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ABSTRACT

Violence related to sexual orientation was studied in a sample of 358 lesbian/gay/bisexual (LGB) and 267 matched heterosexual Austrian adults. Heterosexual males compared to GB males experienced more abuse, but differences were insignificant for females. Anti-LGB abuse was reported by 26 and 45 percent of LB women and GB males. This was associated with the number of sexual partners in males and with LGB-community involvement in females. Abuse correlated with mental health especially in younger LGB participants. Anti-LGB abuse was infrequently reported to the police. Nonreporting was associated with female gender, not living alone, having had fewer sexual partners, fear and shame. (102 words)
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INTRODUCTION

VIOLENCE IN RELATION TO SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Anti-lesbian/gay/bisexual (LGB) violence is a common form of hate crime perpetrated on individuals because they are assumed or known to be gay, lesbian, or bisexual. A recent report using the FBI-register places American anti-LGB violence in the top categories of reported hate crimes, second only to race-related crimes (Sellas-Ferrer & Hutson, 2004). Herek’s 1989 review of the research indicates that many American lesbian and gay individuals have experienced verbal abuse/threats (90%) and physical attack (25%). In order to compare incidences of America and Europe, we conducted an informal review of 23 mostly not peer-reviewed studies using convenience samples of LGB individuals, including studies from Germany (Koordinierungsstelle für gleichgeschlechtliche Lebensweisen München, 2004; Berliner Senatsverwaltung, 1999; Holzbecher, 2000; Dobler, 1993), Sweden (Tiby and Lander, 1996), Ireland (Glen/NEXUS, 1996; McGowan, 1999), Great Britain (Beyond Barriers, 2003; Galop, 1998; Jarman & Tennant, 2003; Morrison & MacKay, 2000; Quiery, 2002; Toner & McLlrath, 1999; Wake et al., 1999), the Czech-Republic (Gay Initiative in the CR, c.f. ILGA 2004), Estonia (Vilnius, 2002), Latvia (Vilnius, 2002), Lithuania (Vilnius, 2002), Malta (Malta Gay Rights Movement, c.f. ILGA 2004), Poland (Lambda Warszawa Association, 2000, c.f. ILGA 2004), Romania (Accept, c.f. ILGA 2004), and Slovakia (Jójart et al., c.f. ILGA 2004). Compared to the Herek (1989) review, the incidences of verbal abuse are somewhat lower (Median 65, Range 38-98), but results are comparable for physical violence (Median 24, Range 10-55). For example, in
a German community sample of 757 lesbians, many had been verbally (98%) or physically (24%) abused because they were lesbian (Holzbecher et al., 2000). Another German study reported that 62 and 33 percent of 234 gay men studied had been verbally or physically abused because they were gay (Dobler, 1993). There is little change in incidence over the years: five national German AIDS-related surveys (1991 to 2003) report that the 12 month incidences of verbal anti-GB abuse varied only in the range from 9 to 13 percent (Bochow, Wright, & Lange, 2004; Bochow, 2001, Bochow, 1997).

The above studies are of predominantly adult populations and lack comparisons with their heterosexual counterparts, but comparisons are available for American LBG adolescents. In large-scaled Massachusetts’ surveys, their risk of experiencing violence, injuries and fear is high when compared to heterosexual adolescents (Durant et al., 1998; Garofalo et al., 1998; Massachusetts Department of Education, 1999). For example, 20 percent LGB adolescents versus 4 percent of other students were treated for medical injuries resulting from having been in one or more fights in the past year, and the incidence for not attending school for at least one day in the past month because of feeling unsafe at school was 20 versus 6 percent (Massachusetts Department of Education, 1999). For adults, however, results have been mixed. One national US-survey reported elevated experiences of discrimination among LGB participants (Mays & Cochran, 2001). In a British convenience sample (King et al., 2003) elevated incidences for experiencing violence was only true for lesbian females, and not for gay males, perhaps due to effects of gender, age, culture, sampling method, or excluding bisexuals from the analysis. A comparison of victimization among LB women and GB men with their heterosexual counterparts has not yet been studied in German speaking countries, this being one objective of our paper.

Experiencing violence/abuse may be associated with identity related risk or protective factors such as hiding or revealing one's LGB identity, personal involvement in the LGB
community, or age of coming out. For example, German gay men who hid their identity from friends experienced less non-physical violence in the past year than gay males who revealed their sexual orientation identity to their friends (7% vs. 15%), but they reported slightly more physical violence in the past year: 2.3% vs. 1.1% (Bochow, 2001; Bochow, 1997). In a US sample, young males known to be gay or bisexual by the majority of people they knew experienced more anti-GB verbal harassment and discrimination but not more anti-GB physical violence in the previous 6 months (Huebner, Rebchock & Kegeles, 2004). Seeking sexual contacts in public spaces such as parks or restrooms (cruising) may increase the likelihood of victimization but the relationship is not clear. German gay men perceive cruising in public spaces as the most risky, likely making them targets for violence (Dobler, 1993), but German gay cruisers did not report experiencing greater violence (Bochow, 2001). Complicating the issue, younger German gay men reported more physical violence in the past year than older gay men: 3.8% vs. 0.8% (Bochow, 2001). Similarly, in a recent US study, more anti-gay verbal harassment in the past 6 months (but not physical harassment) was reported by GB males up to 21 years old, compared to older participants (Huebner, Rebchock & Kegeles, 2004). Other identity related variables possibly associated with anti-LGB abuse/violence that have not been previously studied, such as living in a partnership or LGB community involvement, will be explored in this study.

ANTI-LGB ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH

Experiencing violence or anti-LGB violence is associated with mental health problems such as depression and higher levels of suicidality in LGB adolescents and young adults (Bontempo & D’Augelli, 2002; Huebner, Rebchook & Kegeles, 2004, Mills et al., 2004). It is also likely that LGB people are more negatively impacted by violence than are heterosexual people. In the Bontempo & D’Augelli (2002) study, LGB and heterosexual adolescents with rare
violent experiences had similar suicide attempt incidences. Compared to them, heterosexual adolescents with more violent experiences only had slightly higher incidences for attempting suicide (Cohens d = 0.7 for females and 0.6 for males) while it was much higher for LGB adolescents in the same category (d = 2.1 and 3.3). This increased vulnerability might result from socially acquired coping strategies that are effective for heterosexual people but may fail with LGB individuals given the likely presence of homophobia-related minority stress (Meyer, 2003). Therefore, anti-LGB violence may produce the strongest associations with mental health problems and this possibility will be empirically investigated.

