

Rica Alexandra Hülseberg

16020578

**Providing Safety to the LGBTQ+ Community
Within the Night-Time Economy**

SC6P00

9,788 Words

Supervisor: Stella Scherbach

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Stella Scherbach who has been of great help in directing me where I wanted this piece of research to go and pushed me to get things done when I needed it; and Will Hughes who, although he was not professionally involved in this project, still took the time to have a very valuable talk with me about it. A special thank you is due to the participants of this study without whom I would have been stuck with an idea but no data, who have provided me with insights on a wide range of issues and food for thought that may just last me the rest of my academic career. Also to Keeva Farrell who kindly put me in touch with half of them and thus helped make this project so much more interesting and original. Further thanks go to my parents for putting up with frantic calls during stressful periods of writing, and to my friends who stuck around although I have been too busy to call them back for weeks now. Lastly, I would like to thank the LGBTQ+ community for persisting, resisting and celebrating in the face of hostility across the world. Keep going!

Abstract

While there is a fair amount of research to be found on hate crime against the LGBTQ+ community and safety within the urban night-time economy separately, these issues have rarely been combined in studies, although the night-time economy plays a central role within the LGBTQ+ community. The aim of the study at hand was therefore to assess the situation regarding the safety of the community within the night time and to provide approaches for its improvement. The research has been conducted via semi-structured interviews with nine participants of which four were frequent visitors of LGBTQ+ night-time businesses in Soho, London, and five were involved professionally in the night-time economies of Soho and Vauxhall, either as managers and owners of LGBTQ+-related venues or through crime reduction agencies.

The study identified patterns of victimisation not only against but, importantly, within the community. It also identified general mistrust in the police among individuals and apprehensiveness of confiding in the police about issues regarding safety within their businesses among managers and owners. This was found to be exacerbated by the force's loss of LGBT liaison officers and therefore LGBTQ+ representation, which contributed to the police having been found unsuitable to address issues of LGBTQ+ safety as a singular agency. While the research argued for this gap to be filled by alternative organisations and solidarity within the community through inter-agency approaches, it has identified issues with the inclusivity of campaigns and intra-community victimisation. It was therefore recommended to provide more funds to alternative organisations and to task them with developing campaigns providing pertinent training to businesses and staff that is tailored to the community's needs. A special emphasis on identifying and addressing intra-community patterns of victimisation through campaigns and dialogue has also been suggested in order to create an inclusive framework for LGBTQ+ safety within the night-time economy.

Contents

<u>Acknowledgements</u>	2
<u>Abstract</u>	3
<u>Introduction</u>	5
<u>Literature review</u>	7
<u>Violence against the LGBTQ+ community</u>	7
<u>Issues of Intersectionality</u>	9
<u>Relationship between LGBTQ+ and law enforcement</u>	10
<u>Concerns within the night-time economy</u>	11
<u>Methodology</u>	12
<u>Findings and Discussion</u>	15
<u>Perceptions on causes, frequency and development, reactions to hostility</u>	15
<u>Trust in police and cooperation with authorities</u>	17
<u>Venues and the wider community as providers of safety</u>	19
<u>Alternative approaches to vulnerabilities within the night-time economy</u>	21
<u>Conclusion</u>	24
<u>References</u>	26
<u>Appendix I</u>	30
<u>Glossary</u>	30
<u>Appendix II</u>	32
<u>The Participants</u>	32
<u>Appendix III</u>	33
<u>Consent Form Individual Participants</u>	33
<u>Consent Form Managers and Venue Owners</u>	34
<u>Appendix IV</u>	35
<u>Interview Guidance Questions: Group I</u>	35
<u>Interview Guidance Questions: Group II</u>	36

Introduction

The issue of hate crime against the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community, including extended definitions that encompass queer, asexual and intersex* identities (LGBTQIA), has been widely discussed in different academic contexts (e.g. Green et al., 2011; Chakraborti & Garland, 2015; Hein & Scharer, 2012). Statistics by different charity organisations such as Stonewall (2018) and Gallop (2017) shed light on how often these crimes occur, who falls victim to them, and trends in the development of such aspects. Qualitative studies have added to this by exploring the issue on a microscopic level, pointing to the impact hate crime or frequent harassment have on the individual and their day to day life and behaviour, as well as perceptions on possible solutions to the issue and co-operation with different institutions (Browne et al., 2011). Although there seems to be an abundance of research in the general field of hate crime against LGBTQ+ individuals, a review of relevant literature has shown a gap in dealing with some of the more specific aspects of hostility against the LGBTQ+ community. There are close to no academic resources or research regarding LGBTQ+ individuals' safety in the context of the night time economy, whether related to explicitly LGBTQ+ venues or general areas that are frequented by members of the community. Thus, this work will attempt to further explore the issue of LGBTQ+ safety within the night time economy, focussing on the unique needs of a marginalised community that nonetheless contributes to the night time entertainment industry with a considerable number of 'queer' venues, and whose culture has historically been formed within the bar and club scene (D'Addario, 2016). It will do so by considering the results of nine semi-structured interviews conducted with four participants who frequently visit LGBTQ+ venues and identify along the LGBTQ+ spectrum, and five participants who are involved professionally in the queer night-time economy, either running a business or crime reduction agencies.¹ The study will be based on the areas of Soho in London's West End and Vauxhall in the South. It will also discuss the legal definition of hate crime, and therefore instances of hostility in which the state is able to intervene, and contrast this to the reality of low-scale but rather constant harassment (Browne et al., 2011), often in the shape of verbal insults, but also non-verbal expressions of disapproval. Thus, this work defines safety as not only safety from physical and verbal abuse, but rather as the perception of being in a safe space in which one is not required to compromise one's identity and behaviour associated with it in order to minimise threat.

Whereas LGBTQ+ individuals may arguably experience victimisation in any situation at all times of day (Chakraborti & Garland, 2015), their safety within the night time economy is highlighted due to its characterisation as a sphere in which excess, marginalisation and conflict thrive (Crawford & Flint, 2009) and as hotspots of public violence (Philpot et al., 2019). If the night time economy is a place of greater vulnerability to a heteronormative audience due to heightened levels of violence and potential detrimental effects of substance and alcohol use (London Assembly, 2016), these factors must be exacerbated for an audience that is more vulnerable due to its perceived otherness during any time of the day. It will be shown that some interventions in enhancing safety simply do not apply to them, and their unique needs are often not recognised enough by regulating agencies within the night time economy (Moran & Sharpe, 2004).

¹ For participant names and demographic information, please refer to Appendix II

The community will be referred to as LGBTQ+² throughout this work as it is the most commonly used abbreviation and it ensures inclusion of most identities that are defined or define themselves as part of the community. The word 'queer' as an equally inclusive term to describe the entire community may be used interchangeably (Bloodworth, 2018), however due to its history of being a derogatory term used to describe LGBTQ+ individuals before being reclaimed by the community (Hall, 2016), its use in this work will be limited. Where different and possibly less inclusive abbreviations such as LGB or LGBT are used, the text will explain and justify this. Additionally, this work will discuss the adequacy of an all-inclusive umbrella term considering the variety of different individuals and experiences within the community.

This thesis will first provide a review of the literature on the topic of hate crime against the LGBTQ+ community and safety factors within the night-time economy before justifying the methodology and ethical concerns of the research. It will then proceed to present the results and prevalent themes of the interviews with both, individuals and professionals. These themes will then be linked to existing research mentioned in the literature review, creating the basis for a discussion in which the thesis will attempt to broaden the insight into LGBTQ+ experiences of the night time economy and provide approaches to improving safety within these spaces in a more standardised manner. For explanation of topic-specific terms, refer to Appendix I.

² Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans*, queer, including identities such as pansexual, non-binary and intersex indicated by the addition of a plus.

Literature review

Violence against the LGBTQ+ community

The criminological discourse around hate crime in general, as well as the more specific issue of hate-motivated crimes against members of the LGBTQ+ community is supported by a considerable amount of research. Especially quantitative data, which provides a statistical overview of the prevalence of crimes based on the victims' sexual or gender identity, is gathered and published frequently by the government (Home Office, 2018) and private organisations (Stonewall, 2017; Gallop, 2017), providing an opportunity to identify trends and developments in the prevalence of violence motivated by homophobia or transphobia. Separately, research considering the issue of safety within the urban night-time economy is readily available (Office for National Statistics, 2017; Crawford & Flint, 2009).

