

LOVE & JUSTICE
COMMUNITY UNITED AGAINST VIOLENCE (CUAV)

**2005-06 YOUTH HATE VIOLENCE
SURVEY FINDINGS**

AUGUST 2006

RESEARCH CONDUCTED BY:
Community United Against Violence

ANALYSIS & REPORT PREPARED BY:
Rachel Lanzerotti Consulting

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Overview & Methods	1
II.	Youth Characteristics	3
III.	Coming Out and Community Issues	5
IV.	Prevalence of Hate Violence	7
V.	Seeking Help for Hate Violence	10
VI.	Summary & Conclusions	13
VII.	Hate Violence Survey Instrument	14

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Mario Balcita, Tamiko Wilson, Tamara C'osta, Daniel Thompson, Pablo Espinoza, Tina D'Elia, and Jennifer Rakowski.

We also would like to give thanks to everyone who recognized the need for this survey, the information it contains, and broader awareness about LGBTQ relationship violence and hate violence. We appreciate your help in distributing the survey and its results.

Thank you to the Department of Health Services for providing funding for this project.

Report Distribution

While CUAV wants this information to be broadly distributed and used by the community, it is always helpful to return to the source for follow up and technical assistance. Whenever this report or sections of it are used, please contact Community United Against Violence and the Love & Justice Project. Additional copies of the report may be obtained by request.

2005-06 Youth Hate Violence Survey Findings, Love & Justice Project of Community United Against Violence (CUAV), August 2006.

I. OVERVIEW & METHODS

In 2005, the CUAV Love & Justice Project designed and conducted two surveys: one focused on relationship violence and the other focused on hate violence experienced by LGBTQ young people in the San Francisco Bay Area. This dual survey effort sought to revisit and expand the findings of a previous Love & Justice needs assessment, as reported in 2000, "Queer Youth Relationship Violence: A Needs Assessment Report."

CUAV has significantly developed its hate violence programming in the past five years and decided to conduct a survey that would highlight the prevalence of hate violence and help-seeking behavior among young people reached by the Love & Justice Program. This report presents findings from the 2005-06 Hate Violence Survey.

Methods

In collaboration with Rachel Lanzerotti Consulting, CUAV developed a three-page survey instrument that included questions about respondents' characteristics, issues of importance of them, their experiences of hate violence, and help-seeking behaviors. Love & Justice youth organizers reviewed a pilot version of the survey before distribution. The final survey instrument is included in the Appendices to this report.

From September to December 2005, CUAV distributed both relationship violence and hate violence surveys to various venues, including the following organizations and events:

- Avenues to Independence
- California Youth Connection
- CUAV Speakers Bureau
- Guerrero House
- Huckleberry House
- June Jordan High School
- Larkin Street Youth Services
- Lavender Youth Recreation & Information Center
- Love & Justice
- Out Home Youth Advocacy Council
- SMAAC (Sexual Minority Alliance of Alameda County)
- Women's Building
- YES Conference (GSA Network)
- Youth Leadership Institute

Youth organizers and the Love & Justice Coordinator distributed the surveys at these events, as well as via email, and at the CUAV office. They offered each respondent the incentive of a bath and body product, in appreciation for their time and effort for completing the survey.

Ninety-four (94) young people completed the self-administered survey. Love & Justice staff estimate that about 250 hate violence surveys were distributed, which would suggest a response rate of approximately 38%.

We entered survey data into a database in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Data were cleaned and recoded as necessary for analysis. We ran frequencies of response to each item, multivariate analysis as indicated, and analyzed open-ended responses for thematic content.

Limitations & Strengths

Hate violence survey respondents do not represent a random sample. Rather, they are youth within the reach of CUAV and other community based organizations. Therefore they may represent youth who already are connected to community support, and findings about their experiences may not be generalized to those of other Bay Area youth.

The survey instrument was developed and tested with youth organizers at CUAV. Youth organizers also distributed the survey during their outreach efforts, potentially reaching respondents who otherwise might be reluctant to complete a survey about their experiences with hate violence.

The hate violence survey was developed and distributed at the same time as the Love & Justice survey focused on relationship violence, and many respondents completed both surveys. Some confusion about the similarities and differences between the two surveys may have impacted respondents' answers and therefore biased the findings. The original project design called for one survey instrument, but program staff preferred two shorter surveys to a single, longer one. A lesson learned for the future is to combine the surveys or stagger their distribution timing and venues so as to eliminate confusion and "survey burn-out."

