

Victimisation amongst Female and Male Sexual Minority Status Groups: Evidence from the
British Crime Survey 2007-10

Bere Mahoney¹, Michelle Davies, and Laura Scurlock-Evans

¹Psychological Sciences, University of Worcester, Henwick Grove, Worcester,
Worcestershire, WR2 6AJ; telephone 01905 855301; facsimile 01905 855132;
b.mahoney@worc.ac.uk

Word count 6437

Abstract

International surveys of victims show crime rates in England and Wales, including hate-crimes, are amongst the highest in Europe. Nevertheless, sexual minority status is a less considered risk factor in general victimisation research. This study used sexual minority status and sex to predict victimisation across British Crime Surveys from 2007-2010.

Logistic regression analyses showed sexual minority status groups more likely than heterosexuals to be victimised from any and some specific crimes. However, bisexuals rather than lesbians or gay men were more consistently victimised, notably by sexual attacks and within the household. Implications for understanding victimisation amongst these groups are discussed.

Key words: victimisation, sexual minority status, specific crimes

Introduction

The British Crime Survey (BCS) is a large, nationally representative survey about crime and victimisation across England and Wales in which respondents are surveyed on their experiences of crime-related incidents in the past 12 months, and on their attitudes towards crime-related issues. Since its inception in 1981-82, the BCS has provided a comparatively reliable measure of the extent of victimisation over time and it appears unaffected by whether crime is officially reported to the police by its victims, or by changes to the way in which the police in the United Kingdom record crime (Walker, Flatley, Kershaw & Moon, 2009). Victimisation experiences covered by the BCS include theft and attempted theft, deliberate damage to property, deliberate violence against the person, sexual assault, household violence and threats of violence. Therefore, to some extent the BCS provides a better reflection of the true extent of household and personal crime than police recorded statistics because it includes crimes that are not reported to or recorded by the police (Walker et al., 2009). Further, its national level scope is relatively broad, and its methodological rigour relatively superior to that of smaller scale surveys (Clancy, Hough, Aust & Kershaw, 2001; Home Office, 2009a; Martin & Manners, 1995; Myhill & Allen, 2002).

Over recent years the BCS has recorded an overall reduction in violent crime, a pattern consistent with trends in police recorded crime (Flatley, Kershaw, Smith, Chaplin, & Moon, 2010). Indeed, longer-term trends from the BCS show violent crime down by 50 per cent from its peak in 1995 to a relatively consistent level over the last few years. Specifically, the 2008-9 BCS estimates that in total there were approximately 10.7 million crimes against adults resident in households in England and Wales (Walker et al., 2009), with no significant change in 2009-10 (Flatley et al., 2010).

Nevertheless, persistent trends remain for social groups at greatest risk of victimisation from specific crimes. For example, BCS data have shown women particularly at more risk than men of interpersonal violence, and sexual assault (Walby & Allen, 2004). Furthermore, despite falling crime rates, England and Wales display amongst the highest overall crime rates across all nations studied in the International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS; van Dijk, van Kesteren & Smit, 2007). Of particular interest to the current study, the EU ICVS contained a broad question about experiences with hate-crime based on race,

religion or sexual orientation. Across the 15 EU member states van Dijk et al. (2007) reported 3% of respondents or their family members had been victim of a crime that seemed motivated by some form of prejudice. Percentages of hate-crime victimisation were the highest in France, Denmark, the United Kingdom and the Benelux countries. However, this question was not specific to any one form of prejudice and thus it is unclear how many of these crimes related specifically to hate-crime based on race, religion or sexual minority status. Nevertheless, the British government acknowledges that, based on police recorded crime figures, hate-crime remains a largely under reported, difficult to measure but significant threat to community and individual safety (HM Government, 2011; HM Government, 2012). Importantly, these figures, in spite of their limitations (Walker et al., 2009), show that after racially motivated hate-crime, those motivated by sexual prejudice are the second most frequent type of hate-crime recorded by the police in England and Wales. They account for around 10% of hate-crimes, with transphobic hate-crimes accounting for around 1% (HM Government, 2011; HM Government, 2012).

Furthermore, there is increasing international awareness of the growing prevalence of homophobic and transphobic hate-crimes (Itaborahy, 2012; McClintock & LeGendre, 2007; Polacek & Le Deroff, 2010; Turner, Whittle & Combs, 2009). This is despite legislative change equalising some of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people (McClintock & LeGendre, 2007, 2007; Purdam, Wilson, Afkhami & Olsen, 2008; Turner et al., 2009). In Great Britain (<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/>) legislation now outlaws inciting hatred against sexual minority status groups (2010 under the *Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008*), sexual orientation discrimination in the workplace (*2003 Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation)*), and in the provision of goods and services (*2006 Equality Act*). The rights of same-sex couples have been somewhat equalised with those of heterosexuals (*2004 Civil Partnership Act*), and trans individuals' right to legal recognition of their acquired gender has been established (*2003 Gender Recognition Act*). The broader *2010 Equality Act* is the culmination of these legislative changes and outlaws the unequal treatment of individuals because of their sexual orientation across public and private sector organisations. Unfortunately, anti hate-crime legislation has not necessarily improved the life experiences of those targeted by such crimes. Even though the reasons behind this are necessarily complex it has been suggested that anti hate-crime legislation is difficult to enforce and, in some instances, can generate reprisals against those it is intended to protect (Herek, 2000; Itaborahy, 2012; Janoff, 2005; Kohn, 2001; McClintock & LeGendre, 2007;

Polacek & Le Deroff, 2010; Turner et al., 2009).

Despite these trends in victimisation, sexual minority status is still one possible risk factor that is less considered generally in victimisation research. Survey evidence and peer reviewed research that exists on sexual minority status groups' victimisation tends to focus on sexuality motivated hate-crimes and, to a lesser extent, sexual crimes. The former victimisation experiences in particular are often conceptualised more broadly as sexual orientation victimisation (D'Augelli & Grossman, 2001; D'Augelli, Pilkington & Hershberger, 2002) or as bias crimes motivated by sexual prejudice against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals (Herek, 2000). These experiences encompass a range of incidents the victim believes to be motivated by their sexual orientation from being teased, bullied, verbally abused and harassed, to being physically attacked and sexually assaulted. Only in some instances does this work examine sexual minority status groups more general victimisation experiences (Herek, 2009; Warner et al., 2004). Nevertheless, this evidence suggests that compared to other social groups and heterosexuals, sexual minority status groups are at increased risk of victimisation from a range of crimes (Dick, 2009a; Herek, 2009).

In the United Kingdom a number of small scale surveys of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals have examined their experiences of sexuality motivated hate-crime or sexual orientation victimisation. Methodologically, they typically use questionnaire and focus group data, and recruit lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender respondents from locations, venues and events they are known to frequent, a sampling technique known as outcropping (Sell, 2000) or venue based sampling (Moradi, Mohr, Worthington & Fassinger, 2009). This evidence indicates a relatively consistent picture of verbal harassment and abuse, physical attack and discrimination against respondents. Many incidents of verbal abuse and harassment remain unreported and individuals frequently choose to conceal their sexual orientation for fear of victimisation. For example, Morrison and Mackay (2000) found that 57% of the 300 gay men they surveyed in Edinburgh, Scotland, reported experiencing violence, harassment and discrimination. Their rate of physical assault was greater than in the general public and over 70% of victims believed their experience to be motivated by homophobia. Victims also believed the experience had reduced their quality of life, forcing them to conceal their sexual orientation in some situations because they feared victimisation.

