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Background

**sexual orientation**
- Minor sexual orientation and gender identity (gay men and ‘mostly’ heterosexual)
- Sexual victimisation, revictimisation, mental health consequences (e.g. Meyer, 2003 minority stress model)
- Balsam (2003-6); Laing and Davies (2011); Roberts, Austin, Corliss, Vandermorris and Koenen (2010)

**victimisation**
- Herek 1990s onwards
- Explanation of victimisation prevalence (e.g. Roberts, Austin, Corliss, Vandermorris and Koenen, 2010)
- Minority sexual orientation as a predictor

**health consequences**
- Differential victimisation (Schneider, 2001)
- Fear of crime ‘paradox’
- Victimisation as a predictor

**hate crime**
- Majority: small scale, socially ‘charged’ contexts, sexual victimisation; definitions and sampling (Purdam et al, 2008; Sell, 2000)
- Few: GB/UK, known predictors of victimisation, worry, risk and protective behaviours, crime types, differentiate minority sexual orientation (intersecting identities e.g. Paul et al, 2002; Poteat et al, 2009, 2011)

**criminal victimisation**
- research methods
Purpose

Results
Intersecting identities (known predictors)
Sexual orientation minority (gender identity?)
Crime types

British Crime Survey
Embedded questions
Multipurpose sampling
Comparison groups
Purpose - Results

Does sexual orientation predict general and crime specific criminal victimisation?

Does sexual orientation predict general and crime specific worry about victimisation, and perceptions of future risk of victimisation, and protective and safety behaviours?
Purpose – British Crime Survey

Characteristics of 2007-8, 2008-9, 2009-10 BCS sexual orientation data

Characteristics of 2007-8, 2008-9, 2009-10 BCS methodology

Characteristics of BCS general and crime specific data
Method

British Crime Survey non-victim form data from 2007-8, 2008-9 and 2009-10

Multinomial logistic regressions
(individually weighted responses, cross sectional)

Variables: sexual orientation, gender, age, ethnicity, education, general and crime specific (personal) victim status, general and crime specific perceptions of risk, worry about victimisation, and protection and safety behaviours
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total (row)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual/straight</td>
<td>11,477</td>
<td>13,091</td>
<td>24,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know (DK)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t wish to answer (DWA)</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### Greater victimisation (previous 12 months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gay/Lesbian</th>
<th>Threats of damage or use of force</th>
<th>Gay/Lesbian</th>
<th>Personal items deliberately damaged</th>
<th>Attempted personal theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>“other”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian Bisexual (male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“other”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### More worry about victimisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Attack due to colour, ethnicity, religion</th>
<th>Insulted or pestered</th>
<th>Mugged or robbed</th>
<th>Physical attack</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Home broken into</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual (male)</td>
<td>Gay/Lesbian, Bisexual, DK</td>
<td>Gay/Lesbian, DK</td>
<td>Gay/Lesbian, Bisexual, DK</td>
<td>Gay/Lesbian, Bisexual, DK</td>
<td>Gay/Lesbian, Bisexual, DK</td>
<td>Gay/Lesbian, Bisexual, DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Don’t know” (DK)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gay males less worry</td>
<td>Gay males less worry</td>
<td>“other”, “don’t wish to answer” (DWA)</td>
<td>Gay males less worry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bisexual males less worry
- Gay males less worry
- Gay, bisexual, DWA males less worry
## Results

### Strongest risk perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Burglary, mugging/robbery, physical attack, intimidation, gun/knife crime</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
<th>DK males</th>
<th>FAIRLY LIKELY</th>
<th>FAIRLY LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mugging/robbery, physical attack, intimidation, knife crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“other” males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### Protection and safety behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carry personal alarm</th>
<th>Chains on some doors</th>
<th>Security viewers</th>
<th>Deadlocks</th>
<th>Safe (very/fairly) walking alone after dark</th>
<th>Walking alone after dark (spring/autumn)</th>
<th>Carry mace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual compared to DWA</td>
<td>Heterosexual compared to Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>Heterosexual compared to Gay/Lesbian <em>Gay males</em></td>
<td>Most likely</td>
<td>“other” male</td>
<td>“other” Bisexual (at least once fortnight)</td>
<td>DWA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and implications

Sexual orientation minority identity is not a uniform predictor

Intersecting identities complicate the predictive value of sexual orientation

Methodological sensitivity issues

Implications for risk behaviours

Implications for assessing sexual orientation within the BCS and using BCS data