Integrating Discourses:
How High School Culture Contributes to or Mitigates against Sexual Violence and LGBTQ Violence.

By Kathryn Wanner
New York University
June 3, 2014

<u>Introduction</u>

My interest in the prevention of violence for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth began when I worked as a sexual assault advocate. During this time, I provided outreach to schools about sexual assault prevention and worked with adolescent survivors of sexual violence. As I was immersed in the work of sexual violence, I noticed a lack of resources about issues related to LGBTQ victims. Despite research demonstrating that impact of sexual violence on LGBTQ people (Girshick 2002; Todahl et al. 2009; Special Collection 2010), the prevention material and advocate trainings were exclusively focused on heterosexual victims and relationships. Fortunately, in the past five years, with the passage of new laws, such as the LGBTQ inclusions in the Violence Against Women Act, and research on the impact of violence in the LGBTQ community, resources are beginning to emerge. However there are still many populations that are left out of the conversation. For example, there is very little attention, in research or outreach, regarding LGBTQ youth in schools and sexual violence. Schools are a central point of access to the youth community, yet we know very little about sexual violence and LGBTQ youth. This is problematic because school-aged adolescents are at particular risk for experiencing sexual violence and high levels of sexual harassment occur within schools (CDC 2010; AAUW 2011). Because of these high rates of violence, ignoring the potential for schools to prevent or perpetuate sexual violence is not an option. In response to the limited discussion on sexual violence in the LGBTQ community, this thesis aims to investigate the role of schools in sexual violence prevention, specifically regarding the LGBTQ community.

In order to better understand the role of schools, we need to take seriously two questions regarding the integration of LGBTQ youth and sexual violence prevention. The first is to question the limitations of current discussions on these issues in schools. We have seen significant strides in the last ten years for LGBTQ students; unfortunately, much of the focus surrounds the issue of bullying and neglects to address other important issues (Payne and Smith 2012, Robinson and Espelage 2012). We must ask how we can expand initiatives for LGBTQ students to address other forms of violence. The second question is how normativity, including gender norms and heterosexism, impacts violence. Rigid gender norms have been shown to foster anti-LGBTQ violence as well as sexual violence (GLSEN 2012; World Health Organization 2002). "Compulsory heterosexuality" is a theory presented by poet and essayist Adrienne Rich that posits heterosexuality as not just a sexual identity but also an institution that shapes cultural understandings of masculinity and femininity. This concept is useful in looking at school culture in order to investigate the extent that heterosexism perpetuates violence. By doing so we may come to a more comprehensive understanding of how violence works and we may become more able to implement prevention strategies accordingly.

In the hopes of illuminating possibilities for prevention, this thesis is a critical examination, largely based on a review of the literature, on the extent to which schools, as institutions, participate in constructing compulsory heterosexuality (Rich 1986) and how this contributes to a culture of sexual violence in high schools, with particular repercussions in the LGBTQ community. In this review, I will show how schools contribute to normalizing heterosexuality by negating, or neglecting to represent, the

LGBTQ experience and by framing it as non-normative. I am interested in schools as environments that privilege heterosexuality through student discourse, the performance of masculinity and femininity, and other gendered interactions (Quinn 2002; Pascoe 2007). I will then show how school climate connects to the risk of sexual violence for LGBTQ students in order to look at the potential of current prevention programs to address the issue of sexual violence within the LGBTQ community.

LGBTQ Youth and Violence

       Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and to a lesser extent transgender and queer youth have been the subject of recent research for their statistically higher risk of harassment, violence, and suicide and for their lower academic achievement than their peers (GLSEN School Climate Survey 2010; Homes and Cahill 2011; D'Augilli et al 2005; Cianciotto and Cahill, 2012). As a result of this increased attention, the school climate for LGBTQ students has improved dramatically. For example, the prevalence of Gay Straight Alliances (GSAs) has skyrocketed in the last ten years (GLSEN 2012) and the campaign to provide "safe space trainings" for school staff and the implementation of stricter bullying policies has been met with success (Currie et al 2010; GLSEN 2012; Toomey et al 2011). The role of GSAs in offsetting the negative experiences of LGBTQ students is well documented (Szalacha 2003; Toomey et al 2011; Lee 2002; Griffin 2004), showing that increased attention to LGBTQ student issues is necessary for offsetting their risks and contributes to a better learning environment for these young people.

Despite the increased attention to issues affecting the LGBTQ youth community, harassment and violence continue. According to the 2011 school climate survey by the Gay Lesbian Straight Education Network, which surveyed students between the ages of 13 and 20, "63.5% of students felt unsafe because of their sexual orientation, and 43.9% because of their gender expression" and "81.9% were verbally harassed because of their sexual orientation, and 63.9% because of their gender expression" (2012, p. 20). Students targeted for violence demonstrated higher levels of absenteeism, lower grades and lower self esteem, among other negative effects (p. 39). The statistics show that there is still a need for further analysis of the school climate's effects on LGBTQ students.

In this thesis I use the acronym LGBTQ and also the inclusive term "queer." I do this in order to include all students who deviate from rigid gender and sexual norms as being potentially at risk for negative effects of a heteronormative and misogynist school climate. However these issues have differing impacts on students depending on their gender and sexual identity, and they are also deeply impacted by race and class. I attempt to show how normative culture impacts lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students differently. In particular transgender youth are at an increased risk for violence and suffer from a lack of attention, research and resources (GLSEN 2012; CDC 2010). However it is outside of the scope of this thesis to give proper attention to the differing effects of violence based on gender and sexuality. Because of this it is important to note that much more research needs to be done to further explore how negative school climate and limited discussions on violence impact lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer

students in differing ways. In particular we are in need of more research on how

normativity in schools affects transgender and gender nonconforming youth.

Sexual Violence and LGBTQ Students

One particular area that is in need of further examination for its impact on

LGBTQ youth is sexual violence. When I discuss sexual violence I will be referring to

anything outlined by the CDC's recommended definition: sexual violence (SV) "is any

sexual act that is perpetrated against someone's will... including a completed

nonconsensual sex act (i.e., rape), an attempted nonconsensual sex act, abusive sexual

contact... and non-contact sexual abuse (e.g., threatened sexual violence, exhibitionism,

verbal sexual harassment) " (CDC 2002). Using a definition of sexual violence that

includes sexual harassment is in line with the research that all forms of sexual violence

exist on a continuum with escalating severity (Espelage et al. 2012), and also highlights

the gravity of sexual harassment as a form of sexual violence.

The rates of sexual violence in the United States are staggering. According to the

National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC 2012),

1 in 5 women has been the victim of attempted or completed rape in her lifetime, and 44

percent of all victims are under the age of 18. This means that school-aged boys and girls

are nearly half of all victims. According to the CDC report, "Youth Risk Behavior

Surveillance," a study of high school students across the United States, 12 percent of

female students and 4.5 percent of male students were forced to have sexual intercourse,

and 9.5 percent of students reporting experiencing physical dating violence by their

boyfriend or girlfriend (CDC 2011, p. 10). Sexual harassment also occurs at an alarming

rate in high schools in the United States (AAUW 2011). Because of the prevalence of

dating violence, sexual violence and sexual harassment among students, it is important to

ask what role schools can play in the prevention of sexual violence.

However, sexual violence is typically thought of as a problem disproportionately

affecting females rather than an issue for the LGBTQ population (Girshick 2002; Duke

and Davidson 2009). As a result, services addressing sexual assault tend to focus on

straight and cisgender women, and exclude lesbian, gay, or transgender individuals

(Girshick 2002). Meanwhile, the discourse on LGBTQ issues in schools largely focuses

on problems of bullying and suicide prevention (Robinson and Espelage 2012; Payne and

Smith 2012), and does not include other forms of violence. However, by separating the

conversations on sexual violence and LGBTQ issues, we perpetuate the assumption that

sexual violence is not a problem for this community. However, this is not true.

Research shows that 64.4% of LGBTQ students experienced sexual harassment in

schools, and many experience it regularly (GLSEN 2012). Other forms of sexual violence

also occur in high numbers amongst LGBTQ people. In 2010, the CDC issued a report on

intimate partner violence, and for the first time they showed results by sexual orientation.

It reported that lesbian, gay and bisexual men and women experience sexual violence

frequently. For example, 61.1% of bisexual women compared to 35% of heterosexual

women report being victims of rape or physical violence by an intimate partner. Also,

40% of gay men, compared to 21% of heterosexual men, have been raped in their lifetime

(p. 17). The report summarized that in nearly all incidences studied, bisexual and gay

individuals, both men and women, experienced sexual violence at either the same rate or higher than heterosexuals (CDC 2010, p. 2). Several other studies back up the CDC's findings. For example, a study published by the National Institute of Health (2011), summarized a review of 71 peer-reviewed, published articles and concluded that "sexual violence victimization is prevalent among GLB [gay lesbian and bisexual] individuals...GLB individuals may be at increased risk for sexual violence victimization as compared to their heterosexual counterparts" (p. 7). While the research is limited, current findings show that sexual violence is an issue for LGBTQ people.

The research on sexual violence in LGBTQ youth is even scarcer. While the 2010 CDC report only studied individuals who were 18 years of age or older, it did report the age at which sexual violence first occurred, finding that "more than three-quarters of both bisexual and heterosexual women who were victims of completed rape (91% and 78.5% respectively) were raped before 25 years of age" and that in this category the differences between bisexual women and heterosexual women in the 11-17 age range were statistically significant" (p. 13). This shows that LGB sexual violence occurs disproportionately in adolescence, which is in line with the prevalence for the population as a whole (CDC 2012). In order to combat this issue we need more information on the rates of sexual and intimate partner violence in the LGBTQ youth population.

