (verbal attack, physical violence, discrimination, etc.)

14. When did the most recent anti-gay incident that you experienced occur?

_____ (month/year)

14a. Where did the most recent event occur?

14b. Was this event related to the U of S community (e.g. occurred on the U of S campus, occurred at a University sponsored event, or by a U of S student, etc.)?
(Please circle)

Yes **No**
(If yes, go to 14c.) (If no, go to 15)

14c. If "yes", please indicate how it was related to the U of S:

The following questions pertain to your most **traumatic** anti-gay experience.

15. Was this the same incident as your most recent incident?

Yes **No**
(if yes, go to 18) (if no, go to 16)

16. What was the most traumatic anti-gay incident that you experienced? (e.g., verbal attack, physical violence, discrimination, etc.)?

17. When did the most traumatic anti-gay incident that you experienced occur?

_____ (month/year)

17a. Where did the most traumatic event occur?

17b. Was this event related to the U of S community (e.g. occurred on the U of S campus, occurred at a University sponsored event, or by a U of S student, etc.)?
(Please circle)

Yes **No**
(If yes, go to 17c.) (If no, go to 18)

17c. If "yes", please indicate how it was related to the U of S:

Section II: The following questions ask about mental and physical health consequences that you experienced as a result of an anti-gay experience(s).

Reminder:

An anti-gay experience is defined as **any occurrence of a verbal insult or threat, damage or destruction of personal property, having objects thrown at you, being chased or followed, being spat upon, being punched, hit, kicked, or beaten, being assaulted or wounded with a weapon, being sexually harassed or assaulted, and being treated unfairly or being discriminated against due to one's actual or perceived sexual orientation.**

18. Referring to the incident you described in question 15: please describe how you felt emotionally and mentally because of your most traumatic anti-gay experience.

19. Please describe how you felt physically because of your most traumatic anti-gay experience.

Section III: The following questions ask about support services and their effectiveness in dealing with victims of anti-gay incidents. Please circle the number under the appropriate response alternative or respond in the space(s) provided.

20. If you have been the target of harassment, threats, or violence, based on sexual orientation, that was related to the U of S community, how often have you reported it to an appropriate U of S official (e.g., dean, campus security, police, professor)?

Reported <u>all</u> incidents	Reported <u>some</u> incidents	<u>Never</u> reported an incident	Not Applicable
1 (go to 21)	2 (go to 20a.)	3 (go to 20a.)	4 (go to 21)

20a. What reasons did you have for not reporting an incident(s)?

21. After experiencing an incident of anti-gay discrimination, harassment or violence (related or unrelated to the U of S), to whom or to where did you turn for support in dealing with the incident?

	Yes	No	Not applicable
a) A friend	1	2	3
b) A significant other/partner	1	2	3
c) Family	1	2	3
d) University Chaplains	1	2	3
e) GLUS	1	2	3
f) Student Help Center	1	2	3
g) Student Counselling Services	1	2	3
h) Sexual Harassment Office	1	2	3
i) A faculty member	1	2	3
j) A supervisor	1	2	3

	Yes	No	Not applicable
k) A health-care provider at RUH or student health	1	2	3
l) Campus Security	1	2	3
m) Aboriginal Students' Centre	1	2	3
n) International Student Advisor	1	2	3
o) Services for Students with Disabilities	1	2	3
p) Women's Centre	1	2	3
q) USSU	1	2	3
r) U of S Alumni Association	1	2	3
s) Unclassified Students' Advisor	1	2	3
Others: (Please specify)			
t) _____			
u) _____			
v) _____			

22. For each of the sources that you indicated using in the previous question, please rate how **effective** each source was in helping you deal with an anti-gay incident. If you did not use a support source, please select N/A for Not Applicable.