THE UNDERREPORTING OF ANTI-LGB-VIOLENCE AND ITS REASONS

A number of studies indicate that LGB individuals report anti-LGB experiences to the police less frequently than they report incidents not motivated by the sexual orientation of the victim, but this difference was absent in one study that interviewed participants instead of using a questionnaire (Herek, Cogan, & Gillis, 2002). In one American study, only 27 percent of LGB participants victimized because of their sexual orientation reported incidents to the police (Comstock, 1991) and Herek’s 1989 review reports lower incidence: 10 to 24%. Comparable incidences are reported for German gay men (22%, Dobler, 1993), and for LGB participants in Northern Ireland (26%, Jarman & Tennant, 2003), with estimates being lower for LGB individuals in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and the Czech Republic (approximately 10%, ILGA 2004).

Reporting incidences increased up to 42% with crime severity in the Comstock (1991) study for those more severely victimized because of their sexual orientation. Similar results are reported in a German study: non-physical violence (7%), physical violence without injury (24%), mild forms of injury (57%), and severe forms injury (65%) (Bochow, 1997). In Peel’s 1999
British study the reporting incidence for anti-LGB violence was 18%. Reporters and nonreporters could be classified correctly with eight questions regarding the practicality of reporting, effectiveness of police, the desire to stand up to the perpetrator, feeling angry, scared, blamed, fearing to report, and barriers that resulted because the incident happened at the workplace. Many of the reasons for nonreporting can be subsumed under the fear of “secondary victimization” according to Berrill and Herek (1992). This fear was most frequently cited (68%), followed by the fear of coming out in the Herek et al. (2002) American study. However, fear of secondary victimization was cited by only 5% of the German participants in the Bochow (1997) study. These differences may be national/cultural in nature, noting that results from one national study require replication and that the factors associated with the reporting of anti-LGB crimes to the police remain largely unknown. Possible candidates are having or not having a gay/lesbian/bisexual identity and feeling that one’s homosexual orientation must remain unknown to significant others. Our study explores the impact of many LGB-related variables on reporting anti-LGB incidences to the police, including the possibility that LGB reports of crimes are affected by fear of secondary victimization by the police. In an American study, 25 percent of the policemen acknowledged having committed at least one homophobic behavior (Bernstein & Kostelac, 2002) although this may not translate into a significant homophobic atmosphere for the reporters of anti-LGB violence. In addition, only 60 percent of the policemen believe that policemen treat LGB people as positively as heterosexual people, and 72 percent believe that LGB-identified-victim-police-calls are taken as seriously as calls from other victims (Bernstein & Kostelac, 2002). A US review reported that the lifetime police participation in the victimization of LGB individuals varied from 5 to 26 percent (Herek, 1989). A subsequent US study of LGB adults reported that about two thirds of perpetrators of anti-LGB violence were strangers, followed by fellow students (13%), and police officers (8%) (Comstock, 1991).
Harassment by the police was reported by 20 percent of homosexual Latino-men living in the US (Diaz, Ayala, Bein, Henne, & Marin, 2001) and Harry (1982) reported police involvement in 11 percent of extortion of gay men. In surveys carried out in the new or applying member-countries of the European Union, LGB individuals who experienced physical anti-LGB violence reported that the police accounted for a significant percentage of this violence; for example, 21% in Romania and 15% in Slovakia (ILGA, 2004). Therefore, even with respect to physical violence, the evidence suggests that possible secondary victimization is a well founded fear, but more recent data is required to establish the ongoing nature of the problem. Contrary to the American study results, the police response to reports of anti-GB criminal activity by German gay males were generally positive: 64 percent agreed to clear positive statements (“correct”, “empathic”), but 24 percent did agree to clear negative statements: “hostile”, “homophobic”, “unwilling” (Dobler, 1993). Similarly, 60 percent of Irish gay reporters of physical violence were satisfied with the police response (McGowan, 1999). However, in Romania, Latvia, and Slovakia, hostile responses by the police have been in the majority (ILGA, 2004).

The evidence indicates that a great lack of knowledge exists about the violence experienced by LGB people in German speaking countries in comparison to heterosexual men and women. Exploring this problem is the primary motivation of this study nestled within a larger study that solicited varied information related to mental health and identity issues (Plöderl, 2004). The objective is to explore the association of varied forms of abuse/violence, including anti-LGB abuse/violence on one’s mental health, this being a phenomenon not well understood or studied in German speaking regions. Using many variables, it is possible to explore some of the reasons LGB individuals may or may not report incidences to the police. This information will likely be of great value in endeavors such as the development of LGB violence prevention programmes, support services for LGB individuals, and police education.
METHOD

SAMPLE
Gay/bisexual men (GB) and lesbian/bisexual women (LB) were sampled via Austrian LGB organization address lists. Potential participants received the questionnaire along with an instruction sheet and a pre-paid stamped envelope to be returned to the author by regular mail. Of the 877 contacted individuals, 391 (44%) returned the questionnaire, 358 being acceptable for analysis. A control group of heterosexual individuals was matched to the LGB-sample based on sex, age, and level of education. Of the 848 contacted assumed heterosexual participants, 303 (36%) returned the questionnaires, with 267 used for the analysis. This produced a total of 625 study participants. The mean age of the study sample was 36.2 years ($SD = 11.8$) with 67 percent being male. Compared to the Austrian population few LGB participants were older than 60 years (6% in the sample vs. 21% in the Austrian population). More LGB participants were better educated (31 vs. 16% with A-level and 29 vs. 7% with an academic degree), never married (86 vs. 43%) and living in towns exceeding 100,000 inhabitants (50 vs. 28%). A detailed description of the sampling procedure is given by Plöderl (2004) and Plöderl and Fartacek (in press).