One of the limitations in this field of research is how intersecting identities impact violence. The 2010 report by the CDC did not identify either people of color or transgender people by sexual orientation. This is a severe constraint in that these two populations experience higher rates of other forms of violence (GLSEN School Climate

Survey 2010; Cianciotti and Cahill 2012; Todahl et al. 2009). A preliminary report by the

National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (CNCAVP) found that transgender people

and people of color show higher susceptibility to certain forms of intimate partner

violence (NCAVP 2012). Victims who are racial or ethnic minorities are also impacted

by sexual and intimate partner violence and this is compounded by higher rates of

underreporting and more difficulty accessing services in these communities (World

Report on Violence and Health 2002, Chestnut et al. 2013; Coxell and King 2010;

Girshick 2002; Maier 2008; Todahl et al. 2009; Jindasurat 2014; Ullman and Townsend

2007). While integrating LGBTQ youth as an at risk population, we need to

simultaneously be aware of how race and gender identity impact victimization.

Like heterosexual and cisgender people, LGBTQ people are also affected by

sexual violence, so prevention curriculum in schools needs to be sensitive to, and

inclusive of, these perspectives and experiences. While the research on youth is limited,

preliminary findings show high levels of sexual victimization in LGBTQ populations.

Therefore, it is important to question why conversations around LGBTQ youth focus so

heavily on bullying and often do not include discussion of other types of violence. By

integrating the conversation on anti-LGBTQ violence and sexual violence, we can fill a

gap in the discourse surrounding these two related issues.

Compulsory Heterosexuality and Gender as Performance

It is inescapable to look at any violence outside of the context of masculinity (Leach and Mitchell, 2006, p 7). Because of this, I will investigate the role that schools play in addressing masculinity, femininity, and gender norms. Research on violence, whether it is LGBTQ bullying or sexual assault, states that there is a correlation between rigid and homophobic gender culture and violence; when gender norms are more dichotomized, there tends to be higher levels of homophobia (Buchwald, 2005; Mills, 2001, p 37). The extent to which a school is homophobic often directly relates to how masculinity and femininity are normalized. Therefore, it is important to study how masculinity and femininity are performed in schools, and the extent that this fosters a homophobic climate.

Compulsory heterosexuality is a theory that was presented by poet and essayist Adrienne Rich in her essay "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence" (1980). In it she analyzes the assumption, in both social discourse and literature, that "women are innately heterosexual" and how this assumption reinforces male subordination of women (p. 135). She outlines eight characteristics of male power that are maintained by a societal compulsion toward heterosexuality, such as the power of men "to deny women [their own] sexuality,…to force it [male sexuality] upon them by means of rape,…[and] the socialization of women to feel that male sexual 'drive' amounts to a right" (Rich 1980, p. 131). Although written more than 30 years ago, the tremendous incidences of sexual violence in the United States and worldwide prove the relevance of Rich's observations. Rich explains that compulsory heterosexuality contributes to a culture that supports

sexual violence by normalizing masculine aggression and by equating masculinity with right and access to women's bodies, physically, economically and socially (p. 134).

Compulsory heterosexuality also has consequences for the culture in which anti-queer violence occurs. For identities outside of heterosexuality (Rich speaks specifically to women but I believe her points can extend to queer individuals) are "perceived on a scale ranging from deviant to abhorrent or simply rendered invisible" (130). The invisibility of experience outside heterosexuality is evident in the lack of queer voices integrated into many areas of social discourse in the classroom, such as curricula, prevention education, and school wide events that display heterosexuality, like school dances (GLSEN 2012). Compulsory heterosexuality also works through the rendering of identities as deviant or abhorrent. This can occur through regulating gender behaviors that reinforce male dominance and female submission and by name-calling and harassment against LGBTQ students. By normalizing heterosexuality and making other gender and sexual identities invisible and/or deviant, compulsory heterosexuality contributes to the normalization and acceptance of sexual violence against women and violence against queer people.

It is important to note that Rich is writing as a means of reinterpreting a discursive and physical space for women outside of their relation to men, which she calls "lesbian existence." For Rich these spaces are ripe with opportunities to understand femininity outside of the institution of compulsory heterosexuality. Creating alternative spaces for an understanding of gender has the potential challenge our assumptions of the way we think about sex, sexuality, gender and violence. This is a powerful concept and can be

extended to other types of LGBTQ experiences. Rich writes that "we have been stalled in a maze of false dichotomies" (1980, p. 141), such as the dichotomy of masculinity as dominant and femininity as submissive. Challenging compulsory heterosexuality is so important because by doing so we also challenge violent gendered interactions. By continuing Rich's effort of reinterpreting a space outside of the rigid masculine/feminine dichotomy, we are resisting the acceptance of violence as normal aspect of gendered relations.

To understand how compulsory heterosexuality works in schools, we need a nuanced understanding of the connection between gender and sexual orientation. Using Judith Butler's theory of gender performance, we can look at gender as a specific set of behaviors that are enforced by the expectations of others around us (Butler 1999). Gender is a position ascribed to us at birth and refers to a variety of a person's physical, mental, and personality traits that are used to categorize male and female attributes, such as dress, behavior, characteristics and preferences (LeVay 2012). Gendered behavior can range from the toys children play with to the professions they choose. As almost anything can be gendered, there are numerous ways someone can deviate from gender norms. Gender nonconformity refers to a set of behaviors or traits normally not associated with their ascribed birth gender. The gender identity of individuals refers to how they interpret themselves in relation to these societal understandings (McInroy and Shelley 2012). Some people identify mostly with the gender they were assigned at birth, while others identify with another category, many of which fall outside the male/female dichotomy, like transgender or gender-queer (LeVay 2012). Whatever one's identifications,

reflecting on questions of gender is something that many people do. Egan and Perry argue that "most people devote at least some time to reflecting on questions like...How well do I fit with my gender category?" (Egan and Perry 2001). And for those who do not conform to normative gender characteristics, this process has additional challenges, such as societal ostracism (McInroy and Shelley 2012).

Although gender nonconformity exists across all sexual orientations, gay men and lesbians are often, in research and popular discourse, associated with gender atypical behavior (McCormack 2012). However this line of thinking is incomplete and can promote stereotypes of gay and lesbian individuals. In the book Gay, Straight, and the Reason Why: The Science of Sexual Orientation, Simon LeVay reviews the research on the correlation between sexual orientation and gender nonconformity, showing that homosexual or bisexual individuals are often "gender typical." However, he also cites many studies that show that gay men and lesbians are more likely to exhibit gender nonconforming behavior both in adulthood and childhood, and the connection between "gender atypicality" and sexuality is stronger in boys and men than girls and women (2012, p. 73). LeVay examines the biological relationship between gender and sexuality stating that "some traits appear to be fully gender-transposed in gay people, some are shifted part of the way toward the other sex, some are transposed only in gay men or only in lesbians, some are not shifted at all, and one or two are shifted in the opposite direction to what stereotypes might lead one to predict" (p. 97). While sexual minority youth are perhaps more likely to have unexpected gender expression, there is not a universal connection and many do not. Deviation from gender norms, as well as identification with

the a gender different than that assigned at birth, is something relevant to many people regardless of their sexual orientation.

More importantly than the actual correlation between gender and sexuality is how they are confused in sociological and public discourse and practice. In her ethnography of a California high school, Sociologist C.J. Pascoe argues, "masculinity and femininity are forged through a heterosexual matrix" (Pascoe 2007, p. 26). A heterosexual matrix is a term borrowed from Butler (1994) that, in part, describes the extent that heterosexism permeates culture, and, in this case, how students talk about, perform, and understand gender. As Michael Myers notes in his ethnography on homophobia in schools, violence or harassment against LGBTQ individuals is not only an attack on sexuality, but also occurs when individuals perform gender inappropriately (Myer 2006). There are many ways that students enforce normative gender roles on each other, and this can often includes imperatives towards heterosexuality (Pascoe 2007).   The word "fag" is normally thought of as a derogatory term for a homosexual male, but in everyday speech, it is often used to refer to gender displays rather than sexuality. Words and name calling surrounding homosexual behavior can act as a way for young people to monitor each other's gender behavior. As more attention is being drawn to gay rights issues, the role that gender plays is sometimes left unquestioned. Because gender norms are correlated with sexual and domestic violence, as well as the heightened risk for transgender students and other gender nonconforming youth, the role of gender in regulating behavior becomes even more important (D'Augelli et al. 2005). When strict versions of a heterosexualized masculinity and femininity are enforced through harassment, gender

becomes a means to monitor sexuality and those most at risk are those who deviate from these norms.

A discussion of sexuality and gender must include an understanding of their interconnected nature. That is why I chose to look at school culture through the lens of compulsory heterosexuality in order to understand its connection to the production of gender norms and sexual violence. As Rich states, "The failure to examine heterosexuality as an institution is like failing to admit that the economic system called capitalism or the caste system of racism is maintained by a variety of forces, including both physical violence and false consciousness" (1980, p. 135). It is pertinent to examine heterosexuality as an institutional imperative that normalizes violent behavior.

The Impact of Compulsory Heterosexuality in Schools

To understand how violence works within schools, we must look at how compulsory heterosexuality permeates school culture. This can happen through the normalization of certain gendered behaviors, negative reactions to LGBTQ students, and by school curricula ignoring or neglecting to represent differing gendered and sexual realities and identities. This process can occur among students, among teachers, and also through institutional practices and policies. This section will look at the ways that compulsory heterosexuality impacts school culture, with specific attention to how this relates to gender and sexual violence.