A further survey of 354 lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals in Wales (Robinson & Williams, 2003) found that one in three had experienced bullying or physical violence, with the greatest victimisation amongst those younger than 25 years of age and men rather than women, a finding somewhat consistent with evidence from the *Gender Variance in the UK* (Reed, Rhodes, Schofield & Wylie, 2009). This survey of transgender individuals referred to the National Health Service in Scotland, also found that one in three respondents had been threatened, whilst 25% had been physically abused and 4% sexually abused. Those who had disclosed their gender variance experienced the greatest victimisation, thus confirming the perceived and actual importance of sexual orientation disclosure for increasing victimisation amongst sexual minority status groups. However, rates of victimisation and reactions to incidents vary amongst sexual minority status groups. Two small scale surveys conducted in locations known to have larger sexual minority status populations than other locations in the United Kingdom found that between 30-50% of their respective 270 (Bourne, Reid, Hammond & Weatherburn, 2010) and 819 (Browne, Bakshi & Lim, 2011) lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender respondents had experienced verbal abuse because of their sexual orientation. The majority of respondents also chose not to report their experiences of physical attack or verbal abuse, with many believing the latter would not be regarded as a serious type of victimisation by the police. Nevertheless, these surveys also found that the majority of respondents did feel safe when walking around during daylight hours although few felt safe doing so after dark (Bourne et al., 2010), and many reported that much of the verbal abuse they experienced in public was committed by individuals known to them (Browne et al., 2011; see Herek, Cogan & Gillis, 2002). Also, some respondents themselves did not regard all their victimisation experiences as 'abuse', differentiating verbal harassment as a routine part of life from discrimination and incidents involving 'real' physical and mental harm (Browne et al., 2011).

Larger scale survey evidence of sexuality motivated hate-crimes in the United Kingdom has been produced by Stonewall UK, a British organisation that campaigns for equality across a range of lesbian, gay and bisexual issues. Their *Homophobic Hate-crime: The gay British crime survey 2008* (Dick, 2008) also highlighted the prevalence of homophobic hate-crimes and that it's under reporting is caused by more complex factors than previously assumed, an issue also raised by Janoff (2005) in his study of homophobic hate-crime in Canada. One implication of these observations is that initiatives to tackle hate-crime

have been based on out-dated assumptions around reasons for under-reporting, and this sometimes flawed understanding is aggravated by the methodological challenges of conducting research with sexual minority status groups (Moradi et al., 2009; Sell, 2000). Further survey evidence from Stonewall UK in the *Gay British Crime Survey* (Dick, 2009a) that sampled 1,721 lesbian, gay and bisexual people across Britain suggested that one in eight lesbians and gay men and one in 20 bisexual men or women had experienced a hate-crime within a 12 month period. Seventeen per cent of the victimisation experiences were physical assaults, although these figures double for ethnic minority gay people. Further, 12% of people in the survey had experienced some form of unwanted sexual contact, and homophobic crimes also included harassment, burglary, theft and robbery (Dick, 2009b). Therefore, to some extent the actual experiences of many of Britain's lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender population are still overshadowed by the fear of sexual orientation victimisation (Dick, 2008) or crime in general.

Unlike survey studies, peer reviewed research on victimisation amongst sexual minority status groups appears to have more methodological rigour, making greater use of population-representative sampling to recruit comparatively larger samples of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals (Austin, Roberts, Corliss & Molnar, 2008; Balsam, Rothblum & Beauchaine, 2005; Berlan, Corliss, Field, Goodman & Austin, 2010; Cramer, McNiel, Holley, Shumway & Boccellari, 2012; D'Augelli & Grossman, 2001; Herek, 2009; Roberts, Austin, Corliss, Vandermorris & Koenen, 2010). Also, many survey studies tend to treat sexual minority status groups collectively as a single group whilst academic research often, but not routinely (Price, 2011), considers differences between their victimisation experiences (Balsam et al., 2005; Conron, Mimiaga & Landers, 2010; Herek, 2009; Poteat, Aragon, Espelage & Koenig, 2009; Roberts et al., 2010; Warner et al., 2004). Despite their methodological differences, much of this mainly North American peer reviewed research broadly confirms the findings of survey studies conducted in the United Kingdom, and shows that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals are at increased risk of victimisation from a range of crimes (Balsam et al., 2005; Cramer et al., 2012; D'Augelli, 1992; 2001; Herek, 1989; 2000; 2009; Herek et al., 2002; Herek, Gillis & Cogan, 1999; Kohn, 2001; Lombardi, Wilchins, Priesing & Malouf, 2001; Roberts et al., 2010; Rubenstein, 2004; Strom, 2001). In the United Kingdom, a recent small-scale study of victimisation and fear of crime in gay and heterosexual men in Manchester (Laing & Davies, 2011) found that gay men were more likely to have suffered some form of direct criminal victimisation than were

heterosexual men at some point in their life (51% versus 40% respectively). Warner et al. (2004) larger study of 1285 lesbian, gay and bisexual men and women in England and Wales also found that incidents of physical attack, damage to property, verbal insults and bullying that were both related and unrelated to the victims sexual orientation had been experienced in some instances by up to 70% of the sample.

Peer reviewed research also provides evidence of a complex pattern of victimisation experiences amongst sexual minority status groups. In particular, who is especially victimised amongst these groups and by what type of incident appear less consistent across this work. For example, sexuality motivated hate-crimes appear more likely to target the person whereas racially motivated acts tend to target property (Rubenstein, 2004). In contrast, evidence that rates and types of sexual orientation victimisation differ between sexual minority status groups (Herek, 1989; 2000; 2009; Herek et al., 2002; Roberts et al., 2010; Warner et al., 2004), and between males and females amongst these groups (Balsam et al., 2005) is less consistent. There is more consistent evidence that sexual minority status individuals who are less certain about their sexual orientation and those who have disclosed their sexual orientation experience the greatest victimisation (D'Augelli & Grossman, 2001; Poteat et al., 2009).

However, to some extent, peer reviewed research has some limitations similar to those of survey studies. To a degree, these are general methodological challenges reflecting the inherent difficulties faced in any attempt to assess the social and economic conditions of sexual minority status groups, including their experiences of hate-crime as well as more general victimisation and the criminal justice system (Aspinall, 2009; Gates, 2011; McClean & O'Connor, 2003; McManus, 2003; Martin & Meezan, 2003; Moradi et al., 2009; Price, 2011; Purdam et al., 2008). Thus, research on the victimisation of sexual minority status groups can lack generalisability and reliability (Dick, 2009b; Purdam et al., 2008), and much of the international research on sexuality motivated hate-crime is regarded as methodologically inconsistent (Herek, 2009). Dick (2009a) argues that there is still a lack of general evidence relating to homophobic hate-crimes in Britain, hampering intelligence-led approaches by the police in tackling the issues facing many lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. Yet, hate-crimes *per se* can be difficult to identify (Rubenstein, 2004), and the nature of some sexuality motivated hate-acts can make it difficult for the victim to separate these incidents from those that might not be described as biased crimes (Janoff,

2005). In particular, because both survey studies and peer reviewed research tend to focus on sexuality motivated hate-crime and the sexual orientation victimisation of sexual minority status groups, knowledge of their more general victimisation experiences is somewhat limited. This is despite calls to change the focus of research on sexual minority status groups to include their broader social experiences (Price, 2011) such as general victimisation patterns amongst these groups (Dick, 2009b), and evidence that suggests not all of their victimisations from property damage, theft and personal physical attacks are motivated by sexual prejudice (Warner et al., 2004). Limited understanding of the more general victimisation experiences of sexual minority status groups is also aggravated by the inconsistent use of heterosexual comparison groups across this work. Furthermore, the inclusion in research samples of individuals identifying their sexual orientation as ‘other’, ‘don’t know’ or ‘do not wish to answer’ rather than lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender is uneven despite their potential importance to our understanding of the social and more general victimisation experiences linked to sexual orientation (Diamond, 2008; Epstein, McKinney, Fox & Garcia, 2012).

However since 2007-8 the BCS has recorded respondents’ self-reported sexual orientation¹. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to utilise three years of BCS data now available (2009-10, 2008-9 and 2007-8) to examine the general victimisation experiences of sexual minority status groups, something no previous research has done to investigate victimisation amongst these groups. Specifically, this research utilises these data to predict experiences of victimisation from any and specific crimes using the sexual minority statuses of lesbian/gay, bisexual and as well the sexual orientations labelled ‘other’, ‘don’t know’ and ‘do not wish to answer’. Also, utilising BCS data gives this research a number of methodological advantages over some of the existing research (Clancy et al., 2001; Home Office, 2009a; Martin & Manners, 1995; Myhill & Allen, 2002). Using data collated from three BCSs across 2007-2010 makes this one of the largest studies of victimisation amongst sexual minority status groups in England and Wales to date that has recruited respondents

¹ Since 2009-10 the BCS has asked respondents whether they experienced crimes on the grounds of their sexual orientation (Dick, 2009b) although the research does not consider this data.

using representative sampling². Also, as a national study and one of the largest surveys of victimisation experiences in Great Britain, the scope of the BCS enables this research to make direct comparisons between the general victimisation experiences of heterosexuals with those of sexual minority status groups to test if the latter are more likely to be victimised. In addition, this research examines if compared to heterosexuals males and females within sexual minority status groups differ in their victimisation experiences, a comparison that existing research suggests is important amongst sexual minority status groups and for some types of victimisation.