A largely quantitative survey cannot fully capture the depth and texture of respondents' experiences. Complementary qualitative methods, such as focus groups or case studies, are recommended for the future, in order to round out the findings presented in this report.

II. YOUTH CHARACTERISTICS

The 2005-06 survey respondents reflect a diversity and complexity of identities. The survey design itself mirrored this complexity in presenting multiple response options for characteristics such as ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation.

- The age range for respondents was 14 to 25 years old, with an average age of 20 years. One-quarter (25%) are under eighteen.
- Slightly less than thirty-percent (28%) of respondents selected multiple options for their racial or ethnic background, including multi-racial. Over one-third (35%) is African American/Black, just under one-third (31%) is Caucasian/White, and just over one-quarter (27%) is Latino/a.
- Respondents were asked to describe their gender and sexual identities, and they were offered the opportunity to select as many response options as they chose. Over half (53%) of respondents are female, while over one-third (36%) is male. Four percent (4%) are FTM and three percent (3%) are MTF. Four percent of respondents selected alternate response options to describe their gender identity, including genderqueer and “other”.
- Thirty percent (30%) of respondents are bisexual. Almost one-fifth of respondents are gay (19%), lesbian (19%), and/or heterosexual (19%). Seventeen percent (17%) of respondents are queer.
- Over thirty percent of respondents (31%), have completed high school or a GED. Thirty-four percent (34%) have completed some high school, and another thirty-four percent (34%) have completed some college or are college graduates. These are the current grade levels completed and not necessarily terminal grade levels.
- Survey respondents live in many different cities around the Bay Area, representing 37 zip codes. Sixty-six percent (66%) reside in San Francisco, and 4% reside in Oakland.
- Forty-eight percent (48%) of respondents currently are living with family. Fifteen percent (15%) are living with friends, and eleven percent (11%) of respondents live alone. Seven percent (7%) live with a partner.

Table 1 below presents a summary of the characteristics of respondents to the 2005-06 survey.

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents

Age (n=94)	Average = 20 years Range = 14 to 25 years	
Gender Identification * (n=93)	Female	53%
	Male	36%
	FTM	4%
	MTF	3%
	Genderqueer	2%
	Transgender	1%
	Transsexual	1%
	Questioning	0%
	Intersex	0%
	Other	3%
Racial/Ethnic Background * (n=94)	African American/Black	35%
	Caucasian/White	31%
	Multi-Racial	28%
	Latino/a	27%
	Asian	15%
	American Indian/Native American	10%
	African/Afro-Caribbean	4%
	Pacific Islander	3%
	Arab/Middle Eastern	2%
	Other	4%
Sexual Identification * (n=94)	Bisexual	30%
	Gay	19%
	Lesbian	19%
	Heterosexual	19%
	Queer	17%
	Questioning	9%
	On the DL	5%
	Pansexual	3%
Other	1%	
Education (n=87)	8 th grade	2%
	9 th grade	8%
	10 th grade	8%
	11 th grade	16%
	12 grade, high school or GED	31%
	Some college	17%
	College graduate	17%
Living Situation (n=94)	Family	48%
	Friends	15%
	Alone	11%
	Partner	7%
	Homeless	3%
	Shelter	3%
	Foster care	2%
	Other (primarily transitional housing)	11%

* Because respondents could select multiple response options, percentages add up to greater than 100%.

III. COMING OUT & COMMUNITY ISSUES

In the 2005-06 survey, Love & Justice asked respondents, “How ‘out’ do you consider yourself,” with regards to both sexual identity and gender identity. The addition of gender identity in 2005-06 was a new feature of the survey, reflecting changes in the past five years in the articulation of gender diversity and, in particular, transgender visibility and activism. Table 2 below summarizes responses to a variety of statements about coming out.

Table 2: “How ‘out’ do you consider yourself?”

(n=86)

How ‘out’ do you consider yourself?	Sexual Identity	Gender Identity
No one knows	5%	1%
I’m still figuring things out	30%	24%
I’ve told my family	37%	16%
I’ve told my friends	30%	14%
I’m out at my workplace	22%	9%
I’m out at school	19%	8%
Everyone knows	28%	23%
I’m an out and proud activist!	30%	21%

* Because respondents could select multiple response options, percentages add up to greater than 100%.