MEASURES

The sexual orientation of participants is assessed with the items: “In your sexual fantasies there are?“, “You would like to have sex with?”, with five multiple choice answers: only-, mostly women, men and women, mostly-, only men; and “How do you describe yourself” with six multiple choice answers: heterosexual, mostly heterosexual, bisexual, mostly homosexual, homosexual, transsexual, not sure. Participants are classified as bisexual if they answered
affirmatively to all three items indicating nonexclusive heterosexuality or homosexuality.
Cronbach’s Alpha for the three items was $r_\alpha = .88$. All other combinations of
cognitive/behavioral questions have less internal consistency. Measuring the participant’s
currently perceived social support is based on naming of up to 7 persons – in addition to their
father and mother – who were judged important. Four items measure social support (e.g. “I can
contact him/her when I am in trouble”), with a mean score ranging from one (negative) to four
(positive). The following roles are used for the analysis: mother, father, family (i.e. parents and
siblings), and friends. Social support related to sexual orientation was assessed for each person
from the responses (“do not agree”, “do mostly agree”, “do mostly not agree”, “do agree”) to
four items: possibility of talking about sexual orientation, positive first reaction to coming out,
positive current reaction to sexual orientation, and having the sexual orientation revealed. Other
variables assessed are the number of sex-partners (lifetime and last year), masculinity and
femininity (Bem, 1974; Schneider-Düker & Kohler, 1988), gender role conformity
(nonconforming vs. other, calculated using the procedure of Bierhoff-Alfermann, 1989),
psychological symptoms (Symptom-Check-List; Franke, 1995), depression [short version of the
ADS-scale (Hautzinger & Bailer, 1993; Radloff, 1977)], existential motivation (Eckhardt, 2000),
and harmful alcohol consumption (ml of pure alcohol) as calculated from the number of specific
drinks in the last month, exceeding the amount of alcohol that is defined as harmful by WHO
(Anderson, 1990). Suicidality is assessed with the questions of Paykel, Myers, Lindethal, and
Tanner (1974), covering death-wishes: “Have you ever wished you were dead (for instance, that
you could get to sleep and not wake up)?”, suicide ideation (“Have you ever thought of taking
your life, even if you would not really do it?”), serious suicide ideation (“Have you ever reached
the point where you seriously considered taking your life, or perhaps made plans how you would
go about doing it?”), and aborted suicide attempts (“I already tried to kill myself but stopped the
For each item, participants were asked how often this happened in the last 12 months (often/sometimes/rarely/never) and - with a separate question – how often this occurred in previous years. Suicide attempts are assessed with the item “Have you ever made a suicide attempt?” (no; yes; if yes, how many). False positive suicide attempts were excluded with control questions (Plöderl & Fartacek, in press; Savin-Williams, 2001). Victimization is assessed using the items recommended by Herek and Berrill (1990), ranging from verbal insults to being assaulted with a weapon (Table 1a, 1b). Participants replied with a “yes/no” if such an incidence occurred in the past year, and with a separate item, in previous years. Study participants are deemed to have experienced “physical abuse” if they responded with “yes” to at least one of the items ranging from physical threat to being assaulted with a weapon (see Tables 1ab, items 3, 5 – 10, 12). If participants responded with “yes” only to one or more of the verbal abuses (items 1, 2, 4, 11, 13) they experienced “verbal abuse”, otherwise “none” applies. These categories are used to produce ordinal summary variables representing abusive experiences in the past years and in previous years, with verbal abuse and physical abuse categories being collapsed in some analyses. In addition, in the questionnaire-version sent to LGB organizations, participants replied to each item with a “yes/no” if abuse experiences were motivated by the known or assumed homosexuality of the victim. Here, no distinction is made if the incident happened in the last year or in previous years. The variable “anti-LGB abuse” is calculated as noted above.

Other measures only included in the questionnaires sent to LGB organizations are involvement in the LGB community (not including cruising in parks or public restrooms) (Vanable, McKirman, & Stokes, 1998), satisfaction with LGB friends (one item with the possible responses: definitely, probably, probably not, definitely not, no LGB friends), age of coming out, internalized homophobia (Wagner, 1998), and reaction of the police to reporting anti-LGB violence (Herek
and Berrill, 1990). The data was analyzed with R 2.0.0 (R Development Core Team, 2004).

Correlational effect sizes, denoted by $r^*$, were calculated as outlined by Rosenthal, Rosnow, and Rubin (2000). Effect sizes up to .20 are denoted as small, from .21 to .35 as medium, and those exceeding .35 as large.

**RESULTS**

**ABUSE AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

The results for violent experiences are reported separately for LGB and heterosexual participants, and subdivided by sex. The results of $\chi^2$-tests for each item assessing violence and sexual orientation as the independent variable are given in Table 1a for men and Table 1b for women. For men, the only significant difference for violence experienced in the last 12 months was that more GB men experienced sexual harassment than heterosexual males. For the period before the last year, GB men experienced significantly lower incidences of verbal insults, being physically threatened, theft or damage of property, having objects thrown at them, or being hit/kicked/beaten. On the other hand, more GB men were sexually assaulted. For women (Table 1b), significant differences occurred only for sexual harassment. More LB women compared to heterosexual women reported incidents in the previous years. For all differences, effect sizes were small, not exceeding $r^* = .21$.

“Table 1a and table 1b about here”

The abuse summary measures are reported separately for males and females (Tables 1a and 1b: the two bottom-rows). There were no significant sexual orientation differences for verbal abuse, physical abuse, or any abuse in the last 12 months. For the time preceding the last year, more heterosexual men compared to GB men had experienced physical abuse or any abuse. Such
differences were not observed in women, the elevation for LB females being nonsignificant. Gender differences were explored using $\chi^2$-tests on the ordinal-scaled summary variable. Between GB males and LB females no significant difference were produced, $\chi^2(2) = 4.24, p = .12$, but significantly more heterosexual males reported abuse than heterosexual females, $\chi^2(2) = 16.51, p < .01$. 

ABUSE BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Descriptive statistics for each type of anti-LGB abuse are reported in the first columns of the Tables 1a, 1b. Only a part of the abuse was classified as anti-LGB abuse, as the differences in the percentages of anti-LGB abuse (first column) and abuse up to the last year (third column) indicate. For men, a noticable exception is evident: 20% reported having been sexually harassed and most victims reported that it was motivated by their sexual orientation, the same applying for sexual assaults. In summary, nearly half of the GB men (45%) and about a quarter of LB women (26%) experienced at least one incident of LGB abuse and the incidences for physical anti-LGB abuse were about half as high (24 vs. 13%). Based on the ordinal summary variable, more GB males reported abuse than LB females, $\chi^2(2) = 12.04, p < .01$. Compared to LB women, more GB men reported verbal anti-LGB abuse, $\chi^2(1) = 2.88, p = .08, r^* = .07$, physical anti-LGB violence $\chi^2(1) = 5.10, p < .05, r^* = .12$; or any anti-LGB abuse, $\chi^2(1) = 11.18, p < .01, r^* = .18$

CORRELATES OF ANTI-LGB ABUSE

Associations for selected identity related variables and anti-LGB violence summary measures are listed in Table 2. The overall test is discussed first (last column), followed by pairwise test-result with the no-abuse category as baseline.