The discourse around hate crime is a relatively newly established field of criminological research and was described by Green et al. (2001) as an emerging research agenda only at the beginning of this century. This evaluation is in accordance with legislation in England and Wales, which has been providing a full legal framework for hate crime that includes homophobically aggravated offences only since passing the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (Crown Prosecution Service, 2017). Still, current legislation in England and Wales now obliges the court to acknowledge the presence of a homophobic or transphobic (since 2007) motivation (HM Government, 2017) under the official definition:

"Any criminal offence which is perceived by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice, based on a person's (...) sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation or transgender identity or perceived transgender identity." (Metropolitan Police, 2019; Crown Prosecution Service, 2017)

This includes the possibility of a sentence uplift for hate motivated offences (Crown Prosecution Service, 2017). However, while this definition appears rather sensible, researchers have criticised the legal compartmentalisation of different victim groups as ignorant of the intersectional discriminatory problems members of more than one minority group face (Mason-Bish, 2010) and a hierarchy of victims, rather arbitrarily declaring some groups more victimised than others, often linked to a group's collective level of influence (Chakraborti, 2010). Jacobs and Potter (1998) argue that hate crime legislation amplifies group identification and therefore intergroup hostility, however other scholars define hate crime as socially situated and embedded in the context of group interaction, socially subordinate groups simply falling victim to hate crime due to their subordinate status (Perry, 2002) as it renders them a soft target (White, 2002). Perry (2002) therefore argues that hate crime legislation is an effort to respond to long-standing antagonisms rather than special legal treatment of certain groups fuelling intergroup hostility. However, Maroney (1998) claims that legislation might not be the most appropriate response to hate crime, defining it as a tool of appeasement for minority groups that does not, in fact, have much effect in tackling hate crime or the underlying causes.

This evaluation seems to be partly supported by statistical reports showing a constant annual increase of about 20% in recorded hate crimes (Office for National Statistics, 2018; Antjoulé, 2016; Stonewall, 2017; Crown Prosecution Service, 2018). While this is partly an indicator of

a growing willingness to report victimisation, it is perceived to also be a consequence of an actual increase in incidents proportionate to the growing visibility of the LGBTQ+ community and subsequent rise in hostile sentiments (Hancock & Haldeman, 2017)³, as many more visible LGBTQ+ individuals do not adhere to homonormative standards that are often aimed to be unthreatening to heteronormative perceptions (Duggan, 2003).⁴ Higher visibility of the community may render it easier to identify individual members, thus making them easier to target. Therefore, Browne et al. (2011) argue that there is a gap between the effects of legislation change and perceivable social change, rendering policing and criminal justice measures not necessarily the most appropriate response to experiences of abuse in the LGBTQ+ community.

Moreover, statistics from the Crime Survey of England and Wales (2018) show quite low numbers of police recorded hate crime on the basis of homo- or transphobia, whereas hate crime reports conducted by LGBTQ+ organisations (Stonewall, 2017; Antjoule, 2016) conclude that four in five members of the LGBTQ+ community have previously experienced some form of hate crime. Most scholars (Browne et al., 2011; Antjoule, 2016) therefore suggest an issue of underreporting in this context and it is estimated that only one in four of all homophobic incidents are reported to the police (Chakraborti & Garland, 2015).

Further, Dunbar (2006), after comparing over 1,500 hate crimes based on race, gender and sexual orientation, argues that homophobic hate crimes are often more violent than hate-motivated violence against any other minority group. It is not certain if this is generalisable in a UK based context, as Dunbar's study focuses on the area around Los Angeles, California only. Case studies from the United Kingdom such as the murder of Jody Dobrowski in 2005 (Sturcke, 2006), however, show the possible extent of violence used in homophobic attacks. Further, Hein and Scharer (2012) argue that there is a lack of preparation of LGBTQ+ children for the possibility and handling of such an attack, whereas ethnic and religious minority children have often been raised to cope with being targeted. According to the research, this can have devastating effects on victims' mental health.

While especially quantitative research focuses on particular incidents of physical violence against LGBTQ+ individuals, Browne et al.'s (2011) large-scale qualitative study of Australian LGBT individuals' experiences with hostility suggests that the main issue is not in isolated, distinct cases of violence, but rather constant exposure to verbal and non-verbal violence in the form of remarks or hostile body language. This evaluation is supported by wider literature (Chakraborti, 2015; Sloan & Gustavsson, 1999) and implies limited power of current legislation and law enforcement in the matter. This is in accordance with van Soest and Bryant's (1995) model of three levels of violence⁵.

³ While this is a correlation rather than direct causation, as many factors such as politics and religion may contribute to this development, the relationship between the rise of both, visibility and hostility is supported by statistics (Stonewall, 2018).

⁴ Refer to Chakraborti and Garland (2015) and Duggan (2003) for an elaboration of how LGBTQ+ identities are policed within the community in order to increase acceptance by the heterosexual population.

⁵ Individual violence characterised by harmful acts against people and property, institutional violence that encompasses harmful actions by social institutions and organizational units which obstruct the unfolding of potential in a minority group and, lastly, structural-cultural violence which refers to ideological roots of the matter that underlie individual and institutional contexts.

Statistics further show a correlation between the recent Brexit vote and a rise in homophobic hate crime (Galop, 2017). This link may not be obvious at first, however it becomes more apparent if the decision to leave the European Union is not only viewed as a nationalist act of isolation, but as an attempt by parts of society to re-establish a distinct ‘britishness’ in returning to the old times so often mourned by the English in particular (Pearson, 1983). In this case, returning to the celebrated past, in practice, would mean returning to punishment for parts of society perceived as deviant rather than celebrating diversity (Durkheim, 1964).⁶ While similar developments regarding hate crime statistics are found in the United States (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2018), the causalities between the rise of highly conservative and alt-right attitudes and the election of Donald Trump as President of the United States are too complex to address in this research. However, it is argued that the Trump administration may have provided those with hostile attitudes against minorities with a sense of approval. Once their beliefs are perceived to be shared by authorities, they may feel justified in voicing them and increasing their discriminatory behaviour towards others, sometimes escalating into physical violence (Moreau, 2018). This concept may also be applied to the relationship between the decision to leave the European Union and the rise in homophobic attacks in the United Kingdom.

Issues of Intersectionality

Mason (2001) argues that the targeting of the LGBTQ+ community by outgroups is often a symptom of a heteronormative society in which deviating from the heterosexual, cis-gendered norm is perceived as a threat or inherently wrong. In addition to this, Browne et al.’s research (2011) further observed hostility within the LGBTQ+ community and intragroup discrimination especially against bisexual, transsexual and non-binary individuals based on the seemingly opposing concept of homonormativity (Duggan, 2003). This includes issues with racism within the community (Stonewall, 2018). Thus, Chakraborti and Garland (2015) pose the question whether the categorisation of the LGBTQ+ community as one homogenous group is an adequate application in research surrounding its members’ victimisation. Although homophobia and transphobia are mostly presented as separate issues in the statistical registrations of hate crime and research surrounding the topic, the LGB(T) community is often falsely perceived as a homogenous group with the same experiences and vulnerabilities, rather than a collective of individuals with uniquely intersecting identities and needs (Simmel, 1955). This may inhibit the development of effective solutions to hostility individuals are facing and is an issue the current research must address.⁷

⁶ For a comprehensive explanation of this link, refer to Durkheim’s (1964) models of organic and mechanic societies.

⁷ It could be argued here in terms of labelling theory that the LGBTQ+ community’s history of being labelled as a deviant part of society, and their non-acceptance of society’s entitlement to do so (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1969) may have contributed to the forming of a group identity and celebration of the resulting community’s ‘deviance’ as a self-fulfilling prophecy (Becker, 1963). The identification as a community could also have emerged as a means to be less vulnerable in the context of similar levels of out-group hostility faced by members of the community (Tajfel, 1981).

Relationship between LGBTQ+ and law enforcement

Policing is argued to be a significant factor in public safety, even more so in the night-time economy (Crawford & Flint, 2009), and society's trust in the police is perceived as a cornerstone in the institution's legitimacy in a democratic state (Rosenbaum et al., 2005). Thus, it is imperative for an adequate situation of the research to address the LGBTQ+ community's trust in the police and its helpfulness. Moran and Sharpe (2004) argue that a lack of police recognition of the community, low detection rates and infrequent judicial determinations of guilt lead to a lack of confidence in policing, especially within the transgender community, who are found to be most at risk of verbal or physical violence (Henry, 2017). While this study may seem outdated due to its age, the aforementioned discrepancy between current police statistics and private survey outcomes show the continued significance of Moran and Sharpe's (2004) research, while a study by Miles-Johnson (2013) has found comparatively negative opinions within the LGBTQ+ community regarding key factors such as trust in the police, belief in fairness and legitimacy and mutual respect. Chakraborti and Garland (2015) argue that there is a lack of trust between the homosexual population and the police due to a history of criminalisation and over-policing of homosexual acts and individuals (e.g. Gough & Macnair, 1985). Police harassment and an over-emphasis on remaining anti-gay legislation continued and arguably increased after the partial decriminalisation of homosexual acts in 1967 (Thatchell, 2017), a claim which is supported by statistics found in the Home Office archives (Home Office, 2019). Transgender individuals, in the light of ongoing subjection to police brutality in industrial nations, especially the United States, are argued to be even more apprehensive (Tobin et al., 2015).

Many UK police forces have therefore published official policies on adequate treatment of LGB and especially transgender individuals that come into contact with the law (e.g. West Yorkshire Police, 2018), and police forces within the UK and countries such as Australia have been found to show interest in improving their image with the LGBTQ+ community over the past years (Russell, 2017). The Met Police employs LGBT liaison officers in every London borough as representatives of the community within the police force (Mayor of London, 2013). However, it is unclear how publicly present these officers are and how these measures aid in developing an overall understanding of LGBTQ+ specific vulnerabilities. While there are no official statistics or studies on the exact effect austerity policing has had on the LGBTQ+ community and their safety, a reduction of 50,000 police officers since 2010 (Public Accounts Committee, 2018) and its detrimental effect on the quality of policing and police responses overall (Dearden, 2018) justifies the assumption that the LGBTQ+ community within the night-time economy has been affected considerably by cuts in the police budget too.