- Thirty percent (30%) of respondents said, “I’m an out and proud activist!” about sexual identity.
- Twenty-eight percent (28%) of respondents said, “everyone knows” about their sexual identity.
- Thirty-seven percent (37%) have told family, while thirty percent (30%) have told friends (30%) about their sexual identity. About one-fifth are out at work (22%) or out at school (19%).
- Thirty percent (30%) said “I’m still figuring things out” about sexual identity, and five percent (5%) said, “no one knows.”

New in the 2005-06 survey is the inclusion of questions about how “out” respondents consider themselves about gender identity.

- Over one-fifth (21%) of respondents said, “I’m an out and proud activist!” about gender identity.
- Twenty-three percent (23%) of respondents said, “everyone knows” about their gender identity.
- About one-quarter (24%) said, “I’m still figuring things out,” about gender identity.

Community Issues

From a list of ten issues, we asked respondents to rank the community issues of greatest importance to them. Table 3 below shows the ranking, with **community safety** (49%), **community space and resources** (37%), and **HIV/STIs** (35%) at the top of the list of concerns, with **family issues** (34%) in a close fourth place.

Table 3: Issues of Most Importance
(n=94)

Community Issue	%
Community safety	49%
Community space/resources	37%
HIV/STIs	35%
Family issues	34%
Drug and alcohol use/abuse	29%
Racism	25%
Homelessness	18%
School issues	15%
Religion	10%
Police abuse	5%
Other	4%

Respondents who wrote in other issues listed “gay rights” and “environment.” We explored whether there was a relationship between respondents’ gender and sexual identity and the community issues they selected as priorities. No clear patterns emerged from this analysis, suggesting that prioritization of community issues does not differ by youths’ gender and sexual identity.

IV. PREVALENCE OF HATE VIOLENCE

The 2005-06 survey asked queer youth about their experiences of hate violence with the question: “In the past two years, have you witnessed or experienced homophobia, biphobia, transphobia or other forms of prejudice in any of the following ways,” and by listing specific violent behaviors that respondents may have experienced and/or witnessed. The survey also included opt-out response options to questions about hate violence and help-seeking behaviors, i.e. “I have not witnessed or experienced hate violence.”

Tables 4 and 5 below summarize responses to questions about whether respondents have seen and/or been the target of specific behaviors.

- Overall, almost two-thirds (64%) of respondents report that they have seen at least one form of hate violence.
- Half (50%) of respondents report that they have been the target of at least one form of hate violence.
- Forty-three percent (43%) report that they have both seen and been the target of hate violence.

Table 4 shows proportions of respondents who report witnessing violent behaviors motivated by prejudice.

**Table 4:
“Have You Seen This”
Types of Hate Violence Witnessed in the Past Two Years**

Have you seen this? (n=90)	%	#
Name calling or put-downs	46%	41
Throwing objects	38%	34
Yelling/shouting	38%	34
Pushing and/or shoving	33%	30
Kicking and/or hitting with an object	27%	24
Threatening to harm someone or their loved ones	22%	20
Destroying someone’s belongings	19%	17
Contacting or following someone when they don’t want to be	18%	16
Coercing someone to have sex	14%	13

- In the past two years, forty-six percent (46%) have witnessed name calling or put-downs motivated by homophobia, biphobia, transphobia, or other forms of prejudice.
- Almost forty percent (38%) witnessed throwing objects and another almost forty percent (38%) have seen yelling and/or shouting motivated by prejudice.
- One-third (33%) have seen pushing and/or shoving motivated by prejudice.

Table 5 shows proportions of respondents who report being the target of violent behaviors motivated by prejudice, in the past two years.

**Table 5:
“Have You Been the Target of This”
Hate Violence Experienced in the Past Two Years**

Have you been the target of this? (n=90)	%	#
Name calling or put-downs	33%	30
Yelling/shouting	24%	22
Throwing objects	14%	13
Pushing and/or shoving	13%	12
Kicking and/or hitting with an object	12%	11
Contacting or following someone when they don't want to be	11%	10
Threatening to harm someone or their loved ones (n=104)	9%	8
Destroying someone's belongings	8%	7
Coercing someone to have sex	8%	7

- One-third (33%) of respondents report that they have been the target of name-calling or put-downs motivated by homophobia, biphobia, transphobia, or other forms of prejudice in the past two years.