“Table 2 about here”
For GB males, the lifetime-number of sex-partners was the variable most strongly associated with anti-GB abuse/violence. Pairwise comparisons revealed that it was only GB males reporting having been physically abused who had significantly more lifetime sexual partners ($r^* = .34$). The same applies for the number of sex-partners in the past year, but with a smaller effect size ($r^* = .24$). Single GB males were more at risk to experience abuse, and pairwise comparisons revealed that this is restricted to physical anti-GB abuse ($r^* = .19$). GB males who came out at an earlier age were more likely to have been abused, with the difference being insignificant for verbal anti-GB abuse and significant for physical anti-GB abuse ($r^* = .21$). Both anti-GB verbal abuse ($r^* = .29$) and anti-GB physical abuse ($r^* = .22$) were associated with low social support from the family. Finally, the overall test for sex role was insignificant, but in the pairwise tests gender nonconforming GB males were more likely to report physical anti-GB abuse ($r^* = .11$).

For LB females, all the overall tests were insignificant. Pairwise comparisons revealed that LB females strongly involved in the LGB community reported far more physical anti-LB abuse ($r^* = .47$). Finally, LB females more open about their sexual orientation in their social network were more at risk for having been verbally abused ($r^* = .24$).

IMPACT OF VIOLENT EXPERIENCES ON PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT
The associations of violent experiences and psychological adjustment are reported in Table 3a and Table 3b. Overall statistical tests are given in the right column. Pairwise comparisons always use the non-abused category as baseline. The associations with lifetime suicide attempts are given only for LGB individuals because of low frequencies in the heterosexual sample.

“Tables 3a, 3b about here”

Abuse in the Past Year:
GB males reporting abuse in the past year were more likely to report lifetime suicide attempts. Pairwise comparisons indicate that this effect is mostly produced by physically abused GB males who were three times more likely to report suicide attempts ($r^* = .20$). For GB males, abusive experiences in the past year are associated with current depression, the effect being restricted to those reporting verbal abuses ($r^* = .28$) as revealed by pairwise tests. For heterosexual males, this is an insignificant trend. In LB and heterosexual females, the associations of abusive experiences in the past year with suicide attempts or current depressive mood are insignificant trends. However, four out of 11 LB females reporting physical abuse had attempted suicide.

Abuse in Previous Years:
For GB males, no association of abusive experiences in previous years with suicide attempts was produced. However, LB females reporting physical abuse in previous years were almost three times more likely to have attempted suicide ($r^* = .18$). For GB males, LB females, and both heterosexual males and females, the associations of abuse in previous years with current depressive mood were insignificant trends. However, pairwise tests revealed elevated depression among heterosexual females reporting physical abuse in previous years ($r^* = .32$).

Anti-LGB Abuse:
GB males reporting anti-GB abuse were about three times more likely to report suicide attempts, both for those verbally ($r^* = .18$) and physically ($r^* = .15$) abused. For LB females, the association was an insignificant trend. The correlation of depressive mood with anti-LGB abuse produced only insignificant trends for both GB males LB females. It is plausible that for LGB individuals, anti-LGB victimization has a greater impact on mental health in earlier years and this effect should manifest itself in regression analysis as a significant interaction term of age and
anti-LGB abuse. To increase the statistical power, men and women were combined for analyses. For depression, a significant interaction effect of anti-LGB abuse and age was produced, \( t = -1.98, p < .05 \). This can be illustrated by an association of \( r = .21, p < .01 \) for participants up to 35 years, but \( r = .07, \) n.s. for participants older than 40 years.

To compare age-interaction effects in heterosexual and LGB participants, separate analyses for the groups were conducted with abuse in the past year or in previous years as predictor variables. For both LGB and heterosexual study participants, no significant interaction effects were produced for models including abuse in the past year and current depression or lifetime suicide attempts as dependent variables. The same applied for abuse in previous years: no significant interactions with age were produced for lifetime suicide attempts in the LGB sample. However, for depression, there was a significant interaction of physical (but not verbal) abuse in previous years and age for the LGB group (\( t = -2.80, p < .01 \)) but not for their heterosexual counterparts. The correlation of depression and any violence for LGB participants up to 25 years old was \( r = .38, p < .01 \), and \( r = .03, \) n.s., for those older than 40 years old. For heterosexual participants the correlations were \( r = .13 \) vs. \( r = .13, \) both n.s.

REPORTING OF ANTI-LGB ABUSE TO THE POLICE

Out of 141 LGB study participants who experienced anti-LGB abuse, 103 (22 women, 81 men) answered the question on reporting the incident to the police. The incidences for different forms of anti-LGB abuse are given in Table 4. Nonreporting does not decrease substantially with the severity of the abuse. Even for incidents involving a weapon, 60 percent did not report the incident to the police. Women generally had higher incidences of nonreporting, with nonreporting appearing to increase with the severity of the abuse. None of the 14 physically abused women reported the incident(s) to the police. All three participants injured with a weapon
were male and reported the crime to the police.

“Table 4 about here”

REASONS FOR UNDERREPORTING
Why did participants not report anti-LGB incidents to the police? The subjectively experienced reasons of 72 participants answering the query are given in Table 5.

“Table 5 about here”

They most frequently reported that the incident was not severe enough, that the problem was solved by the participants themselves, or that fear and/or shame was implicated. The latter was most often mentioned, e.g. “I was afraid and ashamed at the thought that my family would hear about my homosexuality”. “I was ashamed, because I wanted to have a ménage à trois with two other boys, who turned out to be gay-bashers”, “Because I feared that instead of support I would experience additional violence, threats, discrimination, or be labelled as a liar”. In some cases, it was not clear if the person experienced the incident to not be severe or if they were downplaying its importance to themselves: “The perpetrator fled and I was not hurt”, “there was no major damage”, “it did not end in an assault”.