Concerns within the night-time economy

Crawford and Flint (2009) describe the contemporary city as a contested space of contradiction in which processes of imagination, creativity and innovation, but also of social exclusion, marginalisation and conflict take place. Their research finds a divide between governmental agendas to re-moralise interactions within the night-time leisure space and promote safety, and a commercially driven sense of excess. Similarly, Philpot et al. (2019) argue that night-time economy leisure zones are hotspots for public violence. This evaluation, together with the aforementioned reduced capacities in austerity policing is especially relevant to groups already at a heightened risk of victimisation such as the LGBTQ+ community. A study by Brands and Aalst (2015) concludes that, while significant increases in surveillance and policing in this context, compared to the day-time economy, does aid in ensuring more security for individuals in the night-time economy, visible proximity of police and door staff has stronger positive effects on experienced safety than CCTV cameras. Most importantly, while the police in this particular study were largely perceived to be helpful and friendly towards everyone, perceptions on door staff were more nuanced, producing ambiguous results regarding ethnicity, often in connection to the venue the security personnel was employed at. As these results, to a certain extent beg the question of efficacy and inclusivity of some safety measures even in heteronormative night-time leisure settings, it would have been interesting to address these issues while specifically including queer participants or night-time districts. Cozens et al.'s (2019) research within night-time economies in Cardiff and Perth argues for the efficacy of an inter-agency tactic to night-time safety, which is an approach this study will consider and address with regards to specifically LGBTQ+ safety and organisations affiliated with it.

The cultural significance of night life within the LGBTQ+ community is very prevalent (Plummer, 2000), leading to an almost symbiotic relationship between the night-time economy and the LGBTQ+ community in some urban areas, evident through a relatively new appreciation of the gay bar as a leisure space for mainstream. However, considering this close relationship between night life and 'queer culture' in some urban centres (Mattson, 2014), there is very little research to be found dealing specifically with LGBTQ+ safety within a night-time leisure setting, which is where this piece of research will be situated.

Methodology

The data informing this study emerges from a number of qualitative interviews which were used in order to focus the research on the personal experience (Silverman, 2013) of members of the LGBTQ+ community and those linked to venues and organisations within the scene. The research attempts to connect the two issues of homophobic and transphobic hate crime, and safety in the night-time community. Safety arguably is subjective and experience-based (Crawford & Flint, 2009), rendering it sensible to let participants elaborate on their interpretation of the word. Hate crime, on the other hand, has been extensively covered by quantitative surveys (e.g. Stonewall, 2017), which allows for a relatively gapless statistical coverage of the issue, requiring further research to build on this rather than replicate existing numbers. Further, a qualitative approach allowed for a relatively small sample size and subsequently easier access to participants (Silverman, 2013).

Participants were interviewed separately and their data has been divided into two groups. The first consists of individuals across the LGBTQ+ spectrum, including a diverse range of gender and sexuality, who have been asked to give personal accounts of their experience with hate crime or hostility. This includes intersectional approaches. The second group includes individuals who are involved in the night-time economy, either as venue managers or representatives of crime reduction organisations and charities. Participants here were asked to give a professional account of the issues LGBTQ+ individuals, as well as venues, are facing in this specific environment.

The research uses semi-structured interviews as a means to access directly people's personal experiences, attitudes and values (Silverman, 2013). According to Byrne (2004), semi-structured interviews with flexible questions are likely to receive more considered responses, therefore enabling the researcher to better access the participants' views and interpretation of events, rather than touching on them superficially. Further, it is argued that qualitative, semi-structured interviews allowing for reaction to participants' statements is an important factor when researching a group which is considered by the researcher to have been misrepresented, ignored or suppressed in the past (Byrne, 2004). This focus on experiences is a rather helpful attribute when dealing with a marginalised and arguably vulnerable group such as the LGBTQ+ community.

The strengths of a qualitative approach in this context are the flexibility of the research, the provision of a deeper understanding of the subject matter and especially the societal contexts and links between phenomena, and the possibility of penetration of otherwise superficial responses (Somekh & Lewin, 2012). The gathered data can also be evaluated in greater detail, and the process of qualitative research is fluid, making it easier to shift focus or re-evaluate priorities of the research question as the study continues (Silverman, 2013). However, there are disadvantages to qualitative data collection, a main aspect of criticism being the subjectivity of the data quality (Denzin & Lincoln, 2012). While qualitative research is purposely subjective regarding the participants' experiences, it is also influenced by the researchers' own subjectivity in selecting data. Further, there is an issue of generalisability with a qualitative approach. As opposed to quantitative research, the generalisability or transferability of the research is not always guaranteed by sample size (Silverman, 2013).

The participants in Group 1 were selected from the researcher's work environment in an LGBTQ+ bar in Soho, London. They were previously known to the researcher, which may influence an objective approach to the research and interviews (May, 2011), although utmost caution was taken by the researcher to ensure the interviews were conducted in a professional manner rather than being conversations between acquaintances. As the researcher will be in regular contact with these participants after the end of the study, some sensitive information may have been withheld due to fear of judgment or embarrassment (Silverman, 2013), as the researcher's knowledge of these aspects in a private context may not be desirable to the participants, although it was communicated that confidentiality extends to the private realm. On the other hand, the previous establishment of an equal relationship between the researcher and the participant may have had a positive influence on the dynamics of the research setting, establishing a largely anti-authoritarian relationship between the researcher and the researched (Raheim et al., 2016).

The subjects of the study were not paid, each of them either participating as a favour to the researcher or out of an interest in furthering the discourse surrounding LGBTQ+ safety. Participants in Group 2 were not previously known to the researcher and were contacted through third parties or via publicly accessible contact information.

The LGBTQ+ community as a whole is widely considered a vulnerable participant group by researchers due to the marginalisation and social challenges the community faces (Price, 2011). The main ethical risks in dealing with vulnerable groups in research are argued to be invasion of privacy, breach of confidentiality and embarrassment (Sieber, 1992), which were the most prevalent concerns in conducting the research at hand. Especially within the context of hate crime and homophobic violence, a special emphasis lay on the anonymity of the participants and confidentiality regarding their experiences to prevent embarrassment and to reduce the risk of retaliation by potential perpetrators. This has been achieved through changing of participants' names and by storing records of interviews in places only the researcher could access.

Furthermore, participants were selected from a group known to the researcher, which provided some prior knowledge of who was in an emotional position to speak about the issue of hate crime. Those who were perceived to be easily distressed were not considered, however it could be argued that the researcher's knowledge of people's characters is no entirely reliable evaluation technique. Hence, the participants were informed about the nature of the study before giving initial oral consent to participate in an interview. Upon arrival, participants were asked to give written consent to participate after reading a leaflet explaining the use of their data and guaranteeing confidentiality and anonymity. A special emphasis was placed on making interviewees feel as comfortable as possible and ensuring they were aware of their ability to terminate their participation in the study at any point before publication and to deny answering any questions they might not feel comfortable addressing (Price, 2011). Further, they prophylactically received contact details of the LGBT Switchboard, an established helpline for LGBTQ+ individuals in case any part of the interview should cause emotional distress.

Recordings were used throughout the study in order to ensure a high level of accuracy and completeness in processing and evaluating participant data and in order to prevent statements being evaluated out of context (Silverman, 2013). This further allows for an in-depth analysis

of common themes and results by developing transcripts and using a qualitative analysis software such as NVivo. Moreover, a focus lay on ensuring diversity in sexuality and gender and intersectionality among the participants, which provides an opportunity to take differing perspectives and experiences into account (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

In total, nine interviews were used as the basis of data collection, four conducted with individuals who were part of Group 1, and five accounts by participants speaking on behalf of venues and organisations, limiting the extent of the study's representativeness.⁸ It would be useful for transferability's sake and in order to be able to provide a more nuanced account of the issues surrounding LGBTQ+ safety within the night-time economy to consider a larger sample of participants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This was not feasible during the present research due to relatively low accessibility, the suggested extent of the study and the absence of funding. Thus, the research's emphasis lies on a thick description of the subject matter (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), explicit descriptions and explanations being included in the research that may clarify the connections to the cultural and social contexts of the data collection in order to provide a more adequate understanding of the research settings.

Moreover, the present study considers a very narrow geographic area for participant selection (Somekh & Lewin, 2012), mainly focussing on London's West End. Although some Group 2 representatives were selected from other areas such as Vauxhall and most participants live outside the West End, many of the interviewees' experiences and reports revolve around that limited space. It would be useful for future studies to include more diverse areas and a larger number of cities with comparable night-time economies in order to be able to provide more generalised approaches to LGBTQ+ night-time safety. Moreover, future studies would benefit from research conducted by an entirely objective researcher with no personal connection to the LGBTQ+ community or the subject matter in order to reduce researcher bias in participant selection and data analysis (Silverman, 2013).