Circle the **0** if **Not Applicable**

Circle the **1** if **Very Ineffective**

Circle the **2** if **Somewhat Ineffective**

Circle the **3** if **Neither Ineffective nor Effective**

Circle the **4** if **Somewhat Effective**

Circle the **5** if **Very Effective**

	N/A	Very Ineffective	Neither Ineffective nor Effective	3	4	Very Effective
a) A friend	0	1	2	3	4	5
b) A significant other/partner	0	1	2	3	4	5
c) Family	0	1	2	3	4	5
d) Chaplains/Priests	0	1	2	3	4	5
e) GLUS	0	1	2	3	4	5
f) Student Help Center	0	1	2	3	4	5
g) Student Counselling Services	0	1	2	3	4	5
h) Sexual Harassment Office	0	1	2	3	4	5
i) A faculty member	0	1	2	3	4	5
j) A supervisor	0	1	2	3	4	5
k) A health-care provider at RUH	0	1	2	3	4	5
or Student Health	0	1	2	3	4	5
l) Campus Security	0	1	2	3	4	5
m) Aboriginal Students' Centre	0	1	2	3	4	5
n) International Student Advisor	0	1	2	3	4	5
o) Services for Students with Disabilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
p) Women's Centre	0	1	2	3	4	5
q) USSU	0	1	2	3	4	5
r) U of S Alumni Association	0	1	2	3	4	5
s) Unclassified Students' Advisor	0	1	2	3	4	5
Others: (Please specify)						
t) _____	0	1	2	3	4	5
u) _____	0	1	2	3	4	5
v) _____	0	1	2	3	4	5

27. Your age is _____ years.

28. Please indicate (check) those individuals to whom, by your choice, you “came out.” Also indicate how old you were when the individual became aware of your sexual orientation. (If you are not “out” to anyone, please proceed to question 30).

Knows Your Sexual Orientation		Your Age
_____	significant other	_____
_____	sibling	_____
_____	mother	_____
_____	father	_____
_____	homosexual/bisexual friends	_____
_____	heterosexual friends	_____
_____	fellow students	_____
_____	professors	_____
_____	counsellor/therapist	_____
_____	gay community	_____
_____	community at large	_____

29. The person to whom you first “came out” was your _____.
(e.g., mother, father, sister, brother, teacher, counsellor, friend, significant other, employer, etc.)

30. Your University of Saskatchewan status. (Circle one)

- 1 undergraduate
- 2 graduate/professional student
- 3 alumnus
- 4 other _____ (Please specify)

31. If you are currently a student at the U of S, how many years have you been a student at the U of S: (Circle one). (If not a current student, please continue with question 32.)

1 2 3 4 5 6+

32. If you are an alumnus, when did you graduate from the U of S?
_____ (month/year).

If you would like to provide the details of a particular incident of harassment, unfair treatment, discrimination, or violence based on sexual orientation, please use the back of this page.

Some people may like to provide more information. If you would like to be part of a list of people who may be selected to be interviewed in-person about anti-gay experiences, please leave your first name and telephone number below. Please note that not all individuals who leave their name and telephone number will be contacted for an interview.

Number) _____ (Name/Telephone

Thank you for your participation!

Please put the completed questionnaire in the envelope addressed to Shelley Balanko, and return it via campus mail (e.g., through any departmental office or through the Post Office located in Upper Place Riel). **Note: No postage is required when using campus mail.**

Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Appendix B

Thesis Interview Questions

- *1. Please describe the climate at the U of S for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals.
 2. What has your life been like since your most traumatic anti-gay experience at the U of S?
 3. How did this (most traumatic) event make you feel physically?
 4. How did this (most traumatic) event make you feel emotionally?
 5. How have you dealt with the event?
 6. Why did you (didn't you) use the support services available on campus?
 - *7. What kinds of services would you like to use if you need help dealing with anti-gay experiences again, or in the future?
 - *8. If you are not totally out about your sexual orientation on campus, what prevents you from doing so?
 - *9. Comments about the study or interview?
- *Denotes questions asked of those interviewees with no anti-gay experiences.

Appendix C

Information Letter: Survey of Discrimination, Harassment, and Violence at the University of Saskatchewan (U of S)

Dear Participant:

My name is Shelley Balanko, and I am a graduate student in the Department of Psychology working on the Master of Arts degree. My thesis research pertains to anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence. I am interested in the responses of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals who are, or have been, U of S students. If you are a member of this group please consider participating in this study. If you are not a member of this group, I thank you for your interest in the study, but your participation is not required.