CORRELATES OF REPORTING ANTI-LGB ABUSE TO THE POLICE
Nonreporting was coded as “1”, reporting (all or some of the incidences) as “0”. Therefore, positive correlations indicate that the likelihood of nonreporting increases with increasing level of the variable in question. Of all variables assessed as listed in the method section, only a few proved to be significantly associated with nonreporting (p < .05), even when the analysis was restricted to participants who had experienced physical anti-LGB abuse. As previously noted, fewer females than males who experienced anti-LGB abuse reported it to the police (14 vs. 37%,
r* = .18). Moreover, none of the 14 physically abused LB females reported the abuse to the police, compared to 39% of GB males. Study participants who lived as a couple were less likely to report incidences than those living alone (22 vs. 39%, r* = .17) and the difference increases for those physically abused (14% vs. 42%, r* = .26). Compared to reporters, those who did not report incidences to the police had fewer sexual partners in the past year (M = 3.16, SD = 1.61 vs. M = 4.21, SD = 1.71, r* = .32) and in their lifetime (M = 4.70, SD = 2.14 vs. M = 5.76, SD = 2.31, r* = .21). The associations increased slightly if the analysis was restricted to those physically abused. Femininity and masculinity were analyzed separately for males and females. For males, low masculinity was associated with reporting incidences (reporters: M = 4.98, SD = 0.64, nonreporters: M = 4.59, SD = 0.77, r* = .23), but this effect becomes insignificant for the physically abused study participants.

REACTION OF THE POLICE

Twenty of the 36 participants who reported anti-LGB violence to the police answered the question regarding the reaction of the police. Positive reactions were in the majority (Table 6). Agreement was lowest for items assessing sensitivity and professionalism, and highest for items assessing discreteness and being objective.

“Table 6 about here”

DISCUSSION

INCIDENCE OF TOTAL AND ANTI-LGB ABUSE

LGB study participant frequently reported being victimized because of their sexual orientation: verbal insults (30% GB men, 20% LB women), physical violence (20%, 13%), and having been
kicked, beaten or hit (14%, 4%). Compared to participants in the Dobler (1993) and Holzbecher et al. (2000) study, fewer LGB participants in this study reported having experienced verbal anti-GB abuse and physical abuse. For males, however, the percentages of anti-GB violence involving blackmailing, sexual assaults and violence with weapons were comparable. Concerning sexual abuse, a clear sex-difference emerged. Almost all the sexual harassment of GB males was related to their sexual orientation but this did not apply for LB females. In the King et al. (1994) study, gay victims of non-consensual sex reported that the perpetrators were often other homosexually active males known to them, but research on this phenomenon is scarce (Stermac et al., 2004). Sexual exploitation, especially of youth who are new in the community, is discussed as a negative aspect in the LGB community for men and for women (e.g. Valentine & Skelton, 2003; Tremblay & Ramsay, 2000). In this study, community involvement was not associated with the sexual harassment of GB males and only slightly for LB females. Further research is needed to clarify the nature of this sexual harassment, information should be solicited to assess perpetrator characteristics, place, and time of the incidents. Consonant with other studies, less LB women experienced anti-LGB abuse compared to GB men (e.g. Comstock, 1991). This is in accordance with the fact that explicit and implicit attitudes are more negative toward gay men compared to LB women (Herke, 2000; Seise, Banse, & Neyer, 2002). This study is one of the few that compared abusive experiences for both heterosexual and LGB participants. According to minority stress models it would be expected that compared to heterosexual participants, LGB experience more stress, including violence (Meyer, 2003). This was reported, for example, in a US study (Mays & Cochran, 2001). In this study, significantly increased incidences of abuse in LGB participants did not apply for LB women, incidences were lower for GB men compared to heterosexual men. Similarly, a recent British study did not find differences between adult gay and heterosexual men concerning physical violence and verbal
harassment in the past 5 years, nor when the participants went to school; but elevated incidences for lesbian compared to heterosexual women were reported (King et al., 2003). It should be noted that the differences between LGB and heterosexual participants in our sample are restricted to the time before the last year, with the exact timing of these events being unknown. Maybe this difference emerged when gender nonconformity was more strongly expressed by LGB individuals. It is known from both prospective and retrospective studies that LGB individuals report being much less gender conforming in their childhood than their heterosexual counterparts (Bailey & Zucker, 1995), but gender nonconformity decreases with age (Harry, 1983). A recent study using a similar sampling design found higher incidences of violent experiences before the age of twelve years for both GB males and LB females compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Plöderl, Fartacek & Tremblay, unpublished manuscript). On the other hand, heterosexual men may more likely frequent spaces where they have to prove their masculinity via violence, including initiating it, thus resulting in experiencing more threats and violence compared to GB males. Nonetheless, reverse effect found in our study and by King et al. (2003) could be due to a culture specific effect or sampling bias. Replication studies using more representative samples that include adolescents are required to test these hypotheses. The fact that GB men reported less violence compared to heterosexual men is notable because it also challenges the proposition that LGB study participants will bias assessed variables in a more problematic direction due to a “suffering script”, as postulated for youth suicidality by Savin-Williams (2001).

CORRELATIONS WITH IDENTITY RELATED VARIABLES
For GB men, the total number of sexual partners is most strongly associated with anti-GB violence. It is plausible that those having many male sexual partners search for them in cruising
areas where there is an increased likelihood of meeting gay bashers posing as potential sexual partners. In the Bochow (2001) study, however, no association was reported between experiencing violence and cruising in locations such as public restrooms or parks, although at least half of GB men believe that cruising areas are the most likely places to be victimized (Dobler1993). Bochow (2001) reports that in large German cities the access to public restrooms is restricted via charging entrance fees and that cruising areas are heavily policed. Perhaps Austrian cruising areas are less safe than German ones. For LB women, there was no significant association of anti-LGB-violence and number of sexual partners. However, LB women are known not to cruise in parks/restroom etc. and therefore report few, if any, abusive experiences in cruising areas (Comstock, 1991). This gender-effect hints at the possibility that violence experienced by GB men could be linked to cruising, noting here that single GB males reported more abuse that is physical. Perhaps they frequent bars or cruising areas more often than males living in a partnership, and thus are more exposed to perpetrators. Notable, for GB men, gay-community-involvement (which does not include cruising in our assessment) is not associated with anti-LGB violence. This is important given that contact with other LGB individuals seems to play a crucial role in the development of a LGB identity and for self-acceptance (e.g. Cass, 1979). However, for female LB participants, the likelihood of experiencing physical anti-LGB abuse increased with community involvement. Victimized LB women might attach to the LGB community more strongly, or perpetrators of violence against LB women may be acting within the LGB community as reported by Bridget & Lucille (1996), but more research is needed to clarify this issue. LB women but not GB males who were more open about their sexual orientation in the social network had an increased risk for experiencing verbal anti-LGB abuse. GB men with less family support experienced more anti-GB violence and they may have experienced anti-GB violence within the family, especially as parental maltreatment and severe
parental maltreatment in childhood and adolescence (Harry, 1989; Corliss et al, 2002). Finally, GB males who came out earlier reported more physical abuse. This might be related to “gay-bashing” in schools, in one’s community or in the family, and Remafedi (1991) also reported an association between coming out at a younger age and attempting suicide. The results hint that the causes of anti-LGB violence and some associated factors may be substantially different for LB women compared to GB men.