Method

The analysis uses BCS data for the years 2009-10, 2008-9 and 2007-8³. The victimisation variables analysed were any victimisation and six specific types of crime victimisation for 2009-10: personal theft, attempted personal theft, deliberate damage, deliberate violence, sexual assault, and household violence. For 2008-9 and 2007-8 the additional specific crime of threats of violence was recorded producing seven specific types of crime victimisation for these years.

Sample

The BCS classifies respondents sexual orientation based on their self-reported identification as belonging to one of the following groups: heterosexual/straight (from this point referred to as heterosexuals), lesbian/gay, bisexual, 'don't know', and 'do not wish to answer'. For 2009-10 the sexual orientation group of 'other' was also used (from this point sexual orientation groups other than heterosexuals are referred to collectively as sexual minority status groups). Table 1 shows the number of respondents in each sexual orientation group across 2007-10.

² In each of its annual waves the BCS aims to recruit over 40,000 individuals aged 16 year or older living in private households using a mixture of stratified and random sampling of post code addresses across all the Police Force Areas of England and Wales to produce a representative sample of that population.

³ Individually weighted Non-Victim Form data is used that asks respondents to report their victimisation experiences in the 12 months prior to completing the survey.

Table 1 here

The majority of respondents self-reported their sexual orientation as heterosexual (94 – 95%), with ‘do not wish to answer’ (2 – 2.5%) and lesbian/gay (1%) respectively forming the two largest sexual minority status groups across the periods considered. Across the BCS years analysed the total sample size for sexual minority status respondents was 4, 449 representing 5.4% of the total sample from the periods considered⁴.

Analysis

Logistic Regression analyses were run to test two models for predicting victimisation: a main effects model using sexual orientation as the independent variable to predict the dependent variable of victimisation; and an interaction model with sex, sexual orientation and sex-by-sexual orientation as the independent variables entered into the model simultaneously to predict victimisation. These two models were tested for each crime type, and each year was analysed separately. For all analyses the following coding was used: the criterion variable of victimisation was coded 1, and non victimisation was coded 0. In both the main effects and interaction models, the categorical predictor of sexual orientation used heterosexual as the comparison group, with gay/lesbian, bisexual, ‘other’, ‘don’t know’ and ‘do not wish to answer’ forming the 1st – 5th parameters respectively in 2009-10. Variation in the recording of sexual orientation in the BCS in 2008-9 and 2007-8 compared to 2009-10 resulted in heterosexual as the comparison group, with gay/lesbian, bisexual, ‘don’t know’ and ‘do not wish to answer’ forming the 1st – 4th parameters respectively in the two earlier years. When testing the interaction model of sex-by-sexual orientation the categorical predictor of sex (independent variable) used male as the comparison group with the parameter comparing females to males⁵.

⁴ The paper does not focus on victimisation and sexuality *per se* but on sexual minority status as a predictor of victimisation. Thus the inclusion of heterosexuals in the sample is for statistical analysis purposes. There are fundamental difficulties in estimating the size of sexual minority status populations (Aspinall, 2009) and these vary from under 1% to 10% of the total population (Aspinall, 2009). However, in large social surveys such as the BCS the sample size is usually around 2.0 – 2.5% of the total sample size (Aspinall, 2009). Thus, the results presented should be interpreted with these caveats in mind.

⁵ The demographic variables of age, education level and ethnicity were not used as covariates because their inclusion rendered some cell sizes too small for SPSS to run the analyses. Therefore, rather than run such analyses for small parts of the data set the decision was made to exclude these variables so that the results could be interpreted with more coherency than this small partial analysis would enable. However, the authors recognise this possible limitation but justify it given the disadvantage of running partial analyses and the richness of the data in other respects.

Results

The Wald statistics for the main effects model showed that the overall contribution of sexual orientation for predicting victimisation was statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) for all crime types and years with three exceptions. Sexual orientation did not contribute significantly to predicting household victimisation in 2009-10 (Wald=.157, $df=5$, $p=1.00$), victimisation from deliberate damage in 2008-9 (Wald = .479, $df=4$, $p=.479$) and victimisation from personal theft in 2007-8 (Wald = 1.88, $df=4$, $p=.757$). However, overall the results suggest that sexual orientation was a significant predictor of the majority of victimisation experiences reported in this BCS data across 2007-10.

Main effects model: sexual orientation and victimisation

Table 2 shows the results of the Logistic Regression analysis testing the main effects model and the sex-by-sexual orientation interactions. Statistically significant contributors to the main effects model and thus the sexual minority status groups that experienced significantly more victimisation than heterosexuals are shown in bold, as are the significant sex-by-sexual orientation interactions.

Table 2 here

The results show that compared to heterosexuals lesbian/gay and bisexual respondents were significantly more likely to be victimised by any crime across 2007-10. Also, compared to heterosexuals, those identifying their sexual orientation as 'other' and 'don't know' were significantly more likely to experience victimisation from any crime, but only for 2009-10 and 2007-8 respectively. The results for victimisation from specific crimes are somewhat consistent with this pattern across 2007-10, with lesbian/gay and bisexual individuals compared to heterosexuals significantly more likely to experience personal theft, deliberate violence, sexual assault and threats of violence. However, to some extent, bisexuals rather than lesbian/gay individuals more consistently experienced a greater likelihood of victimisation from specific crimes than heterosexuals across 2007-10. Namely, victimisation was significantly more likely for bisexuals rather than lesbian/gay individuals from personal

theft, deliberate violence and sexual assault across all the 2007-10 BCS data considered. Furthermore, bisexuals were the only sexual minority status group significantly more likely than heterosexuals to experience household violence (2007-9). Respondents identifying their sexuality as 'don't know' and to a lesser extent those identifying their sexuality as 'other' and 'do not wish to answer' were also significantly more likely than heterosexuals to report victimisation from some specific crimes, all being significantly more likely to experience sexual assault than heterosexuals at some point across 2007-10. However, amongst these groups those in the 'don't know' group appear to most consistently experience a greater likelihood of victimisation compared to heterosexuals from specific crimes across 2007-10. Finally, there were only three instances where a sexual minority status group was significantly less likely to be victimised than heterosexuals: those in the 'do not wish to answer' group were significantly less likely to experience victimisation than heterosexuals from any crime in 2007-8 and in 2009-10, and from threats of violence in 2007-8.

The Odds Ratios (ORs) from the main effects model shown in Table 3 confirm that lesbian/gay and bisexual respondents had greater chances of experiencing any victimisation and some specific types of victimisation compared to heterosexuals across 2007-10.

Table 3 here

Lesbian/gay and bisexuals' chances of victimisation from any crime across 2007-10 were at least 1.3 times greater than that of heterosexuals, although the pattern of victimisation reported for specific crimes was not uniform across sexual minority status groups. The ORs also confirm that, to some extent, bisexuals rather than lesbian/gay individuals appear to be the sexual minority status group who more consistently had greater chances of victimisation compared to heterosexuals across 2007-10. Bisexuals' chances of any victimisation were equal to if not greater than lesbian/gay respondents, ranging from 1.35 to 2.08 times greater than that of heterosexuals; and, their chances of experiencing personal theft, deliberate violence and sexual assault were also greater than for any other sexual minority status group compared to heterosexuals. Specifically, bisexuals' chances of being the victim of personal theft ranged from three to five times greater than heterosexuals across 2007-10. Also, bisexuals' chances of experiencing sexual assault were the largest of any of the sexual

minority status groups considered, ranging from around 5 to 11 times greater than that of heterosexuals across 2007-10. Furthermore, bisexuals' chances of experiencing threats of violence and deliberate violence were around three to four times greater and two to four times greater than that of heterosexuals respectively; and, this groups chances of experiencing household violence ranged from 5 to 10 times greater than those of heterosexuals.

