

Equality and Human Rights Commission
Research report 103

Crime and disabled people: Measures of disability-related harassment

2016 update

Nick Coleman and Wendy Sykes
Independent Social Research

© Equality and Human Rights Commission 2016

First published September 2016

ISBN 978-1-84206-515-0

Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report Series

The Equality and Human Rights Commission publishes research carried out for the Commission by commissioned researchers.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Commission. The Commission is publishing the report as a contribution to discussion and debate.

Please contact the Research Team for further information about other Commission research reports, or visit our website:

Research Team
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Arndale House
The Arndale Centre
Manchester
M4 3AQ

Email: research@equalityhumanrights.com

Telephone: 0161 829 8100

Website: www.equalityhumanrights.com

You can download a copy of this report as a PDF from our website:
www.equalityhumanrights.com

If you require this publication in an alternative format, please contact the Communications Team to discuss your needs at:
correspondence@equalityhumanrights.com

Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Executive summary	iv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 This report	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 Measures covered in the report	2
1.4 Data sources – the crime surveys	2
1.5 Definitions used in this report	4
1.6 Notes for interpreting findings in this report	5
1.7 Notes on the text and tables	7
1.8 Structure of the report	9
2. Disability-related crime and other identity crime	10
2.1 Number of victims of hate crimes (Measure 1)	11
2.2 Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police (Measure 2)	20
2.3 Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents (Measure 4)	21
3. Experience of crime	24
3.1 Adults in England and Wales	25
3.2 Adults in Scotland	40
3.3 10-15 year olds in England and Wales	49
4. Worry about being the victim of crime	57
4.1 Adults in England and Wales	58
4.2 Adults in Scotland	72

5. Conclusions	82
Appendix 1: Data implications	85
Appendix 2: Questions on disability	90
Appendix 3: Measures of crime	95
Glossary	100
References	104

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the Office for National Statistics, TNS-BRMB, Home Office, Ministry of Justice, Scottish Government and the UK Data Service for making the Crime Survey for England and Wales and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey available for secondary analysis and recognise that these organisations bear no responsibility for their further analysis or interpretation.

We are also grateful to staff at the UK Data Service and the Virtual Microdata Laboratory for their assistance during the project.

We are very grateful to Abul Momin, Karen Hurrell, Gregory Crouch, Jonathan Timbers and Vivienne Stone at the Equality and Human Rights Commission for their support throughout the project.

This work contains statistical data from ONS which are Crown Copyright. The use of the ONS statistical data in this work does not imply the endorsement of the ONS in relation to the interpretation or analysis of the statistical data. This work uses research datasets which may not exactly reproduce National Statistics aggregates. Crown Copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland.

Executive summary

Introduction

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (the Commission) is a statutory body established under the Equality Act 2006. It operates independently to encourage equality and diversity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, and promote and protect human rights. The Commission enforces equality legislation on age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. It encourages compliance with the Human Rights Act 1998 and is accredited by the UN as an 'A status' National Human Rights Institution.

An inquiry into disability-related harassment by the Commission in 2010/11 led to the report 'Hidden in Plain Sight' (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2011). This report found that many people who experience such harassment see it as a commonplace part of everyday life, rather than as 'hate crime'. Police records provide information about the number of such crimes that are reported. However, the number of people who experience disability-related harassment may be considerably higher.

The 2012 report 'Out in the open – tackling disability-related harassment: a manifesto for change,' (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2012) which followed the initial inquiry, noted that, while data currently available do not give a full picture of disability-related harassment, national crime surveys – specifically the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) (formerly the British Crime Survey) and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) – provide information on disabled people's experiences of crime, disability hate crime, and the extent to which disabled people report crime that they have experienced. The report identified a set of six measures from these surveys that can help to gauge progress over time.

In 2013, research was undertaken to analyse the statistics for these measures. The findings were published in a Commission research report on 'Crime and disabled people' (Coleman, Sykes and Walker, 2013), and used to inform the Manifesto for Change Progress Report, published in the same year (Equality and Human Rights

Commission, 2013). The statistical analysis has now been updated, by Independent Social Research who carried out the 2013 analysis, and the findings are reported here for five of the original measures for which data are still collected. They, in turn, form part of 'Tackling disability-related harassment: progress report 2016' (EHRC, 2016).

Summary of results

The analysis reported here paints a general picture of improvements since the 2013 report.

The total incidence of hate crime in England and Wales has declined at a time when crime incidence has fallen overall. Numbers of incidents of age hate crime or sexual orientation hate crime both fell, however it is not possible to say whether there has been a decrease in disability hate crime over the same period.