One way that the normalization of heterosexuality occurs in schools is between students. One example is the discourse of masculinity as mastery over girls' bodies

(Pascoe 2007). In Pascoe's ethnography, she describes "getting girls" as a way that the students perform masculinity through talking about their ability to sleep with girls. She explains that some "boys try and try and try to get a girl until one finally gives in." Boys who can't 'get' a girl often respond with anger or frustration because of their presumed right to girls' bodies'" (p. 95). McCormack's (2011) ethnography describes a similar phenomenon as "conquestial recuperation," which is a way to maintain one's heterosexual identity through conquests over girls. Boys and men participate in behavior to defend their heterosexual identity, called "heterosexual recuperation." McCormack interprets the boys in his study's descriptions of their conquests with girls as a way to reassure and reaffirm their heterosexual identity. Both Pascoe and McCormack show how masculinity and heterosexuality are contingent on a performance of access to girls' bodies.

The way the students use physicality to participate in gender roles can also be problematic. For example the types of physical interaction that occurs or does not occur between students can reinforce notions of compulsory heterosexuality and masculine dominance. Not only can touch be used to exclude, such as the disapproval or disallowance of same sex touching, especially in boys, but the way that girls and boys touch each other in schools can also be problematic. For example, in Pascoe's ethnography, the touching that occurred between girls and boys often insinuated violence. She notes that "touching rituals ranged from playfully flirtatious to assault like interactions" (2007, p. 97), the incidences of flirtatious touching many times became "increasingly violent, until a girl squealed, cried, or just gave up" (p. 98). The threat of

violence through touch reminds girls of their lack of agency over their own bodies, and also reinforces the notion of masculine dominance and feminine submission. How teachers, administrators and school policy address students' physical behavior is important in creating a safe environment in schools.

The performance of "getting girls" through discourse and physical displays of dominance is a problem, not only because it reinforces masculinity as necessarily heterosexual, but also it contributes to the normalization of sexual violence. A recent study found that many schoolgirls view sexually violent behavior by boys as normal. Sociologist Heather Hlavka (2014) studied 100 forensic interview videotapes of sexual abuse victims between the ages of 3 and 17 and found that "young women overwhelmingly depicted boys and men as natural sexual aggressors" (p. 8), and many of the girls in the study reported that they expected boys to make unwanted sexual advances, ranging from incidences of sexual harassment to sexual assault. The expectations of violence reported by the girls in this study were accompanied by feelings of self-blame by the victims of sexual violence. By paying close attention to the expectations of youth survivors, the study shows that sexual violence for many is reported as an expected type of interaction between boys and girls. One participant in Hlavka's study commented that "'they [school boys] grab you, touch your butt and try to, like, touch you in the front, and run away, but it's okay, I mean . . . I never think it's a big thing because they do it to everyone'" (p. 8). Hlavka also identifies peer groups as contributing to the normalization of sexually aggressive behavior; the youth in her study were more likely to identify sexual aggression as normal if they were part of a peer group that also held these beliefs

(p. 8). In this study, compulsory heterosexuality is maintained through the acceptance of boys as aggressors. This normalization is mirrored in Pascoe's (2007) ethnography, where she writes that "a close examination indicates that rituals of 'getting girls' relied on a threat of sexualized violence that reaffirmed a sexualized inequality central to the gender order at River High" (p. 93). This, Pascoe argues, exists in a "rape paradigm, where masculinity is predicated on overcoming women's bodily desire and control" (p. 99). By normalizing the "primacy and uncontrollability of the male sexual drive" (Rich 1980, p. 134), girls and boys (as well as teachers and administrators) tolerate and expect aggressive behavior in boys against girls. The "getting girls" discourse also exists within the rape myth ideology that men are naturally inclined to harass and conquer women and rape is an inevitable consequence of this natural drive. At the heart is the idea that masculinity is defined through the sexual attainment of women, which promotes sexual harassment, masculine aggression, victim blaming, and threatens sexual violence.

Another manner in which compulsory heterosexuality manifests in a violent way is through the "fag discourse." Pascoe (2007) cites examples of boys calling each other a 'fag' in order to dissuade a wide variety of behavior, such as ways of dressing, acting or behaving. In these instances, boys use homophobia to shame and pressure other boys into acting in a 'masculine identified' way. According to Pascoe, fag is an "abject identity," a term borrowed from Judith Butler (1995) to describe "unrecognizably and unacceptably gendered selves" (p.13). Not only does the "fag" connote homosexuality, but it also plays a role in regulating masculine behavior. In fact, Pascoe found that fag was more often used as critique of gender behavior than sexual orientation. She writes that "fag"

could be hurled at boys for a multitude of reasons, and was not a static identity of homosexuality, "but was a position that could be moved in and out of, depending on how well you embodied normalized versions of masculine behavior" (p. 61).

Pascoe found the fag identity to be such an unwanted category that the boys in Pascoe's ethnography "claimed they would be driven to violence" if they had to interact with someone who embodied the fag identity. For example the life of a student "Ricky," whose sexuality and gender identity led him to permanently inhabit the 'fag position' that other boys were able to move out of, included constant threats of violence and actual violence (p. 70). Pascoe found that the fag was so feared by the boys in her study because it represented the failure to adequately perform masculinity. She writes that "becoming a fag has as much to do with failing at the masculine tasks of competence, heterosexual prowess, and strength or in any way revealing weakness or femininity as it does with sexual identity" (p. 54). The fag discourse is principally connected to gender regulation and works as a way to normalize and police normative masculine gender behaviors among students. The high prevalence of the use of "fag" thrown at gay and gender nonconforming students and the impact these terms have on sense of safety (GLSEN 2012), show that the threat of violence is a common lived experience of those that deviate from normalized masculine behavior. Violating the culture of compulsory heterosexuality through gender displays and perceived or actual sexual orientation, the fag inhabits the passive and incompetent feminine, and by doing so is deemed abnormal and ultimately punished through violence and harassment.

Compulsory heterosexuality and gender normativity have been shown to have different impacts on boys and girls. While femininity is the target of certain forms of violence, such as sexual harassment, and sexual violence, it is less stigmatized for girls to perform outside of their normative gender and sexual roles in youth (GLSEN 2012; Lytton and Romney 1991; D'Augelli et al. 2008). Misogyny and heterosexism have different impact on girls than boys. One example is how students in schools talk about lesbianism. For example, it may be accepted for a girl to be gay if it is related as a sexual fantasy for boys. Pascoe writes that "several students told me that these homophobic insults applied only to boys and not to girls" and that "lesbians were 'good' because of their place in heterosexual male fantasy, not necessarily because of some enlightened approach to same-sex relationships" (p. 54). In Pascoe's study, the students accept lesbianism as long as it is congruent with females as objects of male's sexual fantasies. This exists inside of a broader cultural discourse on feminine lesbianism as "a sexual commodity to be consumed by males" (Rich 1980, p. 133). As long as men remain in control of women's sexuality, lesbianism can be tolerated as long as it exists for male pleasure.

While femininity in boys is ultimately feared and stigmatized by many, its performance in girls may have more of a complicated set of consequences. According to GLSEN's school climate survey (2012), girls reported less bullying and harassment based on their gender identity and sexual orientation than the boys (p. 90). Girls may also obtain a level of masculine privilege through gender nonconforming behavior. In the article "Tomboy as a Protective Identity," Craig and Lacroix (2011) support this idea by

demonstrating that the tomboy identity might provide (limited) access to privileged masculine spaces. In Pascoe's ethnography, she saw girls who participated in sports, a typically masculine domain, as having access to a self-perception of their bodies as not just "objects to be ogled but active and powerful" bodies (p. 154). In this example, girls' access to typically masculine spaces provided them with a means to understand their bodies' strength and physicality.

Masculinity in girls can provide privilege to certain girls while disrupting the gender binary but can also reinforce masculine dominance over femininity. Some of the girls in Pascoe's ethnography exhibited behavior that "came at the cost of dignity for normatively gendered girls" by "objectifying girls that sometimes looked like boys' masculinity practices (2007, p. 155). Pascoe writes that certain girls she studied "successfully embodied masculinity themselves by dominating others, dressing like boys, competing like boys, fighting like boys, and dating girls as heterosexual boys did" (p. 162). The objectification of girls by other girls functions to reinforce notions of masculine dominance and feminine submission, when the masculinity in girls is performed through the domination of others. While masculinity performed by girls may mirror heterosexist discourse as masculine dominance over femininity, masculinity in schoolgirls is complex because girls do not occupy the same privileged masculine spaces as boys do. Research shows that girls are also stigmatized for performing non-normative gendered behavior (D'Augelli et al. 2005; GLSEN 2012). While masculinity in girls is stigmatized, in certain situations it can also reinforce notions of feminine submission, so

it is important look at for the ways masculinity in girls in some ways can promote gender normativity.

Student discourse interacts with a variety of institutional factors that also reinforce compulsory heterosexuality in schools. One such factor is the role of teachers in constructing or deconstructing heteronormative behavior. Teachers serve as role models, conversation guides, and monitors of student interaction. The visibility, or lack, of out LGBTQ teachers, also impacts the heteronormative climate of schools (GLSEN 2012). Out teachers can serve as role models of experiences outside the heterosexual framework (McCormack 2011). Another way that teachers interact with the culture of compulsory heterosexuality is by engaging in, or ignoring, problematic discourses between students. In the example of sexual harassment, Charmaraman et al. (2013) argue in their article "Is it Bullying or Sexual Harassment? Knowledge, Attitudes and Professional Development Experiences of Middle School Staff," that school administrators could not adequately distinguish between sexual harassment and bullying. They found that administrators "tended to define sexual harassment as something that occurs between adults and/or between adults and students and did not perceive their role in enforcing a 'sexual harassment-free' peer-to-peer school zone" (Charmaraman et al, 2013, p. 438). This exemplifies a lack of awareness of teachers and administrators, which prevents schools from adequately addressing sexual harassment. Similarly, Pascoe (2007) reports that teachers often ignored homophobic or sexist comments between students, and, at times, engaged or participated in them (p. 36). GLSEN (2012) reports a possible link between the intervention by staff and the levels of self-reported safety by the students (p. 16).