Interaction model: sex, sexual orientation and victimisation

The Logistic Regression analysis results from the interaction model tested (see Table 2) show that when the sex-by-sexual orientation interaction is included to predict victimisation it is males rather than females in sexual minority status groups, with the exception of bisexual females, who were significantly more likely to be victimised than heterosexuals at some point across the years considered. Gay men (2008-9), bisexual males (2008-9) and those in the 'don't know' group (2007-8) were significantly more likely than heterosexuals to experience personal theft; and, males identifying their sexual orientation as 'other' were significantly more likely than heterosexuals to experience any victimisation (2009-10). However, males in the 'do not wish to answer' group were significantly more likely than heterosexuals to be victimised by any crime (2007-8) and sexual assault (2007-9). Finally, bisexual females rather than males were significantly more likely to be victimised by any crime and deliberate violence (2007-8).

Discussion

This study is the first to use data from the BCS to demonstrate that sexual minority status groups, and some males and females amongst these groups are more likely to be victimised than heterosexuals. The key findings are that: lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals were more likely than heterosexuals to report being victims of any crime in the last 12 months across all three surveyed years; all the sexual minority status groups considered were significantly more likely than heterosexuals to experience victimisation from any or one or more specific crimes at some point across 2007-2010; bisexuals appeared to most consistently experience a greater likelihood of victimisation than heterosexuals; and, specific crimes against the person (deliberate violence, sexual assault, household violence and threats

of violence) rather than those targeting property or possessions (personal theft, attempted personal theft and deliberate damage) accounted for the majority of these significant results. Also, a smaller number of significant sex-by-sexual orientation interactions showed that: sexual minority status males, particularly those using the category 'do not wish to answer' to indicate their sexual orientation, experienced the greatest likelihood of victimisation compared to heterosexuals; and, female bisexuals were the only sexual minority status women significantly more likely than heterosexuals to experience victimisation.

What is clear from this study is that its findings confirm the greater general victimisation of sexual minority status groups compared to heterosexuals from crimes against the person and to a lesser degree those involving theft and damage to property (Dick, 2009b; Laing & Davies, 2011; Rubenstein, 2003); and, that different sexual minority groups vary in the crimes they are most likely to be victimised by (Balsam et al., 2005; Berlan et al., 2010; Conron et al., 2010; Herek, 2009; Roberts et al., 2010; Warner et al., 2004). The greater victimisation of sexual minority status males rather than females is consistent with research that indicates gay men are more likely to be victimised than lesbians (D'Augelli & Grossman, 2001; Herek, 1989; 2009; Herek et al., 1999). The finding that bisexuals, and female bisexuals particularly, experience greater victimisation than lesbians or gay men compared to heterosexuals from primarily crimes against the person such as deliberate violence, sexual assault and household violence is consistent with their documented greater victimisation risk from these types of interpersonal crimes (Balsam et al., 2005; Conron et al., 2010; Herek et al., 1999; Roberts et al., 2010; Warner et al., 2004), although extant research in this respect is inconsistent (Herek, 2009).

What is less clear from this study is whether the general victimisation of sexual minority status groups worsened or improved across 2007-10. The number of instances when sexual minority status groups were significantly more likely than heterosexuals to be victimised across this period did not increase or decrease consistently, and it is difficult to explain such variable changes over this relatively short time period. Various legislative changes equalising the rights of sexual minority status individuals took place both prior to and during 2007-10, but because the BCS did not record sexual orientation prior to 2007 this study has been unable to consider sexual minority status victimisation prior to major

legislative changes taking place. Nevertheless, and although speculative, the absence of any clear reduction in the instances when sexual minority status groups were significantly more likely to be victimised than heterosexuals might be one indication that during 2007-10, this legislation had yet to reduce the victimisation and sexual prejudice experienced by sexual minority status groups. This possibility is somewhat consistent with the known difficulties of enforcing anti hate-crime and anti-discrimination legislation (Janoff, 2005; Kohn, 2001; Rubenstein, 2003) and the view that their greater general victimisation could be an indirect indicator of the extent of sexuality-motivated bias crimes (Roberts et al., 2010).

There are a number of possible processes by which sexual minority status groups experience greater victimisation compared to heterosexuals. First, childhood trauma, including psychological, physical and sexual abuse are more likely to be experienced amongst sexual minority status groups (Austin et al., 2008; Hatzenbuehler, 2011; Roberts et al., 2010; Roberts, Glymour & Koenen, 2013; Wilson & Widom, 2010), and abuse in childhood is linked to greater victimisation in adulthood (Balsam et al., 2005) and to revictimisation (Balsam, Levahot & Beadnell, 2011). Furthermore, victimisation from abuse in childhood is also associated with gender nonconformity behaviours in children (Roberts, Rosario, Corliss, Koenen & Austin, 2012), and sexual orientation victimisation with gender atypicality amongst adolescents (D'Augelli, Grossman & Starks, 2006). Second, minority stress in the form of the sexual prejudice (Herek, 2000; Savin-Williams, Pardo, Vrangalova, Mitchell & Cohen, 2010; Hatzenbuehler, 2009; Meyer, 2003), stigma and social exclusion sexual minority status groups are exposed to can have a deleterious effect on psychological and physical health, and is associated with risk-taking behaviours linked to greater victimisation risk (Boehmer, Miao, Linkletter & Clark, 2012; Bontempo & D'Augelli, 2002; Cochran, 2001; Cochran & Mays, 2009; D'Augelli, 2003; Goodenow, Netherland & Szalacha, 2002; Hatzenbuehler, 2009; Meyer, 2003; Paul et al., 2002; Robin et al., 2002). Third, risk-taking behaviours appear elevated amongst some sexual minority status groups and such behaviours can put the individual at risk from a range of victimisation experiences (Blake et al., 2001; Bontempo & D'Augelli, 2002; Garofalo, Wolf, Kessel, Palfrey & DuRant, 1998; Rosario, Schrimshaw & Hunter, 2006; 2012). Fourth, and more tentatively, emerging research on the nature of sexual orientation also suggests that sexual minority status is related to greater uncertainty about ones sexuality than heterosexuality (Epstein et al., 2012). Although uncertainty about ones sexuality is not exclusive to sexual minority status

groups (Morgan, Steiner & Thompson, 2010) it has been shown to be associated with greater victimisation amongst young sexual minority status adults (Poteat et al., 2009).

Some of the processes by which sexual minority status groups experience greater victimisation could also account for the particular greater victimisation of bisexuals documented in this study. Stigma and sexual prejudice (Hatzenbuehler, 2009; Meyer, 2003; Paul et al., 2002; Savin-Williams et al., 2010), lack of social support and social isolation as indicated by their concealment of their sexuality from family and friends (Warner et al., 2004), and risk-taking (Conron et al., 2010; Goodenow et al., 2002; Robin et al., 2002) appear to be augmented amongst bisexuals compared to lesbians and gay men and these phenomena could contribute to their comparatively greater likelihood of victimisation. In addition, the conflict model of bisexuality suggests that when bisexuals are conflicted about their sexuality this is associated with more maladaptive behaviours and experiences (Bronn, 2001; Engle et al., 2005; Moore & Norris, 2005; Paul et al., 2002; Wayson, 1985; Wolf, 1985; Zinik, 1985) and mental health problems (Meyer, 2003). Although support for the conflict model is mixed (Bronn, 2001; Konik & Crawford, 2004), it is possible that individuals with conflicted, as well as uncertain or questioning sexual identities put themselves under undue threat of victimisation (Poteat et al., 2009). Previous research showing that bisexuals more than other sexual minority status groups experience greater victimisation from interpersonal crimes, including sexual attacks or household violence as documented in this study, is conflicting. For example, Herek (2009) found greater victimisation amongst gay men compared to lesbians and bisexuals; and Balsam and Szymanski (2005) found that the stress associated with being in a same-sex relationship did not differ between lesbian and bisexual females. However, Balsam et al. (2005) found lifetime physical assault and injury by a partner was greater amongst male and female bisexuals compared to heterosexuals, lesbians and gay men, with such victimisation being greatest amongst male bisexuals in the previous 12 months. Sexual assault, rape and overall lifetime victimisation was also greatest amongst bisexuals, with larger differences between heterosexual, gay and bisexual men. Yet, Conron et al. (2010) found that bisexual women had greater lifetime victimisation from sexual assault and from physical violence by an intimate partner compared to bisexual men, lesbians, gay men and female and male heterosexuals, although Roberts et al. (2010) found that whilst bisexual women rather than lesbians experienced more unwanted sexual victimisation the pattern was reversed when considering

all interpersonal violence. However, the precise nature of bisexuals' intimate relationships is not well documented and, for example, whether bisexuals' greater victimisation from intimate partners occurs when they are in a same-sex or an opposite-sex relationship is uncertain from the research. Many bisexuals are in heterosexual relationships (Buxton, 2004) and although there is some research on the close relationships of lesbians and gay men (Peplau & Fingerhut, 2007) there is currently little research on bisexual experiences in heterosexual relationships. Importantly, that which does exist does not demonstrate that such relationships are more likely to involve violence (Wolf, 1985).