Despite the decrease in the incidence of crime overall, in most cases experience of crime remained higher for disabled people compared with non-disabled people of the same age. For instance, 22% of disabled young people in England and Wales aged 10-15 had been the victim of crime in the previous 12 months compared to 12% of non-disabled young people of the same age.

In England and Wales, more disabled than non-disabled people in every age group had experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Similarly, in Scotland more disabled people than non-disabled people aged 16-44 or 65-74 had experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Experience of any crime was higher overall for disabled adults in the younger age groups.

Experience of any crime was also higher for disabled people with certain impairments in England and Wales, in particular people with mental health conditions such as depression or social or behavioural impairments such as autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome.

Worry about being the victim of crime has declined for both disabled and non-disabled people. In England and Wales, worry about being a victim of crime was more common for disabled people than for non-disabled people in every age group. In Scotland, more young disabled people, aged 16-34, were worried about being a victim of crime than non-disabled people of the same age.

See below for further details and other key findings.

Statistical measures

This report provides the latest data for England and Wales and, where available, for Scotland, in respect of the Manifesto for Change measures set out below, together with analysis of change over time:

- Measure 1: Number of victims of hate crimes
- Measure 2: Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police
- Measure 4: Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents
- Measure 5: Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months
- Measure 6: Worry about being a victim of crime.

The remaining measure, Measure 3: 'Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter' has been excluded from the analysis in this report as the survey question required to populate this measure has not been asked since 2011/12.

To allow detailed breakdown of the views and experiences of disabled people, where possible the study merged survey data collected over several years.

Throughout the report, the convention adopted is that all differences described in the text must be statistically significant – that is, very unlikely to be attributable to chance factors. Note that statistically significant differences can be very small and that this does not place any judgement on the relative importance of the finding. Where a difference or change has been found not to be statistically significant the commentary may explicitly state this.

The definitions and terminology used in this report reflect the conventions from the questionnaires and published reports from the source surveys. See the glossary for more detail.

Key findings

Hate crime incidents and victims (Measures 1–4, England and Wales)

- Throughout this summary, the results for adults (all aged 16 and over) in England and Wales are based on responses from the 2011/12 to 2013/14 surveys, with comparisons with a baseline based on 2007/08 to 2009/10 surveys. Any exceptions will be clearly indicated.

- Based on survey responses, there were around 56,000 **incidents of disability hate crime** per year, with a margin of error¹ of around 13,000 – i.e. between 43,000 and 69,000. This was lower than the annual number of race hate crime incidents (139,000), age hate crime incidents (around 118,000) and gender hate crime incidents (93,000).
- Compared with the baseline period, there was a **decrease in the total number of hate crime incidents** (all hate crime),² from 438,000 to 338,000 per year. This reflects the wider picture: the number of crime incidents overall decreased from 10,139,000 to 8,501,000 per year.
- Specifically, there were decreases in the number of incidents of age hate crime (from 178,000 to 118,000), and hate crime related to sexual orientation (from 62,000 to 36,000). However, sample sizes are too small to allow confident assertions about the change in the number of disability hate crime incidents, or incidents of other types of hate crime.
- The **percentage of adults who were the victim of disability hate crime** in the 12 months before being interviewed was an estimated 0.08 per cent, with 0.59 per cent the victim of any type of hate crime. These figures are slightly lower than the baseline, with decreases of 0.03 percentage points for disability hate crime and 0.20 percentage points for any type of hate crime.
- An estimated 35,000 **adults** per year were victims of disability hate crime (given the margin of error, between 28,000 and 43,000); and in total 219,000 adults were the victims of any type of hate crime.
- **The police were more likely to come to know** about disability hate crime incidents (52.1 per cent) than they were to hear about crime incidents not motivated by identity (38.5 per cent). However, the difference between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime was not statistically significant.
- Victims of 61.8 per cent of disability hate crime incidents who had contact with the police said they were **satisfied with police handling of the matter**. Compared with the proportions for other hate crime incidents (58.6 per cent) and incidents not related to identity (73.1 per cent); the differences were not statistically significant.
- Compared with the baseline period, there has been an increase in satisfaction with the way the police handled the matter. This applied to victims of hate crime

¹ The margin of error is based on a 95% confidence interval. The number of victims of hate crime upon which estimates are based are relatively small. Therefore, the margins of error around the estimates for hate crime are large, and it can be difficult to make comparisons over time.