⁸ See Appendix II for a list of participants and demographic information

Findings and Discussion

Perceptions on causes, frequency and development, reactions to hostility

The research at hand has produced some participant stances coinciding with previous literature, especially on the issue of hate crime and hostility against LGBTQ+, however it has also led to more specific findings on perceptions of the situation regarding safety of LGBTQ+ individuals within the night-time economy. According to the Hate Crime Report (Antjoule, 2016), a quarter of LGBT people in the United Kingdom⁹ have experienced violent hate crime. The possible extent of this violence became clear when Henry recalled an incident taking place at his venue:

‘They broke my head security’s foot, they jumped on it, so it snapped in two. They dislodged my manager’s eye socket, gave him a fracture to the skull. He ended up being rushed to hospital. My nephew got his wrist broken. I myself had my head dislodged. It was the most horrific hate crime attack since the Admiral Duncan’.

Generally, owners and managers of venues reported moderate experience with violent hate crime directed towards them or customers, with some venues being affected significantly more than others, the possible causes of this being discussed throughout this work. Participants in both, Soho and Vauxhall reported experiences with particular gangs ready to use verbal or even physical violence. However, it is not clear whether these incidents can be linked to cultural factors in the willingness to use violence against sexual minorities or whether the incidents are indeed an indiscriminate part of overall criminal behaviour within gang structures in the area.

Although particular violent incidents often dominate public perception and the discourse around hate crime (Chakraborti & Garland, 2015), the research also suggests, in accordance with findings by Browne et al. (2011), that a more prevalent concern for LGBTQ+ individuals as well as venue managers and staff is a frequent subjection to verbal abuse or intimidation. In fact, none of the individual participants reported direct experience with physical violence. However, second-hand knowledge of incidents was not uncommon.

‘I know a drag king who experienced hate crime probably two years ago now where they were beaten up, they were in hospital. But I think that’s the extent of my knowledge of it.’ (Melanie)

While participants from both groups often described verbal abuse as the only hostile encounters they could personally recall, venue managers in particular emphasised the frequency of these ‘minor’ incidents.

‘I haven’t experienced too many physical homophobic attacks luckily because we have good security and everything, but the minor things happen daily, you know, it’s happening constantly.’ (Christian)

Therefore, many of the participants had formed their own definitions of hate and perceptions on what the term encompasses, while acknowledging and aiming to incorporate official legislation into their own perceptions (Crown Prosecution Service, 2017, HM Government, 2017). Individual definitions were rather broad, including being intimidated non-verbally,

⁹ The report uses this more narrowly defined acronym in order to facilitate more transparent statistical data collection.

while most commonly, participants included verbal harassment, but expressed uncertainty of what legislation encompasses. Reactions and ways of dealing with threatening situations, too, were varied. While some individual participants preferred to avoid confrontation by changing the subject or not being open about their sexual or gender identity where possible, others such as transgender participant Caleb reported generally welcoming confrontation while in relatively safe environments as an opportunity to educate or show resilience. It is worth noting that participants who were part of more than one marginalised group, i.e. participants of colour or with a disability were apprehensive about confrontational or threatening situations, which may be explained by research findings that people belonging to two or more minority groups are often doubly marginalised and at a higher risk of discrimination and hostility (Chakraborti & Garland, 2015; Browne et al., 2011). Venue owners and managers were often not in a position to avoid confrontation due to the visibility of the businesses themselves. In such cases, the emphasis lay on resilience.

'It's just a constant battle but something that we can't constantly carry on our shoulders because then we would cease to the hate crimes and not be able to enjoy who we are.' (Christian)

'The thing is in the LGBT community, whilst on the outside they have quite a brave face on so if somebody were to walk by and make a comment, they would probably just brush it off or they wouldn't show that it affects them'. (John)

While there is an abundance of psychological and sociological research regarding the causes of prejudice (D'Emilio, 1983; Tajfel, 1981; Altemeyer, 1981; White, 2002), perceived causes of hate crime in this study mostly seemed to coincide with Herek's (1990) evaluation that hate crime is a rather extreme extension of a heteronormative society, underlying heterosexist ideologies leading to a lack of institutional representation and recognition of homosexual people¹⁰ and to a rather hidden community that is required by heterosexist standards to remain invisible. This may legitimise individual hostile feelings against 'stereotypically' or very visibly LGBTQ+ people and facilitate escalation into violence.

'Everyone I see who gets attacked for being gay or trans, it's usually because people can tell that they are (...) It is just the visibility of somebody and they are then going to attack them.' (Caleb)

Further, while participants acknowledged the development of hate crime legislation, a perception often mentioned in this research was that while the LGBTQ+ community had become more visible, hate speech had become louder and crime more violent (Stonewall, 2018).

'Generally, hate crimes, not just against LGBT people, they are becoming more clever with it and more violent as well.' (Christian)

¹⁰ Herek (1990) uses this term, as his research focuses mostly on gay and lesbian individuals, the complex nuances of the LGBTQ+ community often not being addressed in older research. Extensive research around bisexuality and gender identities increased in the twenty-first century (e.g. Moran & Sharpe, 2004; Browne et al., 2011).

'Well the olden days... days are just as bad now sadly. It is under a different guise. The hate crime now is worse than I experienced in my youth and I've been a young gay man in London since I was 17.' (Henry)

While documentation of homophobic assaults as hate crimes does not reach back in time far enough to confirm these statements, research (Hancock & Haldeman, 2017) points to a correlation between queer visibility and a rise in hostile sentiments. In broader sociological terms, this development may be clarified by Durkheim's (1964) theory of social change. The rather rapid shift from a retributive approach to non-hetero sexualities, essentially punishing their deviance, to an increasing valuation of human dignity and subsequent introduction of hate crime legislation may not have allowed for moral convictions to change, especially in older generations or less liberal cultures. This may have created a state of anomie which may further contribute to some participants' perceptions that the political climate of Trumpism and Brexit have led to more tensions in the past two years.

'I think definitely Brexit and Trump have given people who are racist or homophobic validation. And these events have led them to believe that their feelings are valid and that they are the will of the people.' (Harry)

Trust in police and cooperation with authorities

'The member of the public who was abused would have to report that to the police but there is such an underreporting that I don't think we have even touched the surface of how bad hate crime is.' (Juliet)

The issues surrounding underreporting of hate crime against the LGBTQ+ community (Stonewall, 2017; Antjoule, 2016) were quite apparent to all participants of the study, individuals as well as spokespersons for venues and organisations operating within the night-time economy. All individual participants except one claimed that they would rather not contact the police after being subjected to a hate crime or hostile behaviour based on their sexual or gender identity. Moran and Sharpe (2004) argue that negative attitudes toward the police are due to a lack of LGBTQ+ recognition within the police force and uncertain legal outcomes. Chakraborti and Garland (2015) add that a history of overpolicing and criminalisation is detrimental to trust in the police within the community. Individual participants of the current study were found to be apprehensive of reporting incidents to the police for different reasons. Some worried about the chances of a successful trial or conviction of the perpetrator, pointed out issues with methods of collecting evidence and showed insecurity in reporting incidents not involving excessive physical violence with regards to being taken seriously by law enforcement. They were, in fact, often unsure about the requirements regarding the severity of incidents that could be reported as a hate crime and thus often employed their own coping strategies rather than risking ridicule or a lengthy investigation process:

'It's always the question of how do you prove it. I feel like [the police] need to figure out a way to quickly contact them in the moment. If I could have a shortcut on my phone to a voice memo or something.' (Harry)

'You know you can't call the police saying he called me a faggot, you would just feel stupid for it. But it should be illegal.' (Caleb)

For other participants, general mistrust in the police was a main factor in not reporting incidents of hostility. Unhelpfulness of the police force or even discrimination was perceived by individuals especially in an intersectional context, as apprehensive attitudes towards the police due to being a person of colour and to identifying as queer seemed to merge in accordance with findings by Chakraborti and Garland (2015).

'Also because of being black. I wouldn't even go to the police if I lost my phone because I feel like they would find a way to turn on me. I don't trust the police.' (Lilith)

Often, individual participants' perceptions were in accordance with Maroney's (1998) stance that hate crime legislation is primarily a tool of appeasement for minority groups without much effect on underlying issues or causes of hostility.

'First the law does nothing in my eyes. And [hate crime] is something that I would rather deal with myself.' (Caleb)

Generally, the interviews showed that participants who had the physical ability to do so were more likely to express confidence in successfully dealing with hostility themselves or in seeking help within the community than to contact the police. While one participant reported higher trust in the police, she also felt that it was likely a rare stance to have. However, perceptions on both, the efficiency and professionalism of the police in dealing with hate-induced violence were more optimistic among night-time venue owners and managers than they were in individuals. When asked about the quality of cooperation with the police in the respective areas of Soho and Vauxhall, most participants who were responsible for an LGBTQ+ venue emphasised a satisfactory collaboration with law enforcement and were confident that the police took incidents very seriously. Together with Russell's (2017) findings that there is an interest within police forces to improve their image with the LGBTQ+ community, this could point to an improvement in the police's understanding of LGBTQ+ specific vulnerabilities within the night-time economy. With regards to police engagement, venue manager Christian states:

'Myself and the other managers go every four weeks to local business forums with the police, with secret services because (...) we are aware that the LGBT community could be a huge target (...) being in central London so they are very much on our side to keep us safe and that's quite refreshing (...).'