Because safety is an issue of feeling protected from violence, the link between students'

safety and teacher intervention is relevant. The extent to which teachers participate in,

interrupt, or reinforce heteronormative and sexist discourses contributes to the reach of

compulsory heterosexuality in schools.

School policies and procedures can also play a role in supporting or interrupting

students' violent discourse. An example of this is how schools address sexual harassment.

The above examples of the 'fag discourse' and the rhetoric of 'getting girls' may easily

fall into the definition of sexual harassment, which is illegal, although school authorities

may not treat it as such. For example, a 2004 study on sexual harassment, conducted by

the National Association of School Psychologists, found that 80% of students report

experiencing sexual harassment (Young et al 2004). In fact, as reported by Elizabeth

Myers (2006) in her overview of sexual harassment issues, "verbal harassment is the

most common form of sexual harassment reported by students. Male students often assert

their masculinity by degrading their female peers with terms such as 'bitch,' 'baby,'

'chick,' and 'fucking broad.' Males also perform their masculinity by sexually

objectifying their female peers and discussing the sexual acts they would like to engage

in" (p 45). Sexual harassment as a pervasive issue is part of a larger culture that degrades

femininity and supports an atmosphere that facilitates attitudes of masculine dominance

and homophobia (Myers 2006). A school's failure to address sexual harassment is an

example of how a school can function as a place that supports the compulsion towards

normative gender behavior.

Compulsory heterosexuality is not just about what is being said, but also about what is omitted from school curriculum. Schools function as an institution that normalizes heterosexuality through lack of LGBTQ representations and the normalization of heterosexuality. One way that this normalization works is through the assumption by teachers, students, and administrators that all students and teachers are heterosexual, allowing school discussions, curriculum and rituals to be normalized as heterosexual (Epstein and Johnson 1994). For example, school dances that promote heterosexual pairing and class discussion depicting only heterosexual relationships with no representation of LGBTQ experiences reinforce what Rich (1980) calls "the ideology of heterosexual romance" (p. 134). The erasure of LGBTQ experience is another way that school culture promotes compulsory heterosexuality. In schools, this can happen when there is a lack of class discussion of LGBTQ perspectives (McCormick 2011; GLSEN 2012). The majority of students in the GLSEN survey (83.2%) did not encounter relevant LGBTQ history, events or figures in the classroom (p. 48). The inclusion of a discussion of LGBTQ perspectives in sexual education and any violence prevention initiatives is also critical. The GLSEN survey also found a connection between abstinence-only education and the overall negative school environment for LGBTQ students, perhaps because the programs "assumes a universal heterosexuality and emphasize that physically intimate relationships are harmful outside the context of marriage, an option unavailable to same-sex couples in all but a few states" (p. 50). We know that the integration of LGBTQ perspectives in class discussions, especially in relationship issues, safe sex and dating violence discussions may help to mitigate the risks for LGBTQ students (Cox et

al. 2010). However, the connection between LGBTQ inclusiveness and prevalence of sexual violence is less clear. By addressing school culture's normalization and compulsion towards heterosexuality and confronting students' perspective on gender and sexual normativity, it is possible that we can simultaneously disrupt the culture in which sexual and LGBTQ violence occurs.

A Look Towards Prevention

    With an understanding of the relationship between compulsory heterosexuality and sexual and gender violence, we can better address how schools may work to prevent incidences of violence within the LGBTQ community. Although the issue of LGBTQ sexual violence in schools is not being directly tackled, many organizations are working to challenge school climate, including the cultural and gender norms, in which sexual violence occurs. In this next section I first look at programs that address various aspects of compulsory heterosexuality in school culture, primarily by targeting LGBTQ issues of safety and addressing cultural components of prevention. Then I move to look at direct service organizations, such as domestic violence centers, sexual assault organizations, and anti-violence projects for their inclusion of LGBTQ issues. It is unfortunate that a program does not exist that directly integrates a discussion of LGBTQ sexual violence into school prevention. Without such a model, it is important to look to programs that are working on issues related to LGBTQ and sexual violence so that we may think of ways to combine the conversations effectively. I present these discussions together in hopes that by looking at how these programs target issues of violence, we can imagine how to integrate discussions of sexual violence and LGBTQ violence in schools.

Programs That Challenge Compulsory Heterosexuality in Schools

      Compulsory heterosexuality is created partially through the narrow definitions of masculinity and femininity, including performing masculinity as dominance and femininity as submission, and the erasure of the homosexual experience. Interventions in LGBTQ sexual violence can occur through a variety of ways, such as discussions of gender norms, including LGBTQ perspectives into classroom discussions, providing students information on the power of words, as well as inclusive sexual violence programs. In this section I look at organizations that are concerned with LGBTQ safety, but do not tackle sexual violence, and also at sexual violence prevention initiatives that show potential for LGBTQ inclusion.

Gay Straight Alliances and LGBTQ Inclusion in Schools

      One organization that is working to disrupt rigid gender norms is the Gay Straight Alliance National Network. Gay Straight Alliances (GSAs) are organizations, usually in the form of after school clubs, for LGBTQ youth and their allies. Their goal is to provide safe spaces to address issues relevant to LGBTQ students in the school community, as well as holding school-wide events and campaigns. Schools with an active GSA report fewer incidents of homophobic harassment and an improved overall school climate (GLSEN 2012). GSAs also markedly improve the well being of LGBTQ students, with students reporting lower rates of mental health distress, violence, rates of suicide and higher academic performance (Cianciotto and Cahill 2012; Heck et al 2013).

The history of Gay Straight Alliances (GSAs) in the United States dates back to the early 1990s, when schools began to build "safe spaces" for lesbian and gay teens and their allies as a response to the homophobic bullying and harassment students were facing in schools (Perotti and Westheimer 2001). In the years since the first GSAs, the goals of the organizations have become more complex. Whereas the original GSAs were designed to combat bullying and harassment, research suggests they have evolved beyond this intention and are also used as spaces where conversation and questions about gender identity and gender norms occurs (Cianciotto and Cahill, 2012, p. 98). The mission statement reflects this change by stating that the goals of GSAs are to "educate schools about homophobia, transphobia, gender identity, and sexual orientation" (GSA Network 2014).

In her ethnography, Pascoe (2007) highlights some positive effects of the GSA at the school she studies. She identifies that the girls in the GSA were more likely to reinterpret gender in creative ways. For example, the girls in the GSA typically mixed elements of masculine and feminine apparel, such as "wearing a cubic zirconia tie with a slinky red velvet dress", whereas the girls outside the GSA performed masculinity by wearing "masculine clothing on a regular basis" (p. 152). While both groups of girls performed masculinity through clothing, the mixing of feminine and masculine clothing by the GSA girls imply a greater propensity to disrupt the masculine feminine binary and creatively perform gender. Her ethnography suggests that there may be a freedom created in safe spaces, such as the GSA, where students can question and reinterpret gender. Because schools can foster homophobia and enforce rigid gender norms, GSAs are

imperative at providing spaces that challenge gender normativity and heteronormativity. They provide students with access to supportive faculty, a place to reinterpret and discuss gender and sexuality, and provide resources for students to find information, such as crisis prevention material (Cianciotto and Cahill 2012). As the knowledge about sexual violence within the LGBTQ community grows, GSAs might also provide points of access for information to be distributed to the LGBTQ community and their allies regarding sexual violence prevention.

Another organization that directly addresses compulsory heterosexuality in schools is the Gay, Lesbian, Straight, Education Network (GLSEN). GLSEN is a national organization that works with schools by providing resources and programming for students and educators to create a safer school climate for LGBTQ students. Their programs build awareness around issues like gendered harassment and promote LGBTQ inclusion into the curriculum. For example, No Name-calling Week directly addresses verbal harassment by drawing attention to the ill effects of name-calling. To implement No Name-calling Week, GLSEN provides educators with several lesson plans surrounding the issue of name-calling. One example is a lesson called "What's in A Name", which encourages students to consider how name-calling is part of their lives and learn the history behind commonly used derogatory names, such as "faggot" and "slut" (GLSEN 2012). This type of lesson directly challenges students' usage of specific words with highly gendered implications. In a study of the effectiveness of No Name-Calling Week, GLSEN found that the number of students who reported witnessing teasing, name-calling and bullying at their schools decreased" (GLSEN 2005 p. 2). This shows promise

for programs like these to lessen the prevalence of name-calling and harassment. Another GLSEN program of interest is Transgender Day of Remembrance, which raises awareness on violence in the transgender community. Many of the lessons provided by GLSEN for this day tackle issues gender normativity directly. The lessons encourage students and teachers to challenge gender conformity in schools by questioning things like how male/female bathrooms and locker rooms affect transgender students. As we begin to question these types of issues, we see how gender informs many practices throughout school. By providing programming for students to begin to challenge gender norms and gendered language, GLSEN effectively addresses compulsory heterosexuality in schools.

GLSEN also offers educators various resources, like the "LGBT-Inclusive Curriculum Guide for Educators." (GLSEN 2014) This guide provides teachers with ways to think about including LGBTQ perspectives in more aspects of the curriculum, as well as instructions on how to usefully incorporate LGBTQ discussions into math and writing lessons. Interventions like these empower teachers with information to disrupt the heteronormative focus of school curriculum. This helps to normalize LGBTQ experience and facilitate an ongoing discussion of gender and sexuality in schools. Through programs that open up dialogues about things such as masculinity, name-calling, LGBTQ silence, and LGBTQ inclusion into the curriculum, GLSEN is directly addressing gender and heteronormativy in schools.