Explaining the greater victimisation of individuals identifying their sexual orientation as 'other', 'don't know' and particularly 'do not wish to answer' males is also problematic. It is unclear what these self-identified categories represent about individuals sexual orientation and these categories are used infrequently in studies of victimisation amongst sexual minority status groups. However, there is evidence that those identifying their sexual orientation as 'other' have some similarities with self-identified bisexuals in terms of their sexual behaviour, emotions and cognitions (Epstein et al., 2012); and it is plausible those identifying their sexual orientation as 'don't know' have some degree of uncertainty about their sexual orientation (Poteat et al., 2009), although the sexual minority status characteristics of those in the 'do not wish to answer' group is less clear. Nevertheless, it is possible that these three groups represent meaningful sexual minority status groups (and might include transgender individuals), and thus experience greater victimisation than heterosexuals by processes similar to those associated with the greater victimisation of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals.

The findings of this study should be interpreted with caution given the limitations of the research. The BCS only covers 'normal' households (Home Office, 2006) and excludes those living in halls of residence, nursing accommodation, nursing homes, warden assisted accommodation, and similar multiple occupancy residences. This introduces a potential bias against the elderly, students, certain occupational groups (e.g. nurses), and individuals with mental health problems and learning difficulties. However, this represents approximately only 2% of the adult population (Home Office, 2011a). Also, the BCS uses self-identified sexual orientation which some researchers have questioned as the most accurate method of measuring sexual identity (Ellis, Burke & Ames, 1987; Epstein et al., 2012; Klein, Sepekoff & Wolf, 1985; Paul, 1985; Sell, 2000), and as alluded to, given the BCS response options

provided in this respect it is not always clear what categories such as 'other', 'don't know' or 'do not wish to answer' represent. However, it has been argued that this method of measuring sexual orientation is not wholly inappropriate for research on the victimisation of sexual minority status groups (Roberts et al., 2010; see Sell, 2001).

Despite these limitations this study has a number of implications for understanding victimisation amongst sexual minority status groups. There is a need to consider further the victimisation experiences of bisexuals and those choosing to describe their sexual orientation using labels such as 'other', 'don't know' and 'do not wish to answer' given their similar if not greater victimisation in some instances than those self-identifying their sexual orientation as lesbian or gay. Examining the meaning of these labels to individuals and including rather than excluding such groups could further help understanding of the link between sexuality and victimisation (Price, 2011). It should be noted that although this study did not consider explicitly sexuality-motivated hate crime or sexual orientation victimisation, there is a need to examine how victims conceptualise these experiences in relation to their more general victimisation experiences, especially given the similarity between the pattern of sexual minority status victimisation across crime types shown in this research and that found in research that focuses explicitly on sexuality-motivated bias crimes.

References

- Aspinall, P.J. (2009). *Estimating the size and compensation of the lesbian, gay, and Bisexual population in Britain*. Retrieved from <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com>
- Austin, S.B., Roberts, A.L., Corliss, H.L., & Molnar, B.E. (2008). Sexual Violence Victimization History and Sexual Risk Indicators in a Community-Based Urban Cohort of "Mostly Heterosexual" and Heterosexual Young Women. *American Journal of Public Health, 98*(6), 1015-1020.
- Balsam, K.F., Rothblum, E.D., & Beauchaine, T.P. (2005). Victimization Over the Life Span: A Comparison of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Heterosexual Siblings. *Journal Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*(3), 477-487.

- Balsam, K. F., & Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Relationship Quality and Domestic Violence in Women's Same-Sex Relationships: The role of Minority Stress. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(3), 258-269.
- Balsam, K.F., Levahot, K., & Beadnell, B. (2011). Sexual revictimization and mental health: A comparison of lesbians, gay men, and heterosexual women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26, 1798-1814.
- Berlan, E.D., Corliss, H.L., Field, A.E., Goodman, E., & Austin, S.B. (2010). Sexual Orientation and bullying among adolescents in the growing up today study. *Journal Of Adolescent Health*, 46(4), 366-371.
- Blake, S.M., Ledsky, R., Lehman, T., Goodenow, C., Sawyer, R., & Hack, T. (2001). Preventing Sexual Risk Behaviors Among Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Adolescents: The Benefits of Gay-Sensitive HIV Instruction in Schools. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91(6), 940-946.
- Boehmer, U., Miao, X., Linkletter, C., & Clark, M.A. (2012). Adult Health Behavior Over The Life Course by Sexual Orientation. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(2), 292-300.
- Bontempo, D.E., & D'Augelli, A.R. (2002). Effects of At School Victimization and Sexual Orientation in Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual Youths' Health Risk Behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 30, 364-374.
- Bourne, A., Reid, G., Hammond, D., & Weatherburn, P. (2010). *Waltham Forest LGBT Matters: The Needs and Experiences of Lesbians, Gay Men, Bisexual and Trans Men and Women in Waltham Forest*. London: Sigma Research.
- Bronn, C. (2001). Attitudes and Self-Image of Male and Female Bisexuals. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 1(4), 5-29.
- 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), 739-756.
- Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2011). *Quantitative data analysis with IBM SPSS 17, 18 & 19: A guide for social scientists*. London: Routledge.
- Buxton, A.P. (2004). Work in Progress: How Mixed-Orientation Couples Maintain Their Marriages After the Wives Come Out. In R.C. Fox (Ed.), *Current Research on Bisexuality* (pp.57-82). Binghampton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Clancy, A., Hough, M., Aust, R., & Kershaw, C. (2001). *Home Office Research Study 223 – Crime, Policing and Justice: the Experience of Ethnic Minorities, Findings from the*

- 2000 British Crime Survey. London: The Stationery Office.
- Cochran, S.D. (2000). Emerging Issues in Research on Lesbians' and Gay Men's Mental Health: Does Sexual Orientation Really Matter? *American Psychologist*, 56(11), 932-947.
- Cochran, S.D., & Mays, V.M. (2009). *Does Discrimination Explain Elevated Psychiatric Risk Among Sexual-Orientation Minorities?* American Psychological Association 2009 Convention Presentation.
- Conron, K.J., Mimiaga, M.J., & Landers, S.J. (2010). A Population-Based Study of Sexual Orientation Identity and Gender Differences in Adult Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(10), 1953-1960.
- Cramer, R.J., McNiel, D.E., Holley, S.R., Shumway, M., & Boccellari, A. (2012). Mental Health in Violent Crime Victims: Does Sexual Orientation Matter? *Law and Human Behavior*, 36(2), 87-95.
- D'Augelli, A. (1992). Lesbian and Gay Male Undergraduates' Experiences of Harassment and Fear on Campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(3), 383-395.
- D'Augelli, A.R. (2003). Lesbian and Bisexual Female Youths Aged 14 to 21: Developmental Challenges and Victimization Experiences. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 7(4), 9-29.
- D'Augelli, A.R., & Grossman, A.H. (2001). Disclosure of Sexual Orientation, Victimization, and Mental Health Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Older Adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(10), 1008-1027.
- D'Augelli, A.R., Hershberger, S.L., & Pilkington, N.W. (2001). Suicidality Patterns and Sexual Orientation-Related Factors Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youths. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 31(3), 250-264.
- D'Augelli, A.R., Pilkington, N., & Hershberger, S.L. (2002). Incidence and Mental Health Impact of Sexual Orientation Victimization of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youths in High School. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 17(2), 148-167.
- D'Augelli, A.R., Grossman, A.H., & Starks, M.T. (2006). Childhood Gender Atypicality, Victimization, and PTSD Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(11), 1462-1482.
- Diamond, L.M. (2008). Female Bisexuality From Adolescence to Adulthood: Results From a 10-Year Longitudinal Study. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(1), 5-14.
- Dick, S. (2008). *Homophobic Hate-crime: The Gay British Crime Survey*. London: Stonewall.