Analysis didn't yield significant findings related to the types of hate violence experienced and gender or sexual identity.

Table 6 presents the locations where those respondents who have experienced or witnessed hate violence did so:

**Table 6:
Where have you experienced or witnessed hate violence?
(n=68)**

Location	%
Street or public area	68%
School or college	52%
Public transportation	46%
Private home or apartment	43%
Store, restaurant or business	35%
Service provider or program	16%
Police or jail	15%
GLBT event	12%
Other place	4%

* Because respondents could select multiple response options, percentages add up to greater than 100%.

- Respondents are most likely to have experienced or witnessed hate violence in a street or public area (68%), school or college (52%), public transportation (46%), or private home or apartment (43%).

The 2005-06 survey also asked respondents to report consequences for their well-being as a result of hate violence. Table 7 summarizes the findings below.

Table 7:
Consequences of Experiencing Hate Violence
(n=53)

Consequence	%
Trouble sleeping	45%
<i>A stronger commitment to improve my community</i>	42%
<i>A stronger commitment to my own personal safety</i>	38%
Drug use/abuse	32%
Drop in grades	28%
<i>A stronger commitment to LGBTQQ rights</i>	28%
Trouble making friends	26%
Thoughts of suicide	23%
Alcohol use/abuse	21%
A perception that the world is out to get me	13%
Trouble with the law	6%
Other	9%

- Forty-five percent (45%) of respondents who have experienced hate violence have experienced trouble sleeping as a result. Just under one-third (32%) have experienced drug use/abuse. Twenty-eight percent (28%) have experienced a drop in grades.
- Almost one-quarter (23%) have had thoughts of suicide as a result of experiencing hate violence.
- “Other” experiences listed by respondents include “negative self thoughts,” “problems with anger management,” and “trying to please my partner.”
- Forty-two percent (42%) of respondents have experienced a stronger commitment to improve their community, as a result of hate violence. Thirty-eight percent (38%) have experienced a stronger commitment to their own personal safety, and just below thirty percent (28%) have experienced a stronger commitment to LGBTQQ rights. (n=53)

V. SEEKING HELP FOR HATE VIOLENCE

The 2005-06 Love & Justice Hate Violence Survey asked respondents about where they looked for help regarding hate violence and asked them to assess the helpfulness of these potential sources of support. Respondents may have looked for help from various sources at different times in their lives or regarding different incidents.

Table 8 presents responses to the question, “Where did you go for help regarding hate violence?” among those who sought help.

**Table 8:
Sources of Help Sought
Regarding Hate Violence**

Source of Help	%
Friends (n=63)	76%
Family (n=62)	47%
Queer Youth (n=60)	27%
Youth Agency (n=60)	25%
Therapist (n=60)	22%
LGBT Hate Violence Program (n=61)	20%
Police (n=60)	20%
Teacher/School Counselor (n=61)	20%
Religious Advisor (n=60)	17%
Talk line/Hotline (n=60)	15%
Medical Provider (n=60)	12%

- The greatest proportions of respondents have sought help regarding hate violence from friends (75%) and family (47%).
- Over one-quarter (27%) looked to other queer youth for help, and other quarter (25%) sought help from a youth agency.
- About one third (33%) said that they did not seek help from anybody.



We asked respondents who sought help regarding hate violence to rate the helpfulness of the response they received. On a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 = made things worse and 4 = extremely helpful, Table 9 presents their mean (or average) helpfulness scores.

**Table 9:
How helpful was the response?**

Where did you go for help?	Mean (1-4)
Friends (n=47)	3.3
Queer Youth (n=16)	3.2
LGBT Hate Violence Program (n=12)	3.2
Youth Agency (n=15)	3.1
Family (n=28)	3.0
Teacher/School Counselor (n=12)	3.0
Talk line/Hotline (n=9)	2.7
Therapist (n=13)	2.5
Medical Provider (n=6)	2.5
Religious Advisor (n=10)	2.1
Police (n=12)	2.0

Police (n=12)

“More helpful”

“Less helpful”

- About one-fifth (20%) of respondents who sought help reported that they went to an LGBT hate violence program for help regarding hate violence. Among those who rated its helpfulness, respondents described LGBT hate violence program support as “somewhat helpful,” (mean = 3.2, n=12)
- It is notable that respondents were more likely to have sought help from police than from a religious advisor, talk line/hotline, or medical provider. However, respondents rated police with a mean score of 2.0 = “not helpful.”
- The three sources of support rated as “not helpful” include: religious advisor, nobody, and police.