In addition to its programming, GLSEN's School Climate Survey is an example in how research can impact school culture. The School Climate Survey conducts research

on issues relevant to the LGBTQ student population, such as school resources, policies, possible interventions, and lived experiences of LGBTQ students. The survey is important because it reports both the experiences of LGBTQ students, such as comparatively high levels of sexual harassment, and the school factors that may contribute to these experiences. The survey also shows possibilities for improving school climate. For example, the conclusions from the 2011 School Climate Survey advocate LGBTQ inclusive curricula, supportive school personnel, comprehensive sexual education, and school policies for addressing harassment, bullying and assault as supportive to students' perceptions of safety (GLSEN 2012).

The School Climate Survey gives us an example of the type of survey that could extend to include questions related to sexual violence. GLSEN, through its work with GSAs and schools, has enormous reach to impact school climate. Notably the organization includes sexual harassment in its surveys, but other types of sexual violence are not included. This highlights the need for an instrument to study sexual violence and LGBTQ youth. GLSEN does not contribute to the research on other forms of sexual violence but fills the gaps in other ways, by providing research on school climate, various forms of violence and harassment, and by offering cultural and curricular intervention programs. Although this organization fails to address sexual violence, it can serve as a model for the type of intervention that successfully addresses school culture for violence prevention.

The Trevor Project and Suicide Prevention

Suicide prevention programs in schools also provide a model that is beneficial in understanding how to address other forms of LGBTQ violence. For example, The Trevor Project is an organization aimed at the prevention and intervention of suicide among LGBTQ students, who are at a higher risk of suicidal attempts and ideation (D'Augelli et al. 2005). The Trevor Project addresses school culture in a variety of ways. It provides trainings to educators to inform them of challenges that LGBTQ youth face and offers "Ally Training" programming for staff, which supplies educators with information regarding LGBTQ youth and suicide. The Trevor Project also uses innovative methods to access youth, such as a 24 hour crisis hotline, texting services, a chat room, a social networking community and free question and answer services (The Trevor Project 2014). The Trevor Project also released a comprehensive "Model School District Policy on Suicide Prevention", which provides a list of ways schools can improve how they prevent and address suicide. This model raises awareness about issues related to suicide in the LGBTQ population, such as its connection to bullying, the signs and symptoms of suicide risk, recommendations for prevention programs, and the importance of referral resources. This document is an example of a type of resource that sexual violence educators could provide to schools regarding LGTBQ students. The Trevor Project addresses the silence surrounding suicide and highlights an issue that is particularly relevant for LGBTQ youth in a comprehensive way. As the climate of the school and LGBTQ student suicide risk may also be related, the extent to which the school is involved is crucial to the prevention of suicide (Hatzenbuehler 2014).

Suicidal behavior and thoughts are often a symptom of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, which can occur after a sexual victimization. Adolescents who experience sexual violence and trauma are significantly more likely to experience suicidal ideation or attempt suicide (Tomasula et al. 2012). Because suicide is comparatively more of a problem for victims of sexual violence and for LGBTQ students, LGBTQ victims of sexual violence may be in increased need of resources like The Trevor Project. Unfortunately The Trevor Project does not list sexual violence as an area of concern or specialization on their website. Despite this, it offers crisis counseling to LGBTQ students and therefore can function as resource for LGBTQ victims of sexual violence who experience crisis situations. Because of the interconnected nature of trauma and suicide, suicide prevention initiatives and sexual violence prevention initiatives need to collaborate more effectively in order to best serve LGBTQ youth.

School Culture, Violence, and Youth of Color

Violence must be understood through the complex institutions in which it operates. Although this analysis focuses on the effects of compulsory heterosexuality in schools, other factors, such as the class and race of students, greatly increase the risk of being victims of violence (Maier 2008; World Report on Violence and Health 2002). Prevention initiatives must be relevant to the demographics of the school, and issues specifically impacting LGBTQ students of color must be addressed at the programming level. Organizations aimed at violence prevention for LGBTQ youth of color help to address the impact of race on victimhood. We know that people of color are

disproportionately affected by violence (CDC 2011) and that heterosexualized violence

interacts with racism, misogyny and classism. The Audre Lorde Project and FIERCE,

two New York based organizations, are examples of organizations that address LGBTQ

people of color and risk of violence. The Audre Lorde Project aims to work at the

intersection of different modes of power, such a race, class, sexual orientation (The

Audre Lorde Project 2014). FIERCE challenges school climate by engaging queer youth

of color as potential change agents. For example, the "Education for Liberation

Project" is a program directed at queer youth of color that "provides comprehensive

community organizing, political education, and anti-oppression trainings to new and

active members of FIERCE" (FIERCE 2014), thereby engaging youth to pinpoint issues

that are relevant to the community. Although neither FIERCE nor The Audre Lorde

Project addresses sexual violence and youth explicitly, these organizations have the

potential to provide a point of potential collaboration for other organizations working

directly with youth survivors of sexual violence. By looking at how violence operates

through institutions of compulsory heterosexuality, racism and classism, we can hope to

reach the populations that are impacted most.

Sexual Violence Prevention and Youth

The research on dating violence and sexual violence prevention in schools

overwhelmingly supports institutional and cultural interventions as fundamental to

successful prevention models (Taylor et al. 2011; Cox et al. 2010). Research on sexual

violence prevention initiatives acknowledge that sexual violence does not occur as

isolated incidents between individuals, but it "occurs within social contexts that vary in the degree to which such behaviors are condoned or promoted… prevention strategies must address social norms and individual behaviors" (Cox, 2010, p 304). For example the Center for Disease Control's supported model of prevention, The Rape Prevention Education model, advocates addressing societal level issues in the prevention of sexual violence, which would include initiatives to "determine societal norms that accept vio- lence and to identify strategies for changing those norms" (CDC 2004, p. 5). By addressing cultural norms, sexual and dating violence prevention efforts that target school culture can also have an impact on LGBTQ students.

One prevention model that addresses the societal level issues of violence is the bystander model of prevention. The bystander model of prevention is a model that is focused not on victims and perpetrators, but addresses a wider audience by approaching "both women and men as potential bystanders or witnesses to behaviors related to sexual violence" (Banyard et al 2005). The bystander approach aims to teach participants to intervene when they witness an act of harassment, sexism or homophobia. Because students themselves are often the perpetrators of violence, providing information for students on ways to recognize and intervene when a violent interaction occurs may change the ways students approach volatile situations. Because the bystander model theorizes violence as an issue affecting everyone in the community, it removes focus on the victim/perpetrator binary, thereby encouraging all members of the community to act. Because of its inclusiveness this type of approach has been shown promise in preventing LGBTQ harassment. (Potter et al. 2012). Violence against women and against LGBTQ

people can be disrupted only when a community is empowered to act. Therefore, programs that ask the entire community to notice and intervene in potentially violent situations may lessen the impact of violence on underserved populations that are normally ignored in sexual violence prevention (Potter et al. 2012).

The bystander model also shows promise because many programs that follow this model address issues of gender normativity directly. For example, Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) is a program by violence educator and sociologist Jackson Katz. It is one of the first programs of its kind and uses a model that addresses boys and girls separately to discuss questions of assault, intimidation, manhood and womanhood. The MVP model is in many schools in the United States and shows promise because it targets cultural conceptions of masculinity and femininity (Katz 2014). The program is not aimed explicitly at LGBTQ students. But thinking about how rigid gender constructions help to create and maintain a violent culture is helpful in combating violence, not only against woman, as is the aim of this program, but against violence within the LGBTQ community (Potter and Stapleton 2012).

Like the MVP program, The Men's Project is a bystander approach model of violence prevention. The Men's Project was specifically formulated to address undergraduate men and question their conceptions of social and gender norms and to teach tools for bystander intervention. A preliminary survey-based study on the effectiveness of the program found that students who participated in the program showed a decline in "sexism, rape myth acceptance, and gender-biased language use in addition to increases in collective action willingness, feminist activism, and bystander efficacy"

(Stewart 2013). The study shows promise for programs like this that challenge cultural

conceptions of gender.

There are several other organizations that are aimed at young boys and men and

their conception of masculinity. For example, CONNECT, a domestic violence

prevention organization, provides a program called "Transitioning into Men" that

challenges participants' misconceptions about gender in all male working groups

(CONNECT Youth 2014). What these prevention programs have in common is that they

target men and boys and their definitions of masculinity. Approaching male spaces and

discussing masculinity within a framework of violence prevention creates a potential to

interrogate rigid ideas about masculinity and femininity.

Although these prevention models show potential for interrupting the violent

culture of schools, they are so far incomplete. For one, MVP is the only program that

targets high schools and also includes girls in the discussion (although in a separate,

single sex environment). And none of the programs include a specifically LGBTQ

framework. In the article "Addressing Sexual and Relationship Violence in the LGBT

Community Using a Bystander Framework", Potter and her colleagues (2010)

demonstrate the potential for the bystander approach to prevent violence "not only in the

majority campus community but also in marginalized campus communities (e.g., LGBTQ

and the disabled). Programs that engage community members as both bystanders and

victims work to break down the isolation that threatens potential victims" (p. 5).

Programs like the bystander approach by involving the entire community and opening up

discussions about gender, show promise in their effectiveness for impacting sexual

violence for LGBTQ students.

LGBTQ Inclusion in Direct Services for Sexual and Intimate Partner Violence

Compulsory heterosexuality functions partially through the silencing of queer

experiences, such as the heterosexualized discourse of sexual violence. One way this is

done is through rape myths, which are cultural ideas about sexual violence that carry with

them classed, racialized and gendered implications of what it means to be a victim and

perpetrator (Seaboyer 1991). Namely, the dominant narrative is that the victim and the

perpetrator exist inside a "heterosexual matrix" (Butler 1990), where the aggressor is

understood to be a heterosexual male and the victim a heterosexual female (Schuller et al.

2010; Suarez and Gadalla 2010). This simultaneously enforces the idea that males have

unadulterated access to feminine sexuality, while making invisible the occurrence of

sexual violence against LGBTQ people. While it is true that women are

disproportionately victims of sexual violence (CDC 2012), they are not the only victims.