Overall, individual officers were perceived to be engaging and striving to respond quickly to calls. However, the police as an institution received criticism from venue managers too, with many feeling that in times of austerity, with the police force being reduced by 50,000 officers since 2010 (Public Accounts Committee, 2018), the LGBTQ+ community and its specific vulnerabilities are not enough of a priority to law enforcement. An underlying theme in this participant group's evaluations of the situation was the perception that most individual officers, especially those in closer or regular contact with the LGBTQ+ community were trying to adequately respond to the community's needs but were often not able to do so due to a lack of training and staff resources.

'There was so much visible policing around and community support officers and we don't have that now, it's all gone (...) We have had such a void of support for so long now. People don't even register the police as an authority of support or service now. You don't even think of them and it's not their fault for [God's] sake.' (Henry)

'Eight or nine years ago you had very visible LGBT police officers dealing with issues within the community whereas now the community can lose confidence when you have a non-LGBT officer dealing with LGBT crime when they don't fully understand the issues.' (John)

Further emphasis lay on the issues surrounding the police's contradictory responsibilities to act as safeguards for the community while also being an authority in licence distribution and night-time safety. This may lead to a reluctance in venue owners to discuss problems with the police for fear of finding themselves in trouble with law enforcement, indicating a gap in organisations businesses and anchoring points within the community can turn towards without fearing they may themselves lose the community's trust or their own revenue. The most common worry among managers and owners was the loss of the boroughs' LGBT liaison officers. While in 2013, twenty-two LGBT liaison officers were present in the borough of Westminster and seven worked in Lambeth (Mayor of London, 2013), especially businesses in Vauxhall complained that for the past years, there had hardly been any presence. This concern was shared by the researcher when attempting to interview a liaison officer in Lambeth to inform the study at hand, as upon request, employees of the council were unsure whether anybody was even still employed in that position. It remains unclear throughout this research whether Lambeth still has an LGBT liaison officer, as no current information on the number of liaison officers employed could be found, but statements by participant Henry suggest that at least for Vauxhall, there are none.

The lack of LGBTQ+ individuals' trust in the police force combined with the venues' weariness about police availability, community representation and prioritisation within the force emphasises the importance of other bodies or organisations stepping in to improve LGBTQ+ safety within night-time economy districts. In the light of the aforementioned, the police does not appear to be a suitable authority to provide safety on its own, highlighting the advantages of multi-agency and multi-organisational approaches.

Venues and the wider community as providers of safety

When asked about their perceptions on individual safety within the context of the night-time economy and leisure activities, most participants had a clear preference for areas of London that are known to be dominated by queer culture, and for dedicated LGBTQ+ venues as destinations on a night out. The reason most frequently given for this preference was a higher perception of safety while surrounded by one's own community as a form of ingroup preference (Tajfel, 1981) and mutual understanding of one's vulnerabilities, but also a feeling of solidarity within the community.

'Being in London we have an incredible community, an incredible scene, probably the best in the world because it's so diverse, it's so together.' (Christian)

While hate crime and hostility towards LGBTQ+ individuals is defined as deviant through current legislation, the community itself has a history of being considered the deviant element and still is by certain individuals and groups since, as argued by Browne et al., (2011) there is a gap between legal and perceivable social change. With this in mind, the solidarity and identification with the community as well as an almost defiant sense of pride in one's identity prevalent in the interviews may be partly explained by labelling theory (e.g. Lemert 1969).

Already in the 1960s, when acceptance of LGBT – let alone more complex – identities was far from common, Becker (1963) used homosexuality as an example for the social construction of deviance, further elaborating that those labelled in such a way may not always accept their status as outsiders or perceive those labelling them as entitled to do so. This may in part explain the forming of gay communities and dedicated, secluded venues in the earlier days. Nowadays, with the social norms of acceptance not always quite reaching the – arguably less ‘civilised’ (Crawford & Flint, 2009) – night-time economy, dedicated LGBTQ+ venues often take on the role of ‘safe spaces’ in which gay culture is invented as well as celebrated (D’Addario, 2016). The participants of this study were acutely aware of this responsibility.

‘It is a constant battle [against hostility], but that’s why gay venues exist in the first place to create a safe space for LGBTQ+ people. And not even just people in those categories, people who may not identify as any of them but actually just want a safe space.’ (Christian)

However, the implicitness of this status in the queer public’s perception has been damaged after the mass shooting at Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida in 2016 (D’Addario, 2016). Thus, the interviews showed that the owners and managers placed a special emphasis on venue policy. While these differed, there were some common themes across all venues, including zero tolerance policies regarding verbal or physical violence and close cooperation with law enforcement in case of an incident, as well as LGBTQ+ majority and strict search policies at the door. Most venues in the current study took further preventive measures, including staff making potential customers aware of the nature of the venue and monitoring closely their reactions as an indication of their compatibility with an LGBTQ+ audience and their acceptance. While this is most often done by regular security staff, other options are also applied.

‘At [nightclub] we have a venue picker. And that’s somebody who knows the venue, the crowd, the door policy and rather than being security he is a bit more of a friendly face who can test people’s attitude towards LGBT people.’ (John)

Door policies involving venue pickers instead of relying too heavily on security staff are sensible in the light of research findings by Brands and van Aalst (2015) that especially minorities’ perception of door staff is often ambiguous with regards to their role in enhancing safety. While the emphasis within most businesses lay on prevention of hostility and consistent procedures, participant John also argued that venues not following through with these may pose a threat to the community’s overall reputation regarding safety. Therefore, all managers and agency officials represented in the study stated that high-standard staff training was vital especially, but not only, for security staff, regarding assessing situations and individuals, handling intoxicated customers and understanding the community and its needs and vulnerabilities. Participant John also commends developments in licencing requirements for primarily straight businesses within queer districts:

‘There is a move towards recognising that the LGBT community has specific needs and that venues should recognise that. So, in Westminster and Lambeth there is a big move in licencing to ensure that venues are LGBT inclusive and that venues have measures in place to deal with the issues that the LGBT community face.’

While LGBTQ+ venues as well as the community were mostly regarded as providing a certain amount of safety to queer individuals, opinions on unity amongst LGBTQ+ individuals differed

across both participant groups. While some participants showed confidence in the community and its status as a safe space, unity was also often perceived as an ideal that did not translate into the actual experience, especially within the night-time economy. Chakraborti and Garland (2015) argue that the community is largely perceived as a homogenous group sharing the same needs rather than a collective of individuals with uniquely intersecting affiliations with multiple groups (Simmel, 1955). Some findings in the current research further support the argument that the LGBTQ+ 'community' is more of a convenient make-shift group created by the self-fulfilling prophecy of its label (Becker, 1963) and strain through out-group hostility (Tajfel, 1981). Thus, the research produced reports of intragroup conflict, threats from other members of the group that are often not addressed by agencies, or simply a lack of solidarity:

'Even the community itself doesn't really stand for each other. Even if you just get a gay guy and a lesbian. I have heard so many lesbians say I hate gay guys or the other way around.' (Caleb)

'I said earlier that I feel safe in Soho from hate crime. But I don't feel safe from other gays, from sexual harassment. So even though I am weary of heterosexual people potentially being a threat, I am also weary of other gay men who I know are looking at me like a piece of meat.' (Harry)

Earlier research (Stonewall, 2018) has found prevalent issues with racism within the community, however, misogyny not only towards lesbians and bisexual women but also, more abstractly, towards effeminate gay or bisexual men, as well as transmisogynist attitudes and sexual harassment within the community seemed to be a concern to participants. These issues go beyond the hate crime paradigm and victimisation due to homophobia and show an aspect of the LGBTQ+ scene that is not often addressed or apparent to anyone on the outside. In an attempt to escape the heteronormativity of wider society, LGBTQ+ individuals often enter the queer community to find a prevalent homonormative mindset, which may lead to similar, if less extreme, patterns of victimisation. Harry sums up his experience as an effeminate gay man as such:

'Anybody has the ability to be hostile so I'm always looking out for even the most subtle signs of hostility. At night-time I am mostly looking out for my physical safety, daytimes I am looking out for my dignity.'

In order to create an inclusive framework of LGBTQ+ safety within the night-time economy, these issues must be made visible and addressed by campaigns and authorities.

Alternative approaches to vulnerabilities within the night-time economy

While most participants felt fairly safe within dedicated venues, it was also pointed out that as soon as they leave the venue, those feelings may change rapidly. As the long history of structural-cultural and, consequently, current individual violence (van Soest & Bryant, 1995) against members of the LGBTQ+ community is not expected to cease rapidly (Browne et al., 2011), it is vital that the community itself is provided with resources to strengthen unity and solidarity. For many, it functions as a chosen family offering support to those whose biological families, at best, cannot grasp their experiences of victimisation and at worst enhance or perpetrate them (Hein & Scharer, 2012). With the aforementioned relatively low level of

individual trust in the police (Miles-Johnson, 2013), a shift towards community-based approaches may be necessary.

'In terms of LGBT venues I think there is a big role for charities, as LGBT venues tend to be community focused' (John)

While there are multiple campaigns seeking to improve safety within the night-time economy such as Ask Angela (Metropolitan Police, 2019), WAVE (National Business Crime Centre, 2018) or Drinkaware (2019), these have been criticised by participants for being very heteronormative.