The greatest numbers of people looked for help from friends and family, and they generally found these sources to be more helpful than not.

As another measure of helpfulness of sources of support, the survey asked respondents where they would go in the future for help regarding hate violence. Table 10 presents a comparison those who sought help in the past with all respondents.

**Table 10:
Sources of Future Help
Among Respondents Who Sought Past Help and Among All Respondents**

If you needed help in the future regarding hate violence, would you go to...	Those who sought past help from this source	All respondents (n=92)
Friends	88% (n=48)	77%
Family	69% (n=29)	63%
LGBT Hate Violence Program	58% (n=12)	50%
Queer Youth	56% (n=16)	23%
Therapist	54% (n=13)	22%
Teacher/School Counselor	42% (n=12)	11%
Talk line/Hotline	44% (n=9)	13%
Youth Agency	40% (n=15)	15%
Religious Advisor	30% (n=10)	8%
Nobody	26% (n=19)	9%
Battered Women's Service	25% (n=4)	21%
Medical Provider	14% (n=7)	6%
Police	8% (n=12)	26%

A smaller proportion of those who previously sought help from police (8%) said they would seek help from police in the future, as compared to all respondents (26%) who said they would do so. For every other source of help, greater proportions of respondents who sought previous help said that they would seek help from that source again in the future, as compared to all respondents.

- Among those who sought help from friends in the past regarding hate violence, eighty-eight percent (88%) would do so again in the future. (n=48)
- Among those who sought help from family in the past regarding hate violence, almost seventy percent (69%) would do so again in the future. (n=29)
- Among those who sought help from a LGBT hate violence program in the past, fifty-eight percent (58%) would do so again in the future. (n=12)
- Among those who sought help from nobody in the past, just over one-quarter (26%) would do so again in the future. (n=19)
- Only eight percent (8%) of those who sought help from police in the past would do so again in the future. (n=12)

No significant patterns were found when we conducted further analysis to determine if youths' help-seeking behavior was correlated with their gender and sexual identities.

VI. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

The 2005-06 Hate Violence Survey recorded the characteristics and experiences of Bay Area young people who are reached by CUAV's Love & Justice program. The survey findings focus on their experiences of hate violence, where they go for help regarding hate violence, and what issues are most important to them.

The survey describes a vibrant, and complex community of youth. Multi-racial identities, bisexual/queer identities, and gender fluidity must be represented in all staffing, materials, and messages intended to reach this community.

The young people who responded to the survey, who are all under age 25, reported both witnessing and experiencing many types of hate violence. Almost two-thirds of the young people surveyed report that they have witnessed at least one form of hate violence. Half of the respondents report that they themselves have been targeted by hate violence. Along with a high rate of street violence, youth are experiencing high rates of violence in places of assumed safety, such as schools, homes, and with service providers.

Since LGBTQ youth expressed more openness to discussing hate violence with peers, this should be a starting place for messaging about hate violence and safety and also about violence in LGBTQ relationships. The greatest proportions of these young people have sought previous help from friends and family, followed by queer youth and youth agencies. Friends, queer youth, and a LGBT Hate Violence Program were ranked the most helpful sources of support.

Religious advisors, talk line/hotlines, and medical providers, are the least likely places for youth to seek help. Religious advisors and police scored most poorly on how helpful they were when asked for help. The greatest proportions of respondents who previously sought help related to hate violence would seek help again, if needed in the future, from friends, family, and an LGBT Hate Violence Program. Exploration of what specific factors would increase helpfulness of the response when youth seek support is an area for further investigation.

Some of the consequences of the abuse reported by these respondents include sleep disturbances, a drop in grades, and drug abuse. Almost one-quarter of those who have experienced hate violence have had thoughts of suicide as a result. High risk of falling school performance, drug use, and suicide illustrate the serious, even deadly, consequences of hate violence.

At the same time, some youth report that as a result of their experience of hate violence, they now have a stronger commitment to their own personal safety and to improving their communities. Issues of the highest importance to them include: community safety, community space and resources, addressing HIV/STIs, and family issues. These are issues that programming may want to highlight in order to speak to both the personal and community issues of importance to these young people.