Research shows that women of color, LGBTQ, and males are also impacted by sexual

and intimate partner violence, and this is expounded by higher rates of underreporting

and more difficulty accessing services (Chestnut et al. 2013; Coxell and King 2010;

Girshick 2002; Jindasurat 2014; Maier 2008; Todahl et al. 2009; Ullman and Townsend

2007; World Report on Violence and Health 2002). Transgender individuals are also at

an especially high risk of sexual violence (Grant et al. 2011). One study showed that

violence, including sexual violence and harassment, had the effect of limiting mobility

among transgender individuals and overall negatively impacted the participants' quality

of life (Jauk 2013). Therefore programs that are implicitly geared towards white women

are incomplete in addressing the populations that are impacted by sexual violence. We

must be aware of how other underserved populations are impacted by sexual violence and

broaden our discussion on sexual violence to include victims of different gender, sexual

orientation, race, and ethnic categories.

In order to address sexual victimization of LGBTQ youth, we must understand

where there has already been progress. One such area is the inclusion of LGBTQ-

sensitive services in direct service organizations. Direct service organizations include

counseling centers, medical, and support services that work directly with LGBTQ

survivors in the community. Programs directed at LGBTQ victims of sexual violence are

important because they dismantle the myth that sexual or intimate partner violence exists

only in heterosexual interactions, and also because they provide spaces for LGBTQ

individuals to access services without fear of discrimination (Gentlewarrior 2009).

Unfortunately, many of the programs working to address this gap primarily focus on

adult survivors and have minimal interaction with schools. Despite the fallbacks, I

believe it is important to demonstrate the emerging organizations that are working to

include LGBTQ people in the sexual violence and intimate partner violence discourse.

LGBTQ Anti-Violence Organizations

One type of organization that has potential to include resources and services for

LGBTQ survivors of sexual violence are LGBTQ Anti-violence Organizations.

Organizations that are broadly aimed at violence within the LGBTQ community have historically focused more on hate crimes and verbal harassment, but they are beginning to include services aimed at sexual violence and relationship violence. These organizations are important because they have a base of knowledge and connection to LGBTQ individuals, and they understand a broad range of issues that impact these communities. An example of this type of organization is the New York City Anti-Violence Project (AVP), which works with various programs aimed at preventing and providing services to many different types of violence that LGBTQ individuals may face. According to its mission, the organization works at the "intersection of violence prevention and LGBTQH [H for HIV infected] equality" (The Anti-Violence Project 2014). AVP currently provides counseling services and support groups for LGBTQ survivors of sexual violence. AVP is also running a public awareness campaign called "Sexual Violence: Let's Talk About It" to reduce the stigma that may affect LGBTQ survivors. Organizations knowledgeable on LGBTQ issues, like AVP, are also able to form alliances with sexual violence and domestic violence centers. For example, AVP has partnered with the New York City Domestic Violence Shelter, and is running the "Domestic Violence, We Can Help" campaign, which specifically addresses domestic violence in the LGBTQ community and has created a domestic violence shelter specifically focused on LGBTQ individuals (The Anti-Violence Project 2014).

Several organizations specifically focus on transgender people who are survivors of sexual violence. One organization is FORGE, a Wisconsin based organization aimed at providing support for transgender individuals. It runs several national campaigns in

collaboration with the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs and campaigns to

address sexual violence and domestic violence for transgender people (Anti-Violence

Projects 2014). The Survivor Project also addresses transgender survivors of sexual

violence and domestic violence through community education and organizing (Survivor

Project 2003). These two organizations are crucial in addressing issues specific to

transgender individuals who are impacted by sexual violence. While these organizations

do not currently partner directly with schools, they provide resources for queer survivors

who may not feel comfortable accessing services at sexual violence and domestic

violence clinics, and they provide opportunities to partner with other direct service

organizations in hopes of advocating for LGBTQ people.

Direct Service Organizations for Sexual Violence and Domestic Violence

Sexual Violence Prevention Centers and Domestic Violence Organizations are

also spaces that are beginning to be more inclusive of LGBTQ victims. In 2013, an

important step was made in challenging the heterosexualized discourse of sexual

violence. This was the passage of the Violence against Women Act (VAWA) with

changes to include LGBTQ people in services. VAWA is a law, initially passed in 1994,

to federally fund and support initiatives for the prevention and response to domestic

violence and sexual violence. Before 2013 the law focused primarily on female victims,

with no explicit mention of LGBTQ survivors. However the 2013 provisions underlines

the LGBTQ population as an area of specific need and incorporates anti-discrimination

measures for VAWA grantees (Office on Violence Against Women 2013). The

provisions in the law are important because they reflect a growing effort towards

inclusiveness in direct services, and they nationalize the conversation about LGBTQ

sexual violence. They also have the potential to spread awareness and legal protections

for LGBTQ survivors across the United States (Stapel and Carey 2013).

Despite the legal changes, the resources that the national and statewide direct

services centers provide are limited to adult-focused information. For example, the

National Sexual Violence Resource Center has a growing body of information on

LGBTQ sexual violence, but mostly in the form of research and publications with

statistics for survivors of sexual violence, along with fact sheets for adult survivors

(NSVRC 2014). At the state level, The New York Alliance Against Sexual Assault

provides similar resources, partnering with the Anti-Violence Project for a support group

for LGBTQ survivors, and providing a webinar on LGBTQ issues for service providers.

The National Resource Center on Domestic Violence's online project, VAWnet

(Violence Against Women Network), released a collection of resource materials on

LGBTQ intimate partner and sexual violence. Most information in the collection is not

specifically regarding youth survivors, although much of the information would be

helpful for schools to provide general information about sexual violence for LGBTQ

individuals (Special Collection 2010). As far as youth-directed material, there is one

webinar series focused on transgender youth survivors of sexual violence (Munson and

Cook-Daniels 2010). This webinar was made by FORGE, an organization for transgender

survivors. Besides the occasional information packet, the source material that the

violence center provides is limited to information regarding adult survivors and aimed at first responders, such as medical personnel and counselors.

Organizations aimed at providing services for LGBTQ and sexual violence victims also provide the opportunity for coalition building. By forming alliances with outside organizations, like schools, awareness about LGBTQ sexual violence can spread. For example, The New York State Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender & Queer Domestic Violence Network ("The Network") is a coalition that works with many different agencies in order to broaden the reach of the conversation to include prevention efforts and to work directly in schools. As we saw in this section, the conversation about LGBTQ victims of sexual violence is isolated to direct service organizations focusing almost exclusively on adults. Although limited, this information is a starting point for direct service organizations to begin to provide more youth-focused material that can be useful for schools to incorporate in the curriculum.

Recommendations and Conclusion

Schools often operate as spaces where problematic discourses and other institutional factors normalize rigid gender behavior and identity and reinforce compulsory heterosexuality. If we ignore the consequences of heteronormativity in schools, then violence remains a common lived reality for students. Instead of isolating conversations surrounding LGBTQ issues, bullying, sexual harassment, sexual violence and intimate partner violence, we must understand that these issues exist within a similar cultural framework and intersect. We must understand that sexual violence thrives in

heteronormative culture where LGBTQ voices are not represented. Currently there are a number of programs in schools that tackle issues of heteronormativity and a growing effort in many direct service organizations to challenge the heterosexual and cisgender assumption in services. We can use these programs as models to begin to formulate prevention strategies.

Schools can more adequately address issues of sexual violence and LGBTQ violence in a number of ways. First, schools could take seriously the extent to which compulsory heterosexuality fosters violence. One way to tackle this is to implement programs that interrupt gendered verbal harassment. Many school-based programs, like GLSEN's No-name Calling Week and Transgender Day of Remembrance, are designed to interrupt the gender policing that occurs between students, and simultaneously bring awareness of these issues to teachers and faculty. These programs are often introduced in schools as anti-bullying measures, but their impact goes beyond bullying by interrupting sexually violent behavior, such as sexual harassment. Another way that schools can address heteronormativity is through the inclusion of LGBTQ-sensitive material throughout the curriculum, especially in sexual and dating violence prevention. The prevalence of LGBTQ perspectives in the curriculum has been shown to increase feelings of safety by students (GLSEN 2011). Similarly, sexual harassment and sexual violence occur more frequently in spaces where masculinity is normalized as dominant (Hlavka 2014). Because violence is generally normalized through compulsory heterosexuality, schools can prevent sexual violence by integrating programs that disrupt a heteronormative culture.

We know that resources, like GSAs, specifically designed for LGBTQ identified students are important because these students are at an increased risk for bullying and suicide, but these resources are also important points of access for other types of information and support. For example, LGBTQ students are more likely to report sexual harassment and violence when there is an identified faculty member that is sensitive to LGBTQ issues (GLSEN 2012), therefore GSAs provide visible staff members for students who experience sexual violence and sexual harassment. Safe spaces, like GSAs, can also be points of access for direct service organizations to disseminate crisis information to LGBTQ students. It is through these avenues that students have access to information regarding crisis prevention, such as the Trevor Project and the Anti-violence project. As resources surrounding LGBTQ sexual violence begin to grow, GSAs can serve as a bridge between the community and the school, where this information can be disseminated. GSAs and other safe LGBTQ spaces should not be expected to solve the entire problem of heterosexism in school culture. However, they provide a space where students can access new information and also where conversations surrounding heteronormativity can occur.