'We introduced WAVE which is very much... the training videos are very straight, some feedback we got was whether there is an alternative for the LGBT community. I did a little bit of research and there isn't. So what happens if the night goes horribly wrong in the LGBT community? They have entirely different vulnerabilities.' (Juliet)

The scarcity of LGBTQ+ specific education material and unavailability of formal training to venues and staff was a prevalent concern of those involved professionally in the night-time community. Recently, there appears to be a stronger push towards LGBTQ+ specific education and interventions resulting in the launch of the 'End the Night Right' campaign run by the Westminster Council, the LGBT Foundation and Drinkaware. The campaign encompasses a more community centred approach to training regarding safer alcohol consumption through Drinkaware as well as the placement of a group of trained volunteers – the Soho Angels – within the Soho nightlife district (Westminster City Council, 2018). This multi-agency approach seems to be a first step in the right direction, with research (Cozens et al., 2019) arguing for the efficacy of applying inter-agency tactics to night-time safety in other cities. Upon questioning, individual participants of the study seemed to mostly welcome these measures.

However, there was an emphasis on the need for a more standardised approach across more London boroughs in the light of concerns about an increase in violence (London Assembly, 2016).

'The problem in the night-time economy is that violence is on the increase, so whatever way you look at it, whether that's violence from person to person or that's from customer to staff. I think it's a concern across the whole industry' (John)

'We're hoping to roll the angels out further. Could they come to other districts? The night czar is very keen on this, she wants LGBT venues to stay in London, but that will only happen if people feel safe, so there needs to be a lot more training around it. We just need to identify it first or create it.' (Juliet)

Further, it was pointed out that there was a need for recognition of some venues in which individuals may be perceived as more likely or easier targets due to a more pronounced deviance from hetero- and homonormative standards and that are therefore at a higher (perceived) risk of collective and individual victimisation.

'Guys that are a bit more feminine and wearing heels and stuff and that kind of customers typically are within certain venues and not others. So we take as an example Ku and G-A-Y and bars like that may be more of a target than Compton's.' (Christian)

Conclusion

In the course of this research, the night-time economy has been shown to be a sphere of increased violence and heightened vulnerability in which LGBTQ+ individuals as members of a marginalised group are often required to take additional measures to ensure their safety compared to regular day time activities. However, the night-time economy, in the shape of gay bars and LGBTQ+ nightclubs, has also been argued to be a central part of queer culture. Traditions and cultural norms of interaction unique to the community are shaped in this sphere or existing culture is allowed to be celebrated in a safe environment. While those in charge of LGBTQ+ venues operating within the night-time community have been shown to be acutely aware of the venues' role as safe spaces and their businesses' centrality within the community, they are not able to provide safety to the community on their own. Too often, where the premises of the gay bar end, so do LGBTQ+ individuals' feelings of safety, not only but especially during the night-time, requiring the initiative and cooperation of additional organisations and authorities. While some findings of this research support earlier evaluations that homophobically motivated violence tends to be especially brutal when compared to other forms of hate crime, the main emphasis lay on minor but constantly occurring incidents, such as verbal harassment or attempts at intimidation. A key issue found in this study was individuals' uncertainty of how to address these situations, as they were largely perceived as too minor to report or even mention as singular incidents, despite the frequency of such events seeming to constitute their distressing nature to participants. This research showed that constant exposure to these 'minor' hostile acts led to a sense of resilience which was often shown by participants either ignoring hostile behaviours or responding in a confrontational manner. However, this depended largely on factors such as the participant's character, perceived safety of the situation or even the participant's current mood, showing that there is no clear answer to how LGBTQ+ individuals deal with hostility that is not explicitly addressed by the law. This highlights the importance of qualitative research in this field and a focus on varying individual perceptions.

Whereas the police are widely recognised as the main provider of safety within largely heteronormative night-time spheres, the lack of trust in the police force among LGBTQ+ individuals, which has become evident in this study and through long-standing issues of underreporting of hate crime against LGBTQ+, impede the exertion of this role to a degree. Although venue owners and managers have been found to be more trusting towards law enforcement and some emphasised good officer engagement and collaboration, a lack of police funding under austerity conditions since 2010 has been shown to cause dismantling of initiatives providing more representation and recognition of issues unique to the LGBTQ+ community within police practice, such as LGBT liaison officers. This has been found to render the police as a singular agency unsuitable as providers of safety to the community within the night-time economy. This research therefore suggests that gaps in the influence of the police must be filled by alternative organisations and authorities, not only due to individual lack of trust, but also bearing in mind this study's findings of the police's dual responsibility of providing safety and enforcing adherence to strict licencing regulations, which may cause venue owners to be weary of approaching the police on safety issues for fear of legal consequences.

The study has shown that there is a significant role for charity organisations in close collaboration with venues in particular, as an opportunity to keep the reinforcement of safety community-based. While some groups and organisations are currently operating especially in Soho, these efforts should be expanded to cover more areas that are frequented by an LGBTQ+ audience. They should aim to provide more safety in those areas that are not explicitly LGBTQ+ and where the community as a vital provider of safety is not as closely knit and therefore less capable of doing so. Thus, more alternative organisations must be launched and existing ones must receive more funding and more recognition as providers of safety in order to be able to fill the gaps left by law enforcement. There is a further need to provide campaigns that acknowledge the difference in vulnerabilities between largely straight audiences and the LGBTQ+ community within the night-time economy.

As a crucial part of the provision of safety to the community is proper training of staff associated with LGBTQ+ dedicated and related businesses, campaigns and initiatives must work closely with businesses in developing and enforcing pertinent training tailored to the community surrounding hostility based on homophobia. This must include measures to prevent hate crime and action plans in case of an incident.

However, it must also address intra-community issues such as the dangers of excessive alcohol and drug consumption, as well as safety issues caused or exacerbated by division and victimisation within the community linked to racism, sexism and homonormativity, factors which are detrimental to engaging the community itself as a main provider of safety. These problems need to be addressed exceedingly by campaigns and authorities in order to include those outside hetero- or homonormative standards in the framework of safety.

Overall, this research concludes that there is a need for a standardised and inclusive approach to LGBTQ+ safety in the night-time community, achieved through multi-agency approaches encompassing law enforcement, campaigns, charities and crime reduction organisations and that in order to accomplish this, more emphasis must be placed and education must refer to diversity and patterns of victimisation within the community, not only against it. Future research could be directed towards the threat of sexual harassment within the community in clear relation to night-time safety and organisational and business approaches. Further, in order to be able to lay a foundation for a truly standardised approach to LGBTQ+ safety, the research at hand should be replicated with a larger, more diverse participant group including more representatives of different organisations involved in the provision of safety. It should further be expanded into more than one city within the United Kingdom, perhaps even across Europe and the United States.

References

- Altemeyer, B. (1981) *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Antjoulle, N. (2016) *The hate crime report 2016: homophobia, biphobia and transphobia in the UK*. Galop.
- Becker, H. (1963) *Outsiders: studies in sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Bloodworth, A. (2018) *What is LGBTQ+? What does the plus stand for and is anyone left out?* Available at: <https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2018/03/15/what-is-lgbtq-what-does-the-plus-stand-for-and-is-anyone-left-out/> (Accessed: 22.12.2018).
- Blumer, H. (1969) *Symbolic interactionism: perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Brands, J., van Aalst, I., Schwanen, T. (2015) 'Safety, surveillance and policing in the night-time economy: (re)turning to numbers', *Geoforum*, 62, pp. 24-37.
- Browne, K., Bakshi, L., Lim, J. (2011) 'It's something you just have to ignore: understanding and addressing contemporary lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans safety beyond hate crime paradigms', *Journal of Social Policy*, 40(4), pp. 739-756.
- Byrne, B. (2004) 'Qualitative interviewing', in Seale, C. (ed.) *Researching society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Chakraborti, N., Garland, J. (2012) 'Reconceptualizing hate crime victimization through the lens of vulnerability and 'difference'', *Theoretical Criminology*, 16(4), pp. 499-514.
- Chakraborti, N., Garland, J. (2015) *Hate crime: impact, causes and responses*. London: Sage.
- Cozens, P., Greive, S., Rogers, C. (2019) 'Let's be friends'; exploring governance, crime precipitators and public safety in the night-time economies of Cardiff (Wales) and Perth (Australia)', *Journal of Urbanism*, 12(2), pp. 244-258.
- Crawford, A., Flint, J. (2009) 'Urban safety, anti-social behaviour and the night-time economy', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 9(4), pp. 403-413.
- Crown Prosecution Service (2017) *Hate crime*. Available at: <https://www.cps.gov.uk/hate-crime> (Accessed: 20.02.2019).
- Crown Prosecution Service (2018) *Hate crime annual report 2017/18*. London: The Stationary Office.
- D'Addario, D. (2016) 'The gay bar as safe space has been shattered', *Time Magazine*, 16 June 2016.
- Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.) (2011) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. 4th edn. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Drinkaware (2019) *Staying safe while drinking*. Available at: <https://www.drinkaware.co.uk/advice/staying-safe-while-drinking/> (Accessed: 30.04.2019).
- Duggan, L. (2002) 'The new homonormativity: the sexual politics of neoliberalism', in Castronovo, R. and Nelson, D.D. (eds.) *Materializing democracy: towards a revitalized cultural politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Dunbar, E. (2006) 'Race, gender, and sexual orientation in hate crime victimization: identity politics or identity risk?', *Violence and Victims*, 21(3), pp. 323-337.