ASSOCIATION WITH PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT

Most associations of abuse with depression or suicide attempts were weak and did not show a consistent pattern. Lifetime suicide attempts correlated with physical abuse in previous years for both LB females and GB males. Anti LGB abuse (verbal and physical) was significantly associated with suicide attempts only in GB males. Gender specific recalling of abusive experiences and a gender specific nature of anti-LGB violence might explain these gender differences. The association of anti-LGB abuse with current depression reached significance for the younger LGB individuals but not for the older ones. Moreover, a comparison of LGB with heterosexual participants produced strong associations of physical abuse in previous years with depression for younger LGB adults, but not for older LGB adults, nor for heterosexual adults of any age. This could be explained if perpetrator characteristics and/or the violence differed with age, or if younger LGB individuals are more likely to be stressed with respect to their sexuality and if they have fewer resources available to cope with violent experiences. Furthermore, the time proximity of the violence may be important. For young LGB participants, all violence happening before one year likely happened in the less distant past than most violence reported by older LGB participants.

The reasons for the generally weak associations in older adults could be that the
frequency of violent incidents - which was not assessed - is more important than the type of incident. Furthermore, more subtle forms of violence might have to be explored to produce correlations with mental health. In addition, it may not be the actual violence but the stress caused by anticipating violence or rejection (possibly the result of only experiencing a few incidents or having witnessed such incidents) that could be implicated in the increased suicidality among LGB participants (Meyer, 2003).

REPORTS OF ANTI-LGB VIOLENCE TO THE POLICE
Our study reports high incidences for not reporting crimes to the police: sixty percent did not report incidents of anti-LGB crimes involving a weapon. Related sex differences have not been researched in German speaking countries and this study provides the first indication that nonreporting increases with the severity of the violent incident in women, and that nonreporting is generally higher in women. For LGB participants fear and shame were the major reasons for not reporting, thus suggesting fears of secondary victimization. Contrary to the Dobler (1993) study, not perceiving the incident to have been severe was the second most stated reason for not reporting.

Of the many variables evaluated, only a few correlates of police reporting were produced. First, fewer LB females than GB males reported incidents to the police. That is consonant with the results of a US-Study (The Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force, 2000). Perhaps female victims avoid reporting incidents to the male dominated police forces for reasons that remain to be explored. Second, those living as a couple tended to avoid reporting incidences to the police, despite their lower internalized homophobia and higher disclosure in the social network (Plöderl, 2004). Perhaps the violence was associated with cruising and police-reporting was avoided to conceal one’s dishonesty from one’s partner. Third, with increasing number of sexual partners
participants were more likely to report incidences to the police. The number of sexual partner might therefore be associated less of a concern with what others, including the police, may think of homosexuality. Male participants with lower levels of masculinity were more likely to report anti-GB violence to the police. Perhaps males scoring low on masculinity do not have the male typical script that devalues help seeking (Mahalik, Good & Englar-Carlson, 2003). It is also possible that a more complex interplay of variables can discriminate reporters from nonreporters. Such an analysis, however, would require a much larger sample. Though fear and shame were the most stated reasons for nonreporting, the reaction from the police was generally supportive. The small numbers reporting crimes to police, however, precludes generalizations of results to all Austrian LGB victims. Noteworthy is the fact that about half of the GB men in the Dobler (1993) study would report an incident again, and another 42 percent would report it if the police had a special contact officer for such crimes.

There are caveats for this study, beginning with the fact that a convenience sample was used and that conclusions must therefore be drawn cautiously. It is not known to what extent individuals on mailing lists of LGB organizations differ from the general Austrian LGB population with respect to violent experiences. For example, participants experiencing violence within the LGB community may withdraw from mailing lists or never apply to one. In addition, participants who could not be recruited with mailing lists may be similar to those who mainly hide their same-sex activities to their significant others and thus might be easy targets for blackmailing. Furthermore, “hidden” GB men not on mailing lists could be those who frequent anonymous places such as public parks where there is a greater likelihood for experiencing violence. Therefore, it is not known if our results are overestimations or underestimations. Even though the response rate was high in our study, the results may be biased because of the possibly different characteristics of those who refused to participate. Although abuse/violence was
assessed as recommended by a working group on anti-LGB violence (Herek & Berrill, 1990), the frequency of specific forms of abuse/violence and the exact timing of the event were not assessed. Thus, for example, it is not clear if sexual assaults happened in childhood or later. In addition, the validity of categorizing violence as anti-LGB violence is not known. Herek et al. (2002) reported that LGB participants generally rely on contextual cues (e.g. the location of the incident) and on the explicit statements of the perpetrators to make such determinations. Misclassified incidents were mostly those involving LGB perpetrators with the majority being unwanted sexual advances. To avoid misclassification and differing definitions of violence among participants, open-ended questions should be included in future studies. This would likely reveal the nature of the violence in greater detail. It is possible that heterosexual participants also experienced anti-LGB violence because the perpetrators most often “assume” that the victim is GLB as opposed to “knowing” this as a fact. For example of all adolescents who experienced anti-LGB harassment in the past year, a clear majority were self-identified as heterosexual (Reis & Saewyc, 1999). Most studies, including ours, assessed anti-LGB violence only in samples of LGB individuals. Future studies should assess anti-LGB violence and its possible correlates independent of the sexual orientation of the participant.