² Age, disability, race, religion and sexual orientation.

other than disability (+7.9 percentage points) and victims of incidents not motivated by identity (+9.3 percentage points). However, there was no statistically significant change for victims of disability hate crime incidents.

- Victims of 66.5 per cent of disability hate crime incidents which were known to the police said **police had treated them fairly**, and 74.8 per cent said they were **treated with respect**.

Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months (Measure 5)

Adults in England and Wales

- The overall proportion of disabled people who said that that they had experienced a crime was almost identical to the proportion of non-disabled people (18.9 per cent compared with 19.0 per cent). However, this masks differences by age (noted below).³
- Compared with the baseline period, there was a decrease in the proportion of disabled people experiencing a crime of 1.1 percentage points, but this was smaller than the decrease among the population of non-disabled people of 3.7 percentage points.
- In every age group, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the previous 12 months. Differences were greatest in the younger age groups.
- Analysis of change shows that disabled people aged 45-54 and 75 or over were less likely to experience a crime in the most recent period compared with the baseline period, but that there was not a statistically significant change for disabled people in other age groups. By contrast, every non-disabled age group bar one (65-74) experienced a drop in experience of crime.
- Overall, the proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men (18.8 per cent of women compared with 19.0 per cent of men). This is different from the non-disabled population, where women were less likely than men to experience a crime (18.3 per cent of women compared with 19.7 per cent of men).
- Breakdowns by impairment group show that, in the most recent two year period (2012/13– 2013/14), people with certain types of impairment were more likely to experience a crime than non-disabled people; in particular people with a social or behavioural impairment, such as autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's

³ Because of the older age profile of disabled people, and because older people are generally less likely than younger people to experience a crime, this brings the overall figures for disabled and non-disabled people close together, despite large differences when looking at individual age groups.

syndrome (35.3 per cent) and people with a mental health condition, such as depression (29.6 per cent).

Adults in Scotland

- Throughout this summary, the results for adults (aged 16 and over) in Scotland are based on responses from the 2012/13 survey, with comparisons with a baseline based on 2008/09 to 2010/11 surveys. Any exceptions will be clearly indicated.
- In the most recent survey period, the overall proportion of disabled people who said that they had experienced a crime was almost identical to the proportion of non-disabled people (17.1 per cent compared with 16.9 per cent). Again this overall difference masks patterns by age (see below).
- There was no statistically significant change from the baseline period in the proportion of disabled people experiencing a crime. This was in contrast to the findings for non-disabled people, which showed a decrease of 2.6 percentage points.
- In the younger age groups, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to have been the victim of crime. Specifically, this applied to the three youngest age groups (16-24, 24-34 and 35-44), as well as the 65-74 age group; there was no difference in the other age groups.

10-15 year olds in England and Wales

- In the two-year period 2012/13–2013/14, disabled young people aged 10-15 were much more likely than their non-disabled counterparts to have been the victims of crime (22.4 per cent compared with 12.0 per cent).
- This applies equally to 10-12 year olds and 13-15 year olds and is true of both boys and girls, with 17.6 per cent of disabled girls experiencing a crime compared with 9.6 per cent of non-disabled girls; and 25.3 per cent of disabled boys compared with 14.3 per cent of non-disabled boys.

Worry about being a victim of crime (Measure 6)

Adults in England and Wales

- Disabled adults in England and Wales were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime (46.4 per cent compared with 36.0 per cent). There was a decrease from the baseline period, among both disabled people (down 2.5 percentage points) and non-disabled people (down 5.2 percentage points).

- In all age bands, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime.
- Compared with the baseline period, worry about crime decreased among older disabled people, with decreases in the 55-64 age group and those aged 75 or over. However, there were no statistically significant changes among younger disabled people. By contrast, the percentage of non-disabled people who worried about crime fell in all age groups.
- Disabled women and men were more likely to be worried about being the victim of crime than their non-disabled counterparts (53.2 per cent compared with 44.2 per cent for women and 37.7 per cent compared with 27.9 per cent for men).
- Over time, a smaller percentage of disabled women were worried about crime (down 3.7 percentage points), but there was no statistically significant change among disabled men.
- In the most recent two-year period (2012/13–2013/14), people in all impairment groups were more likely to worry about being the victim of crime, compared with non-disabled people. The highest figures were for people with a mental health condition (55.7 per cent), those with a 'memory' impairment (52.8 per cent), those with an impairment related to 'learning, understanding or concentrating' (52.5 per cent) and those with a 'social or behavioural' impairment, for example associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome (52.3 per cent).

Adults in Scotland

- In