- Durkheim, E. (1964) *The division of labour in society*. New York: Free Press.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2018) *Hate crime statistics 2017*. Available at: <https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2017/topic-pages/incidents-and-offenses> (Accessed: 09.04.2019).
- Gallop (2017) *Online hate crime report 2017: challenging online homophobia, biphobia and transphobia*. Available at: <https://www.galop.org.uk/online-hate-crime-report-2017/> (Accessed: 27.12.2018).
- Garnets, L., Herek, G.M., Levy, B. (1990) 'Violence and victimization of lesbians and gay men: mental health consequences', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5(3), pp. 366-383.
- Gough, J., Macnair, M. (1985) *Gay liberation in the eighties*. London: Pluto Press.
- Green, D.P., McFalls, L.H., Smith, J.K. (2001) 'Hate crime: an emergent research agenda', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, pp. 479-504.
- Hall, J. (2016) *Tracing the history of the word 'queer'*. Available at: <http://www.dazeddigital.com/artsandculture/article/32213/1/tracing-the-history-of-the-word-queer> (Accessed: 02.01.2019).
- Hein, L.C., Scharer, K.M. (2012) 'Who cares if it is a hate crime? Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender hate crimes – mental health implications and interventions', *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 49, pp. 84-93.
- Herek, G.M. (1990) 'The context of anti-gay violence: Notes on cultural and psychological heterosexism', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5(3), pp. 316–333.
- HM Government (2003) *Criminal Justice Act 2003*. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/44/section/146> (Accessed: 04.02.2019)
- Home Office (2018) *Hate crime, England and Wales, 2017/18*. London: The Stationary Office.
- Lemert, E.M. (1972) *Human deviance, social problems, and social control*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Lincoln, Y.S., Guba; E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. London: Sage Publications.
- Maroney, T.A. (1998) 'The struggle against hate crime: movement at a crossroads', *New York University Law Review*, 73, pp. 565-620.
- Mason, G. (2001) 'A picture of hate crime: racial and homophobic harassment in the United Kingdom', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 17(1), pp. 70-95.
- Mason-Bish (2010) 'Future challenges for hate crime policy', in Chakraborti, N. (ed.) *Hate crime: concepts, policy, future directions*. Milton: Willan.
- Mattson, G. (2014) 'Style and the value of gay nightlife: Homonormative placemaking in San Francisco', *Urban Studies*, 52(16), pp. 3144-3159.
- Maxwell, S., Shahmanesh, M., Gafos, M. (2019) 'Chemsex behaviours among men who have sex with men: a systematic review of the literature', *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 63, pp. 74-89.
- Mayor of London (2013) *Police LGBT liaison officers*. Available at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/questions/2013/5262> (Accessed: 09.03.2019).

- Metropolitan Police (2019) *What is hate crime?* Available at: <https://www.met.police.uk/advice/advice-and-information/hco/hate-crime/what-is-hate-crime/> (Accessed: 23.01.2019)
- Meyer, D. (2010) 'Evaluating the severity of hate-motivated violence', *Sociology*, 44(5), pp. 980-995.
- Miles-Johnson, T. (2013) 'Confidence and trust in police: how sexual identity difference shapes perceptions of police', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 25(2), pp. 685-702.
- Moran, L.J., Sharpe, A.N. (2004) 'Violence, identity and policing: the case of violence against transgender people', *Criminal Justice*, 4(4), pp. 395-417.
- Moreau, J. (2018) 'Trump in transnational perspective: Insights from global LGBT politics', *Politics and Gender*, 14(4), pp. 619-648.
- National Business Crime Centre (2018) *Addressing vulnerability in the night time economy*. Available at: <https://nbcc.police.uk/article/?id=2f13a89d3d28b719972ebf7ac5e2a714> (Accessed: 30.04.2019).
- Pearson, G. (1983) *Hooligan: a history of respectable fears*. London: Macmillan.
- Perry, B. (2002) 'Hate crime and identity politics', *Theoretical Criminology*, 6(4), pp. 485-491.
- Philpot, R, Liebst, L.S., Møller, K.K., Lindegaard, M.R., Levine, M. (2019) 'Capturing violence in the night-time economy: A review of established and emerging methodologies', *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 46, pp. 56-65.
- Plummer, K. (2000) 'Mapping the sociological gay: pasts, presents and futures of a sociology of same sex relations', in Sandfort, T., Schuyf, J., Duyvcendak, J.W. and Weeks, J. (eds.) *Lesbian and gay studies: an introductory, interdisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- Price, E. (2011) 'LGBT sexualities in social care research', *NIHR School for Social Care Research Methods Review*, 2, pp. 1-27.
- Public Accounts Committee (2018) *Financial sustainability of police forces in England and Wales*. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmpubacc/1513/151302.htm> (Accessed: 10.04.2019)
- Raheim, M., Magnussen, L.V., Tveit Sekse, R.J., Lunde, A., Jacobsen, T., Blystad, A. (2016) 'Researcher–researched relationship in qualitative research: Shifts in positions and researcher vulnerability', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Health and Well-being*, 11, pp. 125-138.
- Rivers, I., McPherson, K.E., Hughes, J.R. (2010) 'The role of social and professional support seeking in trauma recovery: lesbian, gay and bisexual experiences of crime and fears for safety', *Psychology and Sexuality*, 1(2), pp. 145-155.
- Rosenbaum, D.P., Schuck, A.M., Costello, S.K., Hawkins, D.F., Ring, M.K. (2005) 'Attitudes Toward the Police: The Effects of Direct and Vicarious Experience', *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), pp. 343–365.
- Russell, E.K. (2017) 'A fair cop: queer histories, affect and police image work in pride march', *Crime Media Culture*, 13(3), pp. 277-293.
- Sieber, J.E. (1992) *Planning ethically responsible research: A guide for students and internal review boards*. London: Sage.

- Silverman, D. (2013) *Doing qualitative research*. 5th edn. London: Sage.
- Simmel, G. (1955) *Conflict and the web of group affiliations*. New York: Free Press.
- Sloan, L., Gustavsson, N. (eds.) (1999) *Violence and social injustice against lesbian, gay and bisexual people*. London: Routledge.
- Somekh, B., Lewin, C. (eds.) (2012) *Theory and methods in social research*. 2nd edn. London: Sage.
- Stonewall (2017) *LGBT in Britain: Hate crime and discrimination*. Available at: <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/lgbt-britain-hate-crime-and-discrimination> (Accessed: 20.12.2018).
- Stonewall (2018) *LGBT in Britain: Home and communities*. Available at: https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/lgbt_in_britain_home_and_communities.pdf (Accessed: 07.03.2019).
- Sturcke, J. (2006) *Barman killer had been released early*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/jun/16/gayrights.ukcrime> (Accessed: 05.02.2019).
- Thatchell, P. (2017) *Don't fall for the myth that it's 50 years since we decriminalised homosexuality*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/may/23/fifty-years-gay-liberation-uk-barely-four-1967-act> (Accessed: 04.03.2019).
- Tajfel, H. (1981) *Human groups and social categories—Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The National Archives (2019) *Home Office correspondence from 1782*. Available at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/help-with-your-research/research-guides/home-office-correspondence-1782-1979/> (Accessed: 03.03.2019).
- Tobin, H.J., Freedman-Gurspan, R., Mottet, L. (2015) *A blueprint for equality. A federal agenda for transgender people*. Available at: https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/resources/NCTE_Blueprint_June2015.pdf. (Accessed: 01/04/2019).
- Van Soest, D., Bryant, S. (1995) 'Violence reconceptualized for social work: the urban dilemma', *Social Work*, 40(4), pp. 549-557.
- West Yorkshire Police (2018) *Force policy: trans and non-binary people*. Available at: https://www.westyorkshire.police.uk/sites/default/files/2018-10/trans_and_non-binary_people.pdf (Accessed: 01.03.2019).
- Westminster City Council (2018) *End the night right*. Available at: <https://www.westminster.gov.uk/endthenightright> (Accessed: 30.04.2019).
- White, R. (2002) 'Hate crime politics', *Theoretical Criminology*, 6(4), pp. 499-502.

Appendix I

Glossary

Admiral Duncan. A gay pub on Old Compton Street in Soho, London. Site of a nail bomb attack carried out by a neo-Nazi in 1999.

Asexual. Relating to a person who does not experience sexual attraction and generally has no wish of partaking in any sexual acts. However, asexuality is often perceived as a spectrum encompassing different identities and levels of inclination towards partaking in sexual acts.

#AskForAngela. A campaign supported by the police to help people on a date or having met somebody within a venue if they feel uncomfortable or unsafe with the other person. The person has the opportunity to ask a bartender or member of staff for 'Angela' and will receive help leaving the situation.

BID. A 'business improvement district' is a defined area within which businesses are required to pay an additional tax (or levy) in order to fund projects within the district's boundaries, such as additional police officers (BID officers).

Cis-gender. From the Latin word *cis*, meaning 'on this side of'. Full identification with one's biological sex and the gender assigned at birth.