A second way to confront gender violence and sexual violence in schools is by having strong anti-harassment policies so that school administrators can intervene in problematic situations when they occur. The prevalence of sexual harassment in schools has reached a horrific level. With a recent study showing that 45% of all students experienced sexual harassment in the last year (AAUW 2011) and research showing that many students view sexual harassment as a normal part of student life (Hlavka 2014), we

know that schools are not responding adequately to sexual harassment. Sexual

harassment is often in the form of gendered anti-gay bullying and also threats of sexual

violence. For example, many of the discourses that function to normalize heterosexuality

and rigid gender roles, such as the "fag" or "getting girls" discourses, are, or have the

potential to be, incidences of sexual harassment. In order for schools to address

compulsory heterosexuality, it is crucial they adopt strict measures that empower school

administrators, teachers, and students to be able to identify sexual harassment as

problematic and intervene or report a situation when it occurs.

Schools can also address this issue by including integrating LGBTQ perspectives

in sexual violence prevention material. Most often, sexual violence prevention is

presented in a heteronormative way, with the female as victim and male as perpetrator

(Schuller et al. 2010; Suarez and Gadalla 2010). This framing works to hide the role that

gender identity, sexuality, race, and class play in risk and prevention. Only by broadening

our understanding of the relationship between violence and heteronormativity, can we

hope to provide accessible information to underserved populations most at risk. Many

direct service organizations are taking steps to include material that is sensitive to

LGBTQ survivors, and the push by these organizations to challenge the

heteronormalization of sexual violence is an important start. Unfortunately, because of

lack of information regarding LGBTQ youth and sexual violence, schools are not

adequately part of this conversation. Organizations like Anti-Violence Project and Sexual

Violence National Network are working to integrate sexual violence prevention with

LGBTQ issues, but there needs to be more of an initiative to include youth in the

conversation so that schools can access these resources for use in their curriculum.

There are also certain prevention models that show promise at being more

inclusive towards underserved populations, like LGBTQ individuals. Prevention

programs that include a cultural component that addresses the entire community, such as

the bystander model, may have a greater potential to reach LGBTQ victims of sexual

violence. The bystander model has been shown to be effective on college campuses in

regards to LGBTQ populations perhaps because it is geared towards the community at

large, rather than a rigid victim/perpetrator framework (Potter et al. 2012). What the

success of the bystander model shows us is that it is that prevention programs need to

address the entire community and provide information on how to intervene and respond

to incidences of sexual violence. Prevention programs should also allow for the facilitator

to provide culturally specific material, like a discussion of LGBTQ issues and gender

normativity. These programs are shown to be more successful when they provide

culturally relevant information to the participants and include a discussion of cultural

norms (CDC 2007). Facilitators need to be equipped with information on LGBTQ issues,

specifically on gender normativity, so that material is not presented in a way that

excludes members of the LGBTQ community. Therefore, prevention programs, in order

to successfully address the LGBTQ population, must include a cultural component that

engages the entire community, and also be sensitive to, and inclusive of, LGBTQ issues.

Along with these recommendations, there are two main areas where there is a

substantial lack of research. One is sexual violence in the LGBTQ community, especially

in regards to adolescents. Most of the statistics regarding sexual violence in LGBTQ individuals are of adult populations. We are in need of more information on the types of sexual violence that LGBTQ youth are experiencing, where it is occurring, and its relationship to schools. In researching this information, we also need to have an awareness of how race and class impact victimization. As we know that school-aged people experience sexual violence at extremely high levels, this population needs to be studied for its rates of victimization. A second area for future research is the relationship between school culture and violence prevention. An examination of compulsory heterosexuality in schools is one way to look at how schools collude in a culture that fosters violence against girls and women and LGBTQ people. The GLSEN school climate survey can provide a model for the type of information that helps challenge the way that schools perpetuate or prevent LGBTQ violence. While schools are not solely responsible for the issue of youth violence, they are important points of access to students, as well as places where problematic discourses and institutional practices occur. Because students spend so much time in school, we need to look at how schools work to perpetuate gender normativity and compulsory heterosexuality on many levels. Only once we have an understanding of schools' role in gender normativity and heteronormativity can we fully understand the best way to integrate prevention models. By working towards a better understanding of the relationship between LGBTQ violence and sexual violence we can begin to push schools to question their norms and include LGBTQ perspectives in a more integrated way.

Sexism, homophobia and transphobia are deeply interconnected issues. The devastatingly high number of adolescent victims of sexual harassment, anti-gay violence, sexual violence, transgender violence and dating violence show the impact these issues have on youth. By separating the conversations, we ignore the ways that these issues intersect and turn our heads to possibilities of prevention. By showing where there is potential for integration, we can better understand how cultural interventions in schools can positively impact the lives of students who are most affected by these highly prevalent forms of violence. Violence thrives when we ignore larger ideologies that support it. Therefore by expanding our knowledge on adolescent sexual violence and by confronting heteronormativity in schools, we can work towards making schools places that mitigate against instead of fostering gender and sexual violence.

Bibliography

American Association of University Women (AAUW) (2011). Hill, C and Kearl, H.
    Crossing the Line: Sexual Harassment at School. Washington, DC.

Anti-Violence Projects (2014) in FORGE: Improving the Lives of Transgender and
    SOFFA Individuals. Retrieved from http://forge-forward.org/about/current-
    projects/anti-violence-projects/

Basile KC, Saltzman LE. (2002) Sexual violence surveillance: uniform definitions and
    recommended data elements version 1.0. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and
    Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; 2002. Available
    from:http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pub/SV_surveillance.html

Buchwald, E. (1995) *Transforming a rape culture*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Milkweed
    Editions.

Butler, J. (1993). Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex. New York:
    Rutledge.

Butler, J. (1999). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. New York:
    Rutledge.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2007) Whitaker DJ, Reese LE,
    editors. Preventing Intimate partner Violence and Sexual Violence in
    Racial/Ethnic Minority Communities: CDC's Demonstration Projects. Atlanta
    GA. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury
    Prevention and Control

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)(2010) Walters, M. L., Chen, J., &
    Matthew J. *The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NIPSV): 2010
    findings on victimization by sexual orientation*. Atlanta Georgia: National Center for
    Injury Prevention and Control.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2011). Youth Risk Behavior
    Surveillance, Untied States. (2011) MMWR 2012;61

Charmaraman, L., Jones, A. E., Stein, N., & Esperage, D. L. (2013). Is it bullying or
    sexual harassment? Knowledge, attitudes, and professional development
    experiences of middle school staff. Journal of School Health, 83(6), 438-444.
    doi:10.1111/josh.12048

Cianciotto, J., & Cahill, S. (2012). LGBT youth in America's schools University of

Michigan.

CONNECT Youth (2014). (website). CONNECT: Safe Families, Peaceful Communities. http://www.connectnyc.org/program/connect-youth

Cox, P. J., Lang, K. S., Townsend, S. M., & Campbell, R. (2010). The rape prevention and education (RPE) theory model of community change: Connecting individual and social change. Journal of Family Social Work, 13(4), 297-312. doi:10.1080/10522158.2010.492494

Coxell, A. W., & King, M. B. (2010). Adult male rape and sexual assault: Prevalence, re-victimisation and the tonic immobility response. *Sexual & Relationship Therapy, 25*(4), 372-379. doi:10.1080/14681991003747430

Craig, T., & LaCroix, J. (2011). Tomboy as protective identity. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 15*(4), 450-465. doi:10.1080/10894160.2011.532030

Currie, S., Mayberry, M., & Chenneville, T. (2012). Destabilizing anti-gay environments through gay-straight alliances: Possibilities and limitations through shifting discourses. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 85*(2), 56-60.

D'Augelli, A. R., Grossman, A. H., Salter, N. P., Vasey, J. J., Starks, M. T., & Sinclair, K. O. (2005). Predicting the suicide attempts of lesbian, gay and bisexual youth. The American Association of Suicidology, 35(6), 646-658.

D'augelli, A. R., Grossman, A. H., & Starks, M. T. (2008). Gender atypicality and sexual orientation development among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 12*(1), 121-143. doi:10.1300/J529v12n01_08

Davis, K. and Glass, N. (2011) *Reframing the Heteronormative Construcitons of Lesbian Partner Violence: An Australian Case Study. In Intimate Partner Violence in LGBTQ lives.* Ed. Janice L. Ristock. p. 13-36

Donovan, C., & Hester, M. (2008). "Because she was my first girlfriend, I didn't know any different": Making the case for mainstreaming same-sex Sex/Relationship education. *Sex Education: Sexuality, Society and Learning, 8*(3), 277-287.

Duke, A., & Davidson, M. M. (2009). Same-sex intimate partner violence: Lesbian, gay, and bisexual affirmative outreach and advocacy. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 18*(8), 795-816. doi:10.1080/10926770903291787

Egan, S. K., & Perry, D. G. (2001). Gender identity: A multidimensional analysis with

implications for psychosocial adjustment. Developmental Psychology, 37, 451–463. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.37.4.451

.

Epstein, D., and Johnson, R. (1994). On the straight and narrow: The heterosexual presumption, homophobias and schools. In D. Epstein (Ed.), Challenging gay and lesbian inequalities in education (pp. 197 - 230). Buckingham, England: Open University Press

Espelage, D, K. C. Basile, and M. E. Hamburger. (2012). "Bullying Perpetration and Subsequent Sexual Violence Perpetration AmongMiddle School Students." Department of Educational Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois. Division of Violence Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia

Future of Sex Education Initiative. (2012). National Sexuality Education Standards: Core Content and Skills, K-12 [a special publication of the Journal of School Health]. Retrieved from http://www.futureofsexeducation.org/documents/josh-fose-standards-web.pdf

Gay,Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) (2005)Kosciw, J. G., Diaz, E. M., Colic, D. M., and Goldin, R. *No name calling week project: Year one evaluation.*New York, NY. Gay Lesbian Straight Education Network.