- Dick, S. (2009a). Homophobic Hate-Crime — Findings from the Gay British Crime Survey 2008. *Safer Communities*, 8(4), 35-42.
- Dick, S. (2009b). *Homophobic Hate-Crimes and Hate Incidents. Equality and Human Rights Commission research summary 38*. London: Stonewall.
- van Dijk, J., van Kesteren, J., & Smit, P. (2007). *Criminal Victimization in International Perspective*. The Hague: Boom Juridische uitgevers.
- Ellis, L., Burke, D., & Ames, M. (1987). Sexual Orientation as a Continuous Variable: A Comparison Between the Sexes. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 16(6), 523-529.
- Engler, K., Otis, J., Alary, M., Masse, B., Remis, R., Girard, M., ... Le Clerc, R. (2005). An Exploration of sexual behavior and self-definition in a cohort of men who have sex with men. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 14(3/4), 87-104.
- Epstein, R., McKinney, P., Fox, S., & Garcia, C. (2012). Support for a Fluid-Continuum Model of Sexual Orientation: A Large-Scale Internet Study. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 59, 1356-1381.
- Flatley, J., Kershaw, C., Smith, K., Chaplin, R., & Moon, D. (2010). *Home Office Statistical Bulletin: Crime in England and Wales 2009/10: Findings From the British Crime Survey and Police Recorded Crime (Third Edition)*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Garofalo, R., Wolf, R.C., Kessel, S., Palfrey, J., & DuRant, R.H. (1998). The Association Between Health Risk Behaviors and Sexual Orientation Among a School-based Sample of Adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 101(5), 895-902.
- Gates, J.G. (2011). *How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender?* Retrieved from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-How-Many-People-LGBT-Apr-2011.pdf>.
- Goodenow, C., Netherland, J, M., & Szalacha, L. (2002). AIDS-Related Risk Amongst Adolescent Males Who Have Sex With Males, Females, or Both: Evidence From a Statewide Survey. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(2), 203-210.
- Hatzenbuehler, M.L. (2009). How Does Sexual Minority Stigma “Get Under the Skin”? A Psychological Mediation Framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(5), 707-730.
- Hatzenbuehler, M.L. (2011). The Social Environment and Suicide Attempts in Lesbian, Gay, And Bisexual Youth. *Pediatrics*, 127, 896-903.
- Herek, G. (1989). Hate Crimes Against Lesbians and Gay Men: Issues for Research and

- Policy. *American Psychologist*, 44(6), 948-955
- Herek, G. (2000). The Psychology of Sexual Prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(1), 19-22.
- Herek, G. (2009). Hate-Crimes and Stigma-Related Experiences Among Sexual Minority Adults in the United States: Prevalence Estimates from a National Probability Sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(1), 54-74.
- Herek, G.M., Gillis, R.J., & Cogan, J.C. (1999). Psychological Sequelae of Hate-Crime Victimization Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(6), 945-951.
- Herek, G., Cogan, J.C., & Gillis, R.J. (2002). Victim Experiences in Hate Crimes Based on Sexual Orientation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(2), 319-339.
- Home Office (2006). *Crime Statistics: An Independent Review*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Home Office (2009a). *British Crime Survey User Guide 2008/2009*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Home Office (2009b). *British Crime Survey (England and Wales), Technical Report Volume II Appendices*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Home Office (2011a). *British Crime Survey Dataset User Guide: Children Aged 10-15, 2009/2010 and 2010/2011*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Home Office (2011b). *Home Office Methodology Review: Analysis of the 2010/2011 British Crime Survey Intimate Personal Violence Split-Sample Experiment*. London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Government (2011). *Working for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Equality: Moving Forward*. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.uk>
- HM Government (2012). *Challenge it, Report it, Stop it: The Government's Plan to Tackle Hate Crime*. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.uk>
- Itaborahy, L.C. (2012). *State-sponsored Homophobia A world survey of laws criminalising Same-sex sexual acts between consenting adults*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilga.org/ilga/en/article/1161>.
- Janoff, D. (2005). *Pink Blood: Homophobic Violence in Canada*. Canada: University of

Toronto Press.

- Klein, F., Sepekoff, B., & Wolf, T.J. (1985). Sexual orientation: A Multi-Variable Dynamic Process. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11(1), 35-49.
- Kohn, S. (2001). Greasing the Wheel: How the Criminal Justice System Hurts Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered People and Why Hate Crime Laws Won't Save Them. *Review of Law & Social Change*, 27(2-3), 257-280.
- Konik, J., & Crawford, M. (2004). Exploring Normative Creativity: Testing the Relationship Between Cognitive Flexibility and Sexual Identity. *Sex Roles*, 51(3/4), 249-253.
- Laing, T., & Davies, M. (2011). Fear of Crime in a UK Sample of Gay and Heterosexual Men. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 3(1), 25-31.
- Lombardi, E.L., Wilchins, R.A., Priesing, D., & Malouf, D. (2001). Gender Violence: Transgender Experiences with Violence and Discrimination. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42(1), 89-101.
- McClintock, M., & LeGendre, P. (2007). *Homophobia 2007 Hate Crime Survey*. Retrieved from <http://humanrightsfirst.org>
- McManus, S. (2003). *Sexual Orientation Research Phase 1: A Review of Methodological Approaches*. Retrieved from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2003/03/16650/19351>.
- Martin, J., & Manners, T. (1995). Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing in Survey Research. In R. Lee (Eds.), *Information Technology for the Social Scientist* (pp.52-71). London: Routledge.
- Martin, J.I., & Meezan, W. (2003). Applying Ethical Standards to Research and Evaluations Involving Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Populations. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 15(1/2), 181-201.
- Meyer, I.H. (2003). Prejudice, Social Stress, and Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations: Conceptual Issues and Research Evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674-697.
- Moore, D., & Norris, F. (2005). Empirical Investigation of the Conflict and Flexibility Models of Bisexuality. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 5(1), 5-25.

- Moradi, B., Mohr, J.J., Worthington, R.L., & Fassinger, R.E. (2009). Counseling Psychology Research on Sexual (Orientation) Minority Issues: Conceptual and Methodological Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(1), 5-22.
- Morgan, E.M., Steiner, M.G., & Thompson, E.M. (2010). Processes of Sexual Orientation Questioning among Heterosexual Men. *Men and Masculinities*, 12(4), 425-443.
- Morrison, C., & Mackay, A. (2000). *The Experience of Harassment and Violence of Gay Men in the City Of Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Central Research Unit.
- Myhill, A., & Allen, J. (2002). *Rape and Sexual Assault of Women: the Extent and Nature of the Problem (Home Office Research Study 237)*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Nemes, S., Jonasson, J., Genell, A., & Steineck, G. (2009) Bias in Odds Ratios by Logistic Regression Modelling and Sample Size, *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 9(56), 1-5.
- Paul, J.P. (1985) Bisexuality: Reassessing Our Paradigms of Sexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11(1), 21-34.
- Paul, J., Catania, J., Pollack, L., Moskowitz, J., Canchola, J., Mills, T., ... Stall, R. (2002). Suicide Attempts Among Gay and Bisexual Men: Lifetime Prevalence and Antecedents. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(8), 1338-1345.
- Peplau, L.A., & Fingerhut, A.W. (2007). The Close Relationships of Lesbian and Gay Men. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 405-424.
- Polacek, R., & LeDeroff, J. (2010). *Joining forces to combat homophobic and transphobic Hate crime Cooperation between police forces and LGBT organisations in Europe*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilga.org>
- Poteat, V., Aragon, S., Espelage, D., & Koenig, B. (2009). Psychosocial Concerns of Sexual Minority Youth: Complexity and Caution in Group Differences. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(1), 196-201.
- Price, E. (2011). *LGBT sexualities in social care research*. Retrieved from http://www.eprints.lse.ac.uk/41198/1/SSCR_Methods_Review_2.pdf.
- Purdam, K., Wilson, A., Afkhami, R., & Olsen, W. (2008). Surveying Sexual Orientation: Asking Difficult Questions and Providing Useful Answers. *Culture, Health &*