FTM. A transgender person who has been assigned female at birth and identifies as male (female to male).

Heteronormativity. The societal belief that heterosexuality is the normal or natural sexual orientation, rendering any other orientation a deviation from the norm.

Heterosexism. A term used synonymously with heteronormativity. See 'heteronormativity'.

Homonormativity. A term coined by Professor Lisa Duggan (2003) to highlight the assumption that there is a 'proper' way of being gay and addresses issues of privilege within the LGBTQ+ community, intersecting with problems of racism, sexism, economic marginalisation and transmisogyny (explained below), thus leaving many individuals whose sexual or gender identity is not as easily marketed to a heterosexual audience unable to participate fully in the movement toward equality.

Homophobia. An aversion towards homosexual people, often colloquially used as an umbrella term for an aversion against any LGBTQ+ identity.

Intersex. Individuals born with any of several variations in sex characteristics that do not fit the typical definitions for male or female bodies. E.g. chromosomes, genitals, gonads, etc. Refers to genetics and biological sex rather than social gender.

LGBTQ+. Acronym for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual and queer identities. The plus stands for an indefinite number of other identities that may fall under this umbrella term, for example asexual, intersex or non-binary.

MTF. A transgender person who has been assigned male at birth and identifies as female (male to female).

Night czar. Amy Lamé. Employed by the Mayor's Office in 2016 and tasked with ensuring London thrives as a 24-hour city.

Non-binary. Also referred to as genderqueer. An umbrella term for gender identities that are not exclusively male or female. Based on the assumption that gender is socially constructed and falls on a spectrum, male and female only being the opposing ends of the spectrum. A term describing socio-cultural non-conformity to traditional gender characteristics, as opposed to the biological 'intersex'.

Orlando shooting. See Pulse Nightclub.

Pulse Nightclub. A gay bar and nightclub in Orlando, Florida. Site of a homophobically motivated mass shooting in 2016 killing 49 guests and wounding 53. It was handled as an act of terrorism by the FBI since the perpetrator had previously pledged his allegiance to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS).

Queer. Literally meaning strange or odd. Historically used as a derogatory term for homosexuals but has been reclaimed by the LGBTQ+ community in recent years and is often used as a vague umbrella term for sexual or gender identities that are not straight or cis-gendered.

Soho Angels. A team of volunteers who receive training adapted from the Drinkaware Crew scheme that equips them to support vulnerable people on a night out and help them to 'end the night well'. The Drinkaware Crew are trained staff working within venues to promote a positive social atmosphere and support the welfare of young people on a night out. Support can involve reuniting individuals with their friends, finding lost phones or bags, helping them to get home safely and calling medical assistance if required. The Soho Angels have been active since 2018.

Transgender. Relating to a person whose personal and gender identity does not correspond with the gender assigned at birth, i.e. their biological sex. From the Latin *trans*, meaning 'across'.

Transmisogyny. The intersection between transphobia and misogyny which includes negative attitudes towards transgender individuals falling on the female side of the gender spectrum (MTF transgender).

Transphobia. Specifically the aversion against transgender individuals, including FTM, MTF or non-binary identities.

WAVE. Welfare and vulnerability engagement. Run by the Safer Business Network in collaboration with the Metropolitan Police since 2017 in order to provide training and education on vulnerabilities within the night-time economy and how easily a night out can go wrong.

Appendix II

The Participants

This is intended to provide some further information on the participants of this study in order to give context to their statements included in the discussion. Participant names – as mentioned before – have been changed in order to protect their anonymity.

-
- Melanie* Cisgender lesbian, regular visitor of Soho night-time venues.
- Lilith* Former employee of an LGBTQ+ venue, visitor of night-time businesses. Non-binary person of colour.
- Harry* Gay cisgender man. Regular visitor of LGBTQ+ night-time venues.
- Caleb* Transgender man, FTM. Regular visitor of LGBTQ+ night-time venues.
-
- John* Manager of a large-scale, primarily but not exclusively LGBTQ+ nightclub. Very active in his area within multi-agency approaches to safety.
- Christian* Manager of an LGBTQ+ venue in Soho.
- Henry* Owner of an LGBTQ+ night-time venue in South London.
- Mike* Owner of a venue in South London, mostly attracting gay men.
- Juliet* CEO of a multi-agency based organisation dealing with business safety across London.

Appendix III

Consent Form Individual Participants

As you know, you have been invited to an interview today about your individual perceptions on hate crime within and against the LGBTQ+ community and the community's safety within the night-time economy, including any of your own experiences with the issue you would like to share. Your contribution will be extremely useful in gaining insight into LGBTQ+ individuals' experiences with and perspectives on hate crime based on sexual or gender identity and understanding where law enforcement and other organisations are working well dealing with LGBTQ+ safety, but most importantly where there is room for improvement. The interview will include some questions about your experiences, but will likely be more of an informal chat in which everything you would like to add to the issue can be brought up. There are no right or wrong answers, and you are free to skip any question at any time, stop the interview or withdraw from the project entirely at any point before submission should you feel that you need to do so. You are not required to give any reason in case you would like to end your participation. You are offered anonymity and confidentiality and nobody will know you participated in this interview unless you tell them. Your real name will not appear anywhere in either the research files or any later reports or publications. Any direct quotes used in reports will be anonymised. I will record the interview on a digital recording device in order to include a correct account of what you are sharing with me today in the subsequent report. If for whatever reason you do not wish to be recorded, you are free to refuse.

Please confirm that you have read the information sheet provided.....yes/no

Please confirm that you are willing to take part in the research.....yes/no

Signature of
interviewee.....

(If written consent is refused, then interviewee should consent orally and the interviewer will sign below to confirm this)

I confirm that the interviewee has received an information sheet and has orally consented to taking part in the research.

Signature of interviewer.....

Consent Form Managers and Venue Owners

As you know I am conducting research on the development and perceptions on hate crime within the LGBTQ+ community with a focus on LGBTQ+ safety within the night-time economy. Your contribution will be extremely useful in gaining insight into the measures that are taken to ensure safety for LGBTQ+ people as a vulnerable group and understanding where organisations and agencies are working well to counteract and deal with hostility against LGBTQ+, but most importantly where there is room for improvement. You are granted confidentiality and anonymity, nobody will know you participated in this study unless you wish to inform them. You may refuse to answer any question at any point and you are not required to give any reason in case you would like to do so. If for whatever reason you would like to terminate your participation in the study, you are free to do so at any point before publication with no reason required. All information you give in this interview will be anonymised and your name will not appear anywhere in either the research files or any later reports or publications. I will record the interview on a digital recording device in order to include a correct account of what you are stating in this interview in the subsequent report. If for whatever reason you do not wish to be recorded, you are free to refuse this.

Please confirm that you have read the information sheet provided.....yes/no

Please confirm that you are willing to take part in the research.....yes/no

Signature of
interviewee.....

(If written consent is refused, then interviewee should consent orally and the interviewer will sign below to confirm this)

I confirm that the interviewee has received an information sheet and has orally consented to taking part in the research.

Signature of interviewer.....

Appendix IV

Interview Guidance Questions: Group I

- Have you or somebody you know experienced hate (or even a hate crime) due to your sexual or gender identity? If yes, would you feel comfortable telling me a little about it?
- Picture a typical night out. What is going through your head?
- What is your opinion on the role of law enforcement / the police?
- How do you define open hostility and at what point would you consider an interaction hostile/discriminatory or even a hate crime?
- Have you gone out of your way to avoid situations like that? If so, please explain?
- If not, what do you think are some factors that helped you not to experience this (luck, caution, 'passing' as either straight or the gender you identify as)?
- Can you think of any specific events that you feel impacted on acceptance of the community/yourself? E.g. same sex marriage, conflicts over trans youth overseas, conflicts over religious freedom vs right to marry
- How do you think Brexit has impacted the discussion?
- Do you feel that the more readily available information e.g. via the internet has had any impact on acceptance of trans identity?
- Did you or would you contact the police after being subjected to a hate crime? Why / why not?
- What other alternative organisations are you aware of or would you use to talk about hate crime besides or instead of law enforcement?
- Do you feel confident that law enforcement would take you seriously / did they take you seriously when reporting?

Interview Guidance Questions: Group II

- Has your venue had to deal with homophobic attacks? Or have you or staff had to deal with any incidents that happened nearby? If so, would you feel comfortable telling me about an incident where this has happened?
- How often would you say such incidents happen?
- How does the aftermath of such events impact the venues/ night-time economy in the area?
- Does your business have any safety protocols in place to prevent this? What can feasibly be done?
- Is there an action plan for when it does happen?
- To what extent is there an awareness of specific LGBT needs within the night-time economy by agencies?
- How would you say this translates into safety measures and policies in and around the area?
- How is the co-operation with institutions such as the council/police/different charities?
- How concerned are you generally about hate crimes and attacks on customers and staff?
- How do you think the situation has changed over the past 10 to 15 years?
- What are the things that you would like to see change or any specific points in collaboration between agencies where you see a particular need for improvement?
- How open are venues and customers to policy changes and collaboration with law enforcement and different agencies, given some history of mistrust between the LGBT community and those organisations?
- Any pressing concerns/things you would like to bring up/specific areas where you see a need for improvement that you would like to talk about today?