The purpose of this study is to document the occurrence of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at the University of Saskatchewan. Additional objectives of the survey are to assess mental and physical health consequences of anti-gay incidents, and ascertain whether U of S support services are effective in responding to the needs of victims. You will be asked questions about your anti-gay experiences (if any) at the U of S, and you will be asked to rate the effectiveness of various U of S support services that you may have utilized following an anti-gay experience. The survey takes approximately 45 minutes to complete. I want to emphasize that participation in this research project is completely voluntary, and you are not obligated to complete the questionnaire, or any portion thereof. Responses to this survey will be completely confidential and anonymous, as no personal identifying information is requested. Please do not put your name or any identifying information on the questionnaire. **A returned completed survey package will be interpreted as informed consent to use the responses as data.**

Your participation in this study will further our understanding of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence, in general, and whether this problem exists at the U of S. Results will have implications for U of S support service development and policy formation.

There are no direct risks associated with participation in this study. However, you may experience negative emotions as you recall victimization experiences. If this happens to you, and you are in need of assistance, please call Student Counselling at 966-4920, or the Gay and Lesbian Health Service (GLHS) at 665-1224.

Please detach this information letter from the survey and keep it for your records. Should you have any questions regarding this study or if you wish to know the outcomes of the study, please contact Shelley Balanko or Dr. Louise Alexitch at 966-5922. The results of the study should be available by February, 1997. Copies of the summary of results will be available at Student Counselling Services, the Women's Centre, and from GLUS.

Please put the completed questionnaire in the envelope addressed to Shelley Balanko, and return it via campus mail (e.g., through any departmental office or at the Post Office located in Upper Place Riel).

Sincerely,

Shelley L. Balanko

Note: If you have already completed and returned this questionnaire, please do not do so again. Please contact GLUS, the USSU Women's Centre, or Student Counselling Services for survey packages if you know of gay, lesbian, or bisexual individuals from the U of S who may be interested in participating in this study, as well.

Appendix D

Most Distressing Symptoms Identified by the SCL-90-R

1. Worrying too much about things ($n = 7$)
2. Nervousness or shakiness inside ($n = 6$)
3. Feeling that most people cannot be trusted ($n = 5$)

Copyright © 1975 Leonard R. Derogatis Ph.D. All rights reserved. Published and distributed exclusively by National Computer Systems, Inc., P. O. Box 1416, Minneapolis, MN 55440. Reproduced by Permission.

Appendix E

Written Accounts of Victimization Experiences

Participant 1: I wasn't sure if I should fill out your survey as I am too frightened (by what I perceive as the predominant anti-gay feeling) to come out to anyone on this campus. As a result, I have had no direct attacks on me, but an incident of a group of girls laughing about how gross it was to have seen "two dikes kissing" got me in quite a rage - for a mild person it's a surprise to have to control my temper. I decided to do your survey. I've never before felt like being "bi" was a dirty secret -- I wanted to go over to those girls and tell them it must be nice for them to live in a community where they not only are not embarrassed by their intolerant views but also unconcerned with the feelings of those who might be walking by. And then today a colleague told me that homosexuality is unnatural and wrong. Not being "out" is stressful. Thanks for "Listening."

Participant 2: In my first survey I filled out, I had just come out and had not experienced discrimination and harassment because I'm a Lesbian. Now I feel discriminated against by the Sheaf because they chose to print homophobic literature that I feel called me a pedophile and accused me of necrophilia and bestiality. Previous to these articles I thought that educated and open minded people were at the U of S, and I'm scared now that these people are a minority. I thought the city and education would change a small town attitude, but I don't think it has. Now I walk the halls and think which one of you is the guy who wrote those letters telling me I'm inferior to you. I'm expecting to get bashed sometime, when before I had no fear of it. I feel discriminated against when my history TA says, "He was French and a homosexual who died of AIDS, you know those French are all weirdoes." Discriminated again when I heard that the Ag Bag Drag is for couples (male and female) only, or the Ag shirts of cows mating saying proudly heterosexual. That's just stupid and tasteless but I'd get bashed or at least called names if my shirt proclaimed homosexuality. I get dirty looks when I kiss my girlfriend, and when handing out posters for the "Women loving Women" discussion group we get snickers and "humphs" from the macho men in the halls. I'm very disappointed in the close mindedness at the U of S.

Appendix F

Attitude Questionnaire

General Instructions:

Please answer all questions on the answer sheet provided using a **pencil** to blacken the space of the response selected. Please follow the instructions carefully and answer all of the questions. **Please do not write on this questionnaire.**

Part 1: Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements by filling in the appropriate letter on your answer sheet.

	Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree
1. Lesbians just can't fit into our society.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
2. A woman's homosexuality should <i>not</i> be a cause for job discrimination in any situation.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
3. Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
4. State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior should be loosened.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
5. Female homosexuality is a sin.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
6. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
7. Female homosexuality in itself is no problem, but what society makes of it can be a problem.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
8. Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
9. Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
10. Lesbians are sick.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
11. Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
12. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
13. Male homosexuals should <i>not</i> be allowed to teach school.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
14. Male homosexuality is a perversion.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I

	Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
15. Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men.									
16. If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them.									
17. I would <i>not</i> be too upset if I learned that my son were a homosexual.									
18. Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.									
19. The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me.									
20. Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should <i>not</i> be condemned.									

Part 2: Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Please read each item and decide whether the statement is TRUE or FALSE as it pertains to you personally. Remember to fill in your response on the computer answer sheet.

BEGIN WITH ITEM 21 ON YOUR ANSWER SHEET.

TRUE FALSE
A B

21. I like to gossip at times.
22. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
23. I'm always willing to admit when I make a mistake.
24. I always try to practice what I preach.
25. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
26. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
27. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
28. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
29. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
30. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Part 3: The following questions ask you to report about incidents of discrimination, harassment, or violence at the U of S. Please blacken the letter of the appropriate response on your answer sheet for each question.

31. How often have you heard other members of the U of S community (e.g., students, faculty, staff persons, etc.) make belittling/demeaning remarks about bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always
A	B	C	D	E

32. How often have you seen anti-gay graffiti at the U of S?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always
A	B	C	D	E

33. How many other members of the U of S community do you know personally who have been harassed, threatened with violence, or physically attacked at the U of S because they were known/assumed to be lesbian/gay/bisexual?

None	One	Two or Three	More than three
A	B	C	D

34. In your opinion, what are the chances that an average bisexual, lesbian, or gay man at the U of S will be the target of discrimination, unfair treatment, anti-gay harassment, threats of violence, or physical attack?

Very unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Neither unlikely nor likely	Somewhat likely	Very likely
A	B	C	D	E

Part 4: The following questions ask you to provide some demographic information. Please blacken the circle for the appropriate response on your computer answer sheet.

35. Gender:

- A Male B Female

36. Sexual orientation:

- A gay/lesbian
B bisexual
C heterosexual

37. Your age:

- | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---------|
| A | under 18 | F | 22 |
| B | 18 | G | 23 |
| C | 19 | H | 24 |
| D | 20 | I | 25 |
| E | 21 | J | over 25 |

38. Your college is:

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|--------------|
| A | Arts and Sciences | E | Pharmacy |
| B | Education | F | Agriculture |
| C | Commerce | G | Engineering |
| D | Physical Education | H | Unclassified |

39. How many years have you been a student at the U of S:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| A | B | C | D | E | F |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6+ |

Thank you for your participation!

**Please put the questionnaire and answer sheet
in the envelope provided (Do not fold).**

Appendix G

Attitude Questionnaire: Information Letter

Dear Participant:

My name is Shelley Balanko, and I am a graduate student in the Department of Psychology working on a Master of Arts degree. My thesis research pertains to anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence at the University of Saskatchewan.

The purpose of this study is to document students' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men to provide an indication of what is it like for lesbians and gay men at the University of Saskatchewan (U of S). You will be asked questions about your attitudes and whether you have witnessed any anti-gay discrimination, harassment, or violence at the U of S. The questionnaire takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. I want to emphasize that participation in this research project is completely **voluntary**, and you are not obligated to complete the questionnaire, or any portion thereof. Responses to this survey will be completely **confidential and anonymous**, as no personal identifying information is requested. There are no direct risks associated with participation in this study. Please do not put your name or any identifying information on the questionnaire. **A returned completed questionnaire will be interpreted as informed consent to use the responses as data.**

Your participation in this study will further our understanding of anti-gay discrimination, harassment, and violence, in general, and whether this problem exists at the U of S. Results will have implications for U of S support service development and policy formation.

Please detach this information letter from the questionnaire and keep it for your records. Should you have any questions regarding this study or if you wish to know the outcomes of the study, please contact Shelley Balanko or Dr. Louise Alexitch at 966-5922. The results of the study should be available by April, 1997. To obtain copies of the summary of results, please call Dr. Louise Alexitch at 966-5922.

Please put the questionnaire and answer sheet in the envelope provided and return it to me at the end of this testing session. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Shelley L. Balanko