- Sexuality: An International Journal for Research, Intervention and Care*, 10(2), 127-141.
- Reed, B., Rhodes, S., Schofield, P., & Wylies, K. (2009). *Gender Variance in the UK: Prevalence, Incidence, Growth and Geographic Distribution*. Surrey: Gender Identity Research and Education Society.
- Roberts, A.L., Austin, S.B., Corliss, H.L., Vandermorris, A.K., & Koenen, K.C. (2010). Pervasive Trauma Exposure Among US Sexual orientation Minority Adults and Risk of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(12), 2433-2441.
- Roberts, A.L., Rosario, M., Corliss, H.L., Koenen, K.C., & Austin, S.B. (2012). Childhood Gender Nonconformity: A Risk Indicator for Childhood Abuse and Posttraumatic Stress in Youth. *Pediatrics*, 129, 410-417.
- Roberts, A.L., Glymour, M.M., & Koenen, K.C. (2013). Does Maltreatment in Childhood Affect Sexual Orientation in Adulthood? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(2), 161-171.
- Robin, L., Brener, N.D., Donahue, S.F., Hack, T., Hale, K., & Goodenow, C. (2002). Associations Between Health Risk Behaviors and Opposite-, Same-, and Both-sex Sexual Partners in Representative Samples of Vermont and Massachusetts High School Students. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 156, 349-355.
- Robinson, A.L., & Williams, M. (2003). *Counted Out The findings from the 2002-2003 Stonewall Cymru survey of lesbian, gay and bisexual people in Wales Executive Summary October 2003*. Retrieved from <http://www.stonewall.org.uk>.
- Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E.W., & Hunter, J. (2006). A Model of Sexual Risk Behaviors Among Young Gay and Bisexual men: Longitudinal Associations of Mental Health, Substance Abuse, Sexual Abuse, and the Coming-out Process. *AIDS Education Prevention*, 18(5), 444-460.
- Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E.W., & Hunter, J. (2012). Risk Factors for Homelessness Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youths: A Developmental Milestone Approach. *Child Youth Services Review*, 34(1), 186-193.
- Rubenstein, W. (2004). The Real Story of U.S. Hate Crime Statistics: An Empirical Analysis. *Tulane Law Review*, 78(4), 1213-1246.

- Savin-Williams, R.C., Pardo, S.T., Vrangalova, Z., Mitchell, R.S., & Cohen, K.M. (2010). Sexual and Gender Prejudice. In J.C. Chrissler & D.R. McCreary (Ed.), *Handbook Of Gender Research in Psychology* (pp.359-370). USA: Springer.
- Sell, R. (2000). Methodological Challenges to Studying Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender health, in *Lesbians, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Health: Findings and Concerns. Journal of the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association*, 4(3), 102-151.
- Strom, K. (2001). Hate Crimes Reported in NIBRS, 1997-99. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Turner, L., Whittle, S., & Combs, R. (2009). *Transphobic Hate Crime in the European Union*. Retrieved from http://www.ucu.org.uk/media/pdf/r/b/transphobic_hate_crime_in_eu.pdf
- Walby, S., & Allen, J. (2004). *Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey. Home Office Research Study 276*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Walker, A., Flately, J., Kershaw, C., & Moon, D. (2009). *Crime in England and Wales 2008/09 Volume 1: Findings from the British Crime Survey and Police Recorded Crime*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Warner, J., McKeown, E., Griffin, M., Johnson, K., Ramsay, A., Cort, C., & King, M. (2004). Rates and predictors of mental illness in gay men, lesbians and bisexual men and Women: Results from a survey based in England and Wales. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 185, 479-485.
- Wayson, P.D. (1985). Personality Variables in Males as They Relate to Differences in Sexual Orientation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11(1/2), 63-73.
- Wilson, H.W., & Widom, C.S. (2010). Does Physical Abuse, Sexual Abuse, or Neglect in Childhood Increase the Likelihood of Same-sex Sexual Relationships and Cohabitation? A Prospective 30-year Follow-up. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 63-74.
- Wolf, T.J. (1985). Marriages of Bisexual Men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11(1/2), 135-148.
- Zinik, G. (1985). Identity Conflict or Adaptive Flexibility? Bisexuality Reconsidered.

Journal of Homosexuality, 11(1/2), 7-19.

Table 1 Number of respondents in each sexual orientation group in the sample

Sexual orientation	Years		
	2009-10 (N)	2008-9 (N)	2007-8 (N)
Heterosexual	25, 811	28, 017	23, 923
Lesbian/gay	344	333	307
Bisexual	201	252	183
Other	136	-	-
Don't know	183	265	291
Do not wish to answer	545	758	651
Total	27, 220	29, 625	25, 355

Table 2

Results of the Logistic Regression Analysis testing for sexual minority status groups reporting more or less victimisation compared to heterosexuals and the sex-by-sexual orientation interactions for 2009-10, 2008-9 and 2007-8