Gay,Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) (2012). Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Bartkiewicz, M. J., Boesen, M. J., Palmer, N. A.. *The 2011 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools.*

Gay,Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) (2014) "LGBT-Inclusive Curriculum Guide for Educators" [website] New   York, NY. Gay Lesbian Straight Education. Retrieved from: http://glsen.org/educate/resources/creating-lgbt-inclusive-lessons

Gentlewarrior, Sabrina, and Fountain K. (2009) Culturally Competent Service Provision to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Survivors of Sexual Violence. VAWnet. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence

Gibson, A., & Macleod, C. (Feminism and Psychology). "(Dis)allowances of lesbians' sexual identities; lesbian identity construction in racialised, classed, familial and institutional spaces".22(4), 462-481.

Gillum, T. L., & Difulvio, G. (2012). "'There's so much at stake' sexual minority youth discuss dating violence".Violence Against Women, 18(7), 725-745.

Girshick, L. B. (2002). Woman to woman sexual violence: Does she call it rape?
    Boston: Northeastern University Pres

Grant JM, Mottet LA, Justin Tanis JD, et al. (2011) Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of
    the National Transgender Discrimination Survey Washington, DC: The National
    Gay and Lesbian Task Force and National Center for Transgender Equality.
    Retrieved from:
    http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/reports/reports/ntds_summary.pdf

Hlavka, H.R. (2014) Normalizing Sexual Violence: Young Women Account for
    Harassment and Abuse. *Gender and Society* DOI: 10.1177/0891243214526468.
    accessed at http://gas.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/02/28/0891243214526468.
    published online 28 February 2014

Jauk, D. (2013). *Gender violence revisited: Lessons from violent victimization of
    transgender identified individuals* doi:10.1177/1363460713497215

Jindasurat, C. (2013). LGBTQ sexual violence. (cover story). *Sexual Assault Report,
    16*(4), 49-61.

Katz, J. (2014). Mentors in Violence Prevention: Gender Violence Prevention Education
    and Training. http://www.jacksonkatz.com/mvp.html

Kernsmith, P. D., & Hernandez-Jozefowicz, D. (2011). A gender-sensitive peer
    education program for sexual assault prevention in the schools. Children & Schools,
    33(3), 146-157.

Leach, F. (2003). Learning to be violent: The role of the school in developing adolescent
    gendered behaviour.Compare, 33(3), 385-400.

Lee, C. (2002). *The impact of belonging to a high school Gay/Straight alliance.*

Lehavot, K., Molina, Y., & Simoni, J. (2012). Childhood trauma, adult sexual assault,
    and adult gender expression among lesbian and bisexual women. *Sex Roles, 67*(5),
    272-284. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0171-1

Lytton, Hugh, and David M. Romney. "Parents' differential socialization of boys and
    girls: A meta-analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 109.2 (1991): 267.

Maier, S. L. (2008). Rape victim advocates' perception of the influence of race and
    ethnicity on victims' responses to rape. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice,
    6*(4), 303-334. doi:10.1080/15377930802533530

McInroy, L.,Shelley L. (2012). *Articulating identities: Language and practice with multiethnic sexual minority youth* Routledge. doi:10.1080/09515070.2012.674685

McCormack, M. (2011). Queer masculinities and gender conformity in the secondary school. In N. Rodriguez and J. Landreau (Eds). Queer masculiniteis: A critical reader in education (pp. 23-38). New York. Springe

Meyer, D. (2012). "An intersectional analysis of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people's evaluation of anti-queer violence". Gender and Society, 26(6), 246-299.

Mills, Martin (2001). *Challenging Violence in Schools: An issue of masculinities.* Buckingham. Open University Press

Munson, Michael, and Cook-Daniels, Loree (2010, December 16). Transgender Youth Survivors: Understanding, Serving, Celebrating. [webinar]. FORGE and the National Coalition on the Violence Against Women. Retrieved from: http://www.wcsap.org/transgender-youth-survivors-understanding-serving-celebrating

National Coalition of Anti Violence Programs (2013). Shelby Chestnut, Chai Jindisurat, Preeti Varathon. "2012 Report on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, and HIV-Affected Intimate Partner Violence in 2012. New York City Anti Violence Project. New York, NY.

Office on violence against women (OVW) VAWA 2013 summary: Changes to OVW-administered grant programs. (2013). *Sexual Assault Report, 17*(2), 21-31.

Oringher, J., & Samuelson, K. W. (2011). Intimate partner violence and the role of masculinity in male same-sex relationships. Traumatology, 17(2), 68-74.

Pascoe, C. (2007). Dude you're A fag: Masculinity and sexuality in highschool. Berkely, CA: University of California Press, LTD

Payne, E., & Smith, M. (2012). Rethinking safe schools approaches for LGBTQ students: Changing the questions we ask. *Multicultural Perspectives, 14*(4), 187-193. doi:10.1080/15210960.2012.725293

Perrotti, J., & Westheimer, K. (2002). When the drama club is not enough. lessons from the safe schools program for gay and lesbian students. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Potter, S. J., Fountain, K., & Stapleton, J. G. (2012). Addressing sexual and relationship violence in the LGBT community using a bystander framework. *Harvard Review of   Psychiatry, 20*(4), 201-208. doi:10.3109/10673229.2012.712838

Quinn, B. A. (2002). Sexual harassment and masculinity: The power and meaning of 'girl watching'. Gender and Society, 16(3), 386-402.

Rich, A. (1986). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. Blood, bread and poetry (pp. 23-74). New York: W.W. Norton.

Robinson, J. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). Bullying explains only part of LGBTQ-heterosexual risk disparities: Implications for policy and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(8), 309-319.

Rothman, E. F., Exner, D., & Baughman, A. L. (2011). "The prevalence of sexual assault against people who identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in the united states: A systematic review". Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 12(2), 55-66.

Saewyc, E.; Konishi, C.; Rose, H.; Homma, Y. (2014) School-based strategies to reduce suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and discrimination among sexual minority and heterosexual adolescents in western Canada. *International Journal of Child, Youth, and Family Studies*f

Savin-Williams, Ritch C. (2006) *The New Gay Teenager*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Schuller, R. A.; McKimmie; B. M. ; Masser, B. M; Kippenstine, M. A. (2010) Judgments of Sexual Assault: The Impact of Complainant Emotional Demeanor, Gender, and Victim Stereotypes New Criminal Law Review: An International an Interdisciplinary Journal Vol. 13, No. 4 (Fall 2010) (pp. 759-780)

Special Collection: Sexual Violence in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex or Queer (LGBTIQ) Communities (2011). In National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women. Retrieved from: http://www.vawnet.org/special-collections/svlgbtiq.php#800

Stapel, S. and Carey, R. (2013). An open letter about new protections for LGBT survivors of violence. The Anti-Violence Project. Retrieved from: http://www.avp.org/resources/avp-resources/274-an-open-letter-about-new-protections-for-lgbt-survivors-of-violence

Stewart, A. L. (2013). The Men's Project: A Sexual Assault Prevention Program Targeting College Men. Psychology of Men & Masculinity. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/a0033947

Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(11), 2010-2035.

Survivor Project (2003). Retrieved from: survivorproject.org

Taylor, B, Stein, N., Woods, D., Mumford, E. Shifting Boundaries: Final Report on an Experimental Evaluation of a Youth Dating Violence Prevention Program in New York City Middle Schools. October 2011 2008-MU-MU-0010. Unpublished NCJRSU.S. Department of Justice

Teunis, N. (2006). Sexual inequalities and social justice. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tharp, A. T., Degue, S., Valle, L. A., Brookmeyer, K. A., Massetti, G. M., & Matjasko, J. L. (2012). "A systematic qualitative review of risk and protective factors for sexual violence perpetration". Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 14(2), 133-167.

The Anti-Violence Project (2014). Mission, Vision, and Goals. Retrieved from: http://www.avp.org/about-avp/mission-vision-a-goals

The Anti-Violence Project (2014). New York State Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender & Queer Domestic Violence Network. Retrieved from: http://www.avp.org/about-avp/new-york-state-lgbtq-domestic-violence-network

Todahl, J. L., Linville, D., Bustin, A., Wheeler, J., & Gau, J. (2009). "Sexual assault support services and community systems: Understanding critical issues and needs in the LGBTQ community". Violence Against Women, 5(8), 952-976.

Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., & Russell, S. T. (2011). High school gay-straight alliances (GSAs) and young adult well-being: An examination of GSA presence, participation, and perceived effectiveness. *Applied Developmental Science, 15*(4), 175-185

Tomasula, J. L., Anderson, L. M., Littleton, H. L., & Riley-Tillman, T. (2012). The association between sexual assault and suicidal activity in a national sample. *School Psychology Quarterly, 27*(2), 109-119.

Toomey, R., McGuire, J., Russell, S. (2012). Heteronormativity, school climates, and perceived safety for gender nonconforming peers. International Journal of Adolescence and Youth

Toynton, R. (2007). The de-representation of science and queer science students in higher education within the queer/gay discourse. Teaching in Higher Education, 12(5), 593-605. doi:10.1080/13562510701595242

Ullman, S. E., & Townsend, S. M. (2007). Barriers to working with sexual assault survivors: A qualitative study of rape crisis center workers. *Violence Against Women, 13*(4), 412-443. doi:10.1177/1077801207299191

World Health Organization. (2002) Heise L, Garcia-Moreno C. Violence by intimate partners. In: Krug E, Dahlberg LL, Mercy JA, et al., editors. World report on violence and health. Geneva (Switzerland). p. 87-121.

Young, Ellie L. PhD, Melissa Allen & Betty Y. Ashbaker (2004). *"Sexual Harassment".* Brigham Young University© 2004 National Association of School Psychologists, 4340 East West Highway. Suite 402, Bethesda, MD 20814—(301) 657-0270.

Zacko-Smith, J., & Smith, G. P. (2013). Recognizing and utilizing queer pedagogy. *Multicultural Education, 20*(3), 74-80.