The number of participants reporting anti-LGB incidents to the police was too small to draw valid conclusions. Therefore, larger samples or qualitative interviews with LGB participants and police-staff should be conducted to explore related issues. Finally, reports of violence in the past could be biased. The direction of the bias is not clear and could depend on several variables (Krieger & Sidney, 1997). Studies of larger and more representative community based samples, random population samples, and samples taken for longitudinal studies would be required to address the caveats of this study. Despite the limitations, our results have been highly valuable for a police education program in Salzburg and for the development of another program
aimed at preventing anti-LGB violence.
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Table 1a. Violent Experiences of GB and Heterosexual Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>GB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anti-GB</td>
<td>12mon</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>12mon</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>12mona</td>
<td>beforeb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (r^2c)</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (r^2c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. verbal insults</td>
<td>72 (30)</td>
<td>33 (14)</td>
<td>105 (43)</td>
<td>31 (18)</td>
<td>97 (55)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98 (.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. blackmailing</td>
<td>23 (9)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>29 (12)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>13 (7)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. physical threat</td>
<td>36 (15)</td>
<td>18 (7)</td>
<td>74 (30)</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
<td>82 (46)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.88 (.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Theft/damage</td>
<td>21 (9)</td>
<td>34 (14)</td>
<td>71 (29)</td>
<td>32 (18)</td>
<td>89 (50)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>18.65 (.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Objects thrown</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>21 (9)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>34 (19)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>9.24 (.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chased/followed</td>
<td>23 (9)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>40 (16)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>21 (12)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Spat upon</td>
<td>15 (6)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>28 (11)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>27 (15)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kicked, beaten, hit</td>
<td>33 (14)</td>
<td>12 (5)</td>
<td>67 (27)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>84 (47)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>16.98 (.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Threat with weapon</td>
<td>14 (6)</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td>24 (10)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>18 (10)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hurt with weapon</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sexual harassed</td>
<td>42 (17)</td>
<td>18 (7)</td>
<td>50 (20)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>30 (17)</td>
<td>7.52 (.13)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sexual assault</td>
<td>20 (8)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>26 (11)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>8.11 (.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Work-absence</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>15 (6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>52 (21)</td>
<td>42 (17)</td>
<td>45 (18)</td>
<td>40 (23)</td>
<td>36 (17)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>59 (24)</td>
<td>27 (11)</td>
<td>105 (43)</td>
<td>17 (10)</td>
<td>106 (60)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10.99 (.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any abuse</td>
<td>111 (45)</td>
<td>69 (28)</td>
<td>150 (61)</td>
<td>57 (32)</td>
<td>136 (77)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>9.89 (.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1b. Violent Experiences of LB and Heterosexual Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of abuse</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>heterosexual</th>
<th>Test (LB vs. heterosex.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anti-LB</td>
<td>12mon</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Verbal insults</td>
<td>23 (20)</td>
<td>9 (8)</td>
<td>48 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Blackmailing</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>14 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical threat</td>
<td>10 (9)</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>33 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Theft/damage</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>11 (10)</td>
<td>32 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Objects thrown</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>15 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chased/followed</td>
<td>5 (4)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>15 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Spat upon</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>10 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kicked, beaten, hit</td>
<td>5 (4)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>32 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Threat with weapon</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>8 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hurt with weapon</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sexual harassed</td>
<td>10 (9)</td>
<td>12 (11)</td>
<td>57 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sexual assault</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>20 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Work-absence</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>15 (13)</td>
<td>16 (14)</td>
<td>19 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>15 (13)</td>
<td>11 (10)</td>
<td>54 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any abuse</td>
<td>30 (26)</td>
<td>27 (24)</td>
<td>73 (64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to Table 1a and Table 1b:

a significance-test ($\chi^2$) of violence in the last 12 months between GB and heterosexual men ($n = 421, df = 1$ in Table 1a) and LB and heterosexual women ($n = 204, df = 1$ in Table 1b).

b as previous footnote but for violence in previous years.

c correlational effect sizes are given only for statistically significant differences.

d absence from work or school because of feeling threatened on the way to work or school.
Table 2a. Associations of Anti-LGB Abuse and Identity Related Variables – Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity related variable</th>
<th>Not abused</th>
<th>Verbally abused</th>
<th>Physically abused</th>
<th>Overall Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 133</td>
<td>n = 52</td>
<td>n = 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>χ²(2) = 9.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership (living alone)ₐ</td>
<td>50 (34)</td>
<td>19 (37)</td>
<td>35⁺⁺ (59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGB community involvement</td>
<td>26.82 (4.62)</td>
<td>26.93 (5.69)</td>
<td>28.16 (4.85)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with LGB friendsₐ</td>
<td>1.73 (0.70)</td>
<td>1.73 (0.69)</td>
<td>1.76 (0.71)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sex-partners (12mon)</td>
<td>3.33 (1.55)</td>
<td>3.81 (2.06)</td>
<td>3.97⁺ (1.60)</td>
<td>F(2,240) = 3.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sex-partners (total)</td>
<td>4.54 (2.13)</td>
<td>5.00 (2.29)</td>
<td>5.83⁺⁺ (2.20)</td>
<td>F(2,241) = 7.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of coming out</td>
<td>23.01 (6.45)</td>
<td>21.21 (5.10)</td>
<td>20.71⁺ (6.62)</td>
<td>F(2,229) = 3.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since coming out</td>
<td>14.64(10.63)</td>
<td>14.92 (11.56)</td>
<td>16.71 (11.49)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being out in the social network</td>
<td>0.84 (0.22)</td>
<td>0.87 (0.18)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.18)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being out in the family</td>
<td>0.72 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.73 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.34)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from family</td>
<td>2.92 (0.61)</td>
<td>2.61⁺⁺ (0.70)</td>
<td>2.67⁺ (0.69)</td>
<td>F(2,208) = 4.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized homophobia</td>
<td>26.37(10.46)</td>
<td>25.79 (9.08)</td>
<td>26.56 (10.65)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex role (nonconforming)ₐ</td>
<td>50 (34)</td>
<td>23 (44)</td>
<td>30⁺ (51)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38.30(11.80)</td>
<td>36.20 (12.52)</td>
<td>38.63 (12.74)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2b. Associations of Anti-LGB Abuse and Identity Related Variables – Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity related variable</th>
<th>Not abused</th>
<th>Verbally abused</th>
<th>Physically abused</th>
<th>Overall Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 84$</td>
<td>$n = 15$</td>
<td>$n = 15$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership (living alone)$_a$</td>
<td>30 (36)</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGB community involvement</td>
<td>25.35 (4.52)</td>
<td>25.20 (3.49)</td>
<td>28.13$^+$ (3.80)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with LGB friends$_b$</td>
<td>1.76 (0.73)</td>
<td>1.40 (0.63)</td>
<td>1.47 (0.64)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sex-partners (12mon)</td>
<td>2.17 (0.71)</td>
<td>2.13 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.27 (0.46)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sex-partners (total)</td>
<td>3.70 (1.65)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.46)</td>
<td>3.07 (1.39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of coming out</td>
<td>24.08 (7.49)</td>
<td>22.87 (6.98)</td>
<td>23.33 (8.95)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since coming out</td>
<td>8.88 (6.33)</td>
<td>10.73 (5.69)</td>
<td>10.00 (4.93)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being out in the social network</td>
<td>0.85 (0.25)</td>
<td>0.98$^+$ (0.04)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.19)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being out in the family</td>
<td>0.75 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.64 (0.42)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from family</td>
<td>2.65 (0.71)</td>
<td>2.69 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.40 (0.65)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized homophobia</td>
<td>23.71 (8.70)</td>
<td>25.47 (7.70)</td>
<td>24.47 (6.44)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex role (nonconforming)$_a$</td>
<td>14 (17)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32.84 (9.25)</td>
<td>33.60 (10.52)</td>
<td>34.00 (12.20)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table 2a and Table 2b