	2009-10				2008-9				2007-8			
	Sexual orientation ^a		Sexual orientation x sex ^b		Sexual orientation		Sexual orientation x sex		Sexual orientation		Sexual orientation x sex	
	B (SE) ^c	P	B (SE)	P	B (SE)	P	B (SE)	P	B (SE)	P	B (SE)	P
Any victimisation												
Lesbian/gay	.474(.115)	.000^d	.026(.243)	.914	.320(.116)	.006	-.259(.234)	.268	.275(.125)	.027	.443(.264)	.093
Bisexual	.304(.156)	.050	-.036(.316)	.910	.588(.129)	.000	.235(.268)	.379	.736(.153)	.000	-.762(.317)	.016
Other	.356(.191)	.050	.814(.399)	.041	- ^e	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-.200(.182)	.273	-.058(.368)	.875	-.077(.142)	.588	.234(.285)	.412	.246(.128)	.050	.142(.256)	.579
Do not wish to answer	-.293(.109)	.007	.367(.219)	.094	-.140(.085)	.101	.112(.171)	.511	-.182(.095)	.050	.651(.193)	.001
Personal theft												
Lesbian/gay	.709(.316)	.025	1.08(.759)	.154	.509(.307)	.097	1.33(.700)	.050	1.31(.249)	.000	-.861(.568)	.130
Bisexual	1.65(.275)	.000	.816(.552)	.139	1.10(.270)	.000	1.56(.550)	.005	1.21(.336)	.000	-.073(.688)	.916
Other	-17.1(3594)	.996	.404(7197)	1.00	- ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1.00(.377)	.008	-.824(.834)	.323	-.881(.676)	.192	-16.4(3686)	.996	1.68(.269)	.000	1.94(.846)	.022
Do not wish to answer	-.520(.452)	.249	1.43(.972)	.142	.300(.226)	.185	-.448(.539)	.406	.571(.239)	.017	-.495(.479)	.302
Attempted personal theft												
Lesbian/gay	1.08(.370)	.003	.995(.950)	.295	-.186(.717)	.795	16.59(3386)	.996	-.137(.679)	.840	-.386(1.40)	.784
Bisexual	.776(.563)	.168	-17.6(4502)	.997	.716(.533)	.179	-17.4(4243)	.997	.628(.611)	.304	17.4(3958)	.996
Other	-16.3(3594)	.996	.087(7197)	1.00	- ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-16.3(3030)	.996	.087(6106)	1.00	1.19(.420)	.004	1.48(1.00)	.140	-16.4(2356)	.994	-.473(4716)	1.00
Do not wish to answer	-.501(.633)	.429	-16.3(2638)	.995	-.783(.640)	.222	-.191(1.30)	.884	.377(.374)	.367	-1.19(.845)	.156
Deliberate damage												
Lesbian/gay	-.564(.977)	.564	15.68(3714)	.997	-.031(.694)	.965	-1.48(1.43)	.301	.164(.702)	.815	16.6(3699)	.996
Bisexual	.409(.802)	.610	-17.2(4502)	.997	-.775(1.15)	.502	15.8(3124)	.996	.744(.690)	.281	.249(1.38)	.857
Other	.211(1.10)	.849	-17.2(4965)	.997	- ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1.68(.457)	.000	-.638(.918)	.487	.006(.774)	.994	1.26(2.13)	.554	.783(.531)	.141	17.5(3276)	.996
Do not wish to answer	-1.07(1.00)	.285	-15.7(2638)	.995	.055(.446)	.902	.540(.987)	.585	1.05(.321)	.001	-.356(.662)	.591
Deliberate violence												
Lesbian/gay	.609(.248)	.014	-.017(.600)	.977	.889(.211)	.000	-.743(.432)	.085	.432(.271)	.112	.177(.660)	.788
Bisexual	.868(.292)	.003	-.006(.594)	.992	.619(.273)	.023	-.266(.548)	.627	1.29(.246)	.000	-1.15(.518)	.026
Other	.970(.345)	.005	1.21(1.01)	.232	- ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Do not know	-.830(.668)	.214	16.7(4573)	.997	-1.01(.576)	.079	-.844(1.60)	.466	.169(.311)	.588	.008(.655)	.991
Do not wish to answer	.070(.253)	.781	1.51(.671)	.087	-1.00(.219)	.647	.110(.462)	.813	.143(.213)	.503	.541(.469)	.273
Sexual assault												
Lesbian/gay	.585(.832)	.482	-1.80(3530)	1.00	2.18(.495)	.000	1.61(1.05)	.125	.772(.829)	.353	-13.6(2960)	.996
Bisexual	1.91(.582)	.001	16.2(5124)	.997	2.44(.503)	.000	-15.7(4243)	.997	1.68(.696)	.016	-14.2(4663)	.998
Other	1.60(.825)	.050	-.488(3530)	1.00	- ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-15.2(3030)	.996	-17.6(6092)	.998	-14.7(2478)	.995	1.84(4980)	1.00	1.60(.570)	.005	-14.2(3392)	.997
Do not wish to answer	-15.2(1753)	.993	.000(7053)	1.00	1.05(.569)	.066	3.95(1.67)	.018	1.42(.429)	.001	4.45(1.16)	.000
Household violence												
Lesbian/gay	.425(1.10)	.689	16.1(4010)	.997	.714(.862)	.407	-15.6(3219)	.996	.433(1.15)	.708	-15.8(3432)	.996
Bisexual	-15.0(3260)	.996	.219(6613)	1.00	1.75(.596)	.003	-16.2(4628)	.997	2.28(.589)	.000	-17.3(5039)	.997
Other	-15.0(3821)	.997	.219(7650)	1.00	- ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-15.0(3188)	.996	.219(6438)	1.00	-15.2(2603)	.995	1.22(5233)	1.00	-.090(1.39)	.948	16.25(3482)	.996
Do not wish to answer	.088(1.02)	.931	16.1(2557)	.995	.522(.630)	.407	17.8(2144)	.993	.064(.893)	.943	-15.1(2616)	.995
Threats of violence^f												
Lesbian/gay	-	-	-	-	.919(.188)	.000	.175(.390)	.654	.856(.196)	.000	.359(.424)	.398
Bisexual	-	-	-	-	1.12(.199)	.000	-.508(.442)	.250	1.31(.215)	.000	.255(.431)	.554
Other	-	-	-	-	- ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-.744(.447)	.096	.303(.899)	.736	-.325(.334)	.330	.326(.676)	.630
Do not wish to answer	-	-	-	-	-.015(.187)	.935	.489(.380)	.198	-.493(.244)	.043	.356(.488)	.465

^aThe results from the Logistic Regression Analysis testing the main effects model of sexual orientation as the independent variable using heterosexual as the comparison group for sexual orientation

^bThe results from the Logistic Regression Analysis testing the interaction model of sex-by-sexual orientation using heterosexual as the comparison group for sexual orientation and male as the comparison group for gender

^cB is the unstandardised beta coefficient and (SE) the standardised error from the Logistic Regression Analysis

^d $p < .001$

^eThe sexual orientation category 'other' was not recorded in 2008-9 and 2007-8

^fThreats of violence were not recorded in 2009-10

Table 3

Odds ratios^a for sexual minority status groups reporting more or less victimisation compared to heterosexuals for 2009-10, 2008-9 and 2007-8

	Odds ratio ^b	2009-10 95% C.I. Lower – Upper ^c	Odds ratio	2008-9 95% C.I. Lower - Upper	Odds ratio	2007-8 95% C.I. Lower - Upper
Any victimisation						
Lesbian/gay	1.60	1.20-2.01	1.38	1.10-1.73	1.32	1.03-1.70
Bisexual	1.35	.998-2.10	1.80	1.40-2.32	2.10	1.55-2.82
Other	1.42	.982-2.07	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	.820	.573-1.71	.926	.700-1.22	1.28	1.00-1.64
Do not wish to answer	.746	.603-.924	.870	.736-1.03	.830	.700-1.00
Personal theft						
Lesbian/gay	2.03	1.09-3.77	1.66	.913-3.04	3.70	2.30-6.02
Bisexual	5.22	3.04-8.94	3.02	1.78-5.13	3.60	1.73-6.48
Other	.000	.000-.000	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	2.73	1.30-5.74	.414	.110-1.55	3.22	1.90-5.45
Do not wish to answer	.594	.245-1.44	1.35	.866-2.10	1.77	1.11-2.83
Attempted personal theft						
Lesbian/gay	2.96	1.43-6.12	.830	.204-3.38	.872	.230-3.30
Bisexual	2.17	.721-6.54	2.05	.720-5.82	1.87	.566-6.20
Other	.000	.000-.000	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	3.30	1.45-7.51	3.30	1.45-7.51	.000	.000-.000
Do not wish to answer	.606	.175-2.10	.457	.130-1.60	1.40	.674-2.91
Deliberate damage						
Lesbian/gay	.570	.080-3.90	2.43	1.60-3.70	.970	.250-3.78
Bisexual	1.50	.310-7.20	1.90	1.10-3.20	.460	.050-4.20
Other	1.20	.150-10.4	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	5.36	2.19-13.1	.360	.120-1.10	1.00	.220-4.60
Do not wish to answer	.342	.050-2.50	.900	.600-1.40	1.10	.440-2.53
Deliberate violence						
Lesbian/gay	1.84	1.13-2.99	2.43	1.61-3.68	1.54	.910-2.62
Bisexual	2.38	1.34-4.22	1.86	1.10-3.17	3.66	2.26-5.92
Other	2.64	1.34-5.20	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	.436	.118-1.61	.360	.120-1.20	1.20	.640-2.18
Do not wish to answer	1.10	.653-1.76	1.00	.600-1.40	1.50	.760-1.75
Sexual assault						
Lesbian/gay	1.80	.350-9.20	8.93	3.40-23.5	2.20	.430-11.0
Bisexual	6.80	2.17-21.2	11.5	4.30-30.9	5.40	1.37-21.0
Other	4.96	.984-25.0	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	.000	.000-.000	.000	.000-.000	4.98	1.62-15.2
Do not wish to answer	.000	.000-.000	2.85	.935-8.70	4.14	1.79-9.60
Household violence						
Lesbian/gay	1.53	.180-13.1	2.05	.380-11.1	1.54	.160-15.0
Bisexual	.000	.000-.000	5.76	1.79-18.5	9.90	3.12-31.2
Other	.000	.000-.000	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	.000	.000-.000	.000	.000-.000	.910	.060-14.0
Do not wish to answer	1.10	.150-8.13	1.70	.500-5.80	1.10	.190-6.14
Threats of violence^e						
Lesbian/gay	-	-	2.51	1.73-3.62	2.36	1.60-3.46
Bisexual	-	-	3.10	2.10-4.35	3.72	2.44-5.66
Other	-	-	- ^d	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	.475	.200-1.14	.723	.380-1.40
Do not wish to answer	-	-	.985	.680-1.42	.611	.374-.985

^aThe odds ratios from the Logistic Regression Analysis testing the main effects model with sexual orientation as the independent variable using heterosexual as the comparison group for sexual orientation

^bThe odds ratios are odds ratio Exp (B)

^cExp (B)

^dThe sexual orientation category 'other' was not recorded in 2008-9 and 2007-8

^eThreats of violence were not recorded in 2009-10