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, $^+$ $p < .05$ and $^{++} p < .01$ for pairwise comparisons with the non-abused group,

* Binary Variables, therefore frequencies and percentages are given in the table.

b Those participants who reported having not LGB friends were from the analyses.
Table 3a. Associations of Abuse and Mental Health – Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of abuse</th>
<th>Not abused</th>
<th>Verbally abused</th>
<th>Physically abused</th>
<th>Overall Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M/n$ $SD/%$</td>
<td>$M/n$ $SD/%$</td>
<td>$M/n$ $SD/%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse in the past year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempts - GB</td>
<td>15 (9)</td>
<td>5 (12)</td>
<td>8++ (30)</td>
<td>$\chi^2(2) = 9.02^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression – GB</td>
<td>7.51 (2.37)</td>
<td>8.55+ (2.93)</td>
<td>7.52 (2.29)</td>
<td>$F(2,240) = 3.09^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression - heterosexual</td>
<td>6.90 (2.24)</td>
<td>7.38 (2.68)</td>
<td>7.59 (2.65)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse in previous years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempts - GB</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>13 (12)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression – GB</td>
<td>7.35 (2.27)</td>
<td>7.73 (2.66)</td>
<td>7.97 (2.59)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression - heterosexual</td>
<td>6.63 (2.03)</td>
<td>6.87 (2.21)</td>
<td>7.30 (2.54)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-LGB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempts - GB</td>
<td>8 (6)</td>
<td>10++ (19)</td>
<td>10+ (17)</td>
<td>$\chi^2(2) = 7.97^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression – GB</td>
<td>7.57 (2.40)</td>
<td>7.83 (2.68)</td>
<td>7.83 (2.53)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3b. Associations of Abuse and Mental Health – Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of abuse</th>
<th>Not abused</th>
<th>Verbally abused</th>
<th>Physically abused</th>
<th>Overall Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M / n$ SD / %</td>
<td>$M / n$ SD / %</td>
<td>$M / n$ SD / %</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse in the past year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempts - LB</td>
<td>13 (15)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression – LB</td>
<td>7.95 (3.06)</td>
<td>8.19 (2.61)</td>
<td>8.36 (2.80)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression - heterosexual</td>
<td>6.96 (2.07)</td>
<td>8.36 (3.89)</td>
<td>7.50 (0.58)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse in previous years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempts - LB</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>14$^+$ (26)</td>
<td>$\chi^2(2) = 5.79^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression – LB</td>
<td>7.49 (2.85)</td>
<td>7.84 (2.89)</td>
<td>8.49 (3.03)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression - heterosexual</td>
<td>6.59 (1.77)</td>
<td>7.30 (2.90)</td>
<td>7.92 (2.67)$^+$</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-LGB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempts - LB</td>
<td>12 (14)</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression – LB</td>
<td>7.86 (2.97)</td>
<td>8.47 (2.77)</td>
<td>8.49 (3.16)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table 3a and Table 3b.

$^*p < .05, **p < .01, ^+ p < .05$ and $^{++} p < .01$ for pairwise comparisons with the non-abused group.

Lifetimes Suicide attempts given. Due to the small numbers of suicide attempts in heterosexual males and females, they are only given for GLB study participants. Current depressive mood is given. $^*p = .05$. 
Table 4. Reporting Incidences for different Forms of Anti-LGB Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of anti-LGB violence (number of individuals)</th>
<th>reporting of incident(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any abuse (103)</td>
<td>70 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (81)</td>
<td>51 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (22)</td>
<td>19 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse (58)</td>
<td>41 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (44)</td>
<td>27 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (14)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical serious abuse(^a) (41)</td>
<td>26 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (36)</td>
<td>21 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (5)</td>
<td>5 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaponized(^b) abuse (15)</td>
<td>12 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt with weapon (3)</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table 4.

\(^a\) Objects thrown, chased/followed, punched/kicked/beaten/hit, threat or hurt with a weapon (items 5, 8, 9, 10), \(^b\) Threatened or hurt with a weapon (items 9 and 10). Only one woman was in this group, so the results are collapsed.
Table 5. Reasons for Not Reporting Anti-LGB Victimization Experiences to the Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for not Reporting</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear or shame</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident was not severe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved the problem by myself</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting would not help</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of secondary victimization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator was a family member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident happened at the workplace</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No anti-discrimination laws</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would have fallen under §209(^a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to stay anonymous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happened in a foreign country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual acts were still illegal(^b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would have cost to much effort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downplayed it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrators threaded me with police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table 5

\(^a\)Until 2002 the Austrian law considered consensual sex between a man of over 18 years old and a man under 18 years old as illegal. Sex between men and women or between women were legal if both partners were at least 14 years old.\(^b\)Until 1971 sexual contact between men or between women were illegal and fell under the same paragraph as sodomy.
Table 6. Reaction of the Police to Reporting Anti-LGB Victimization Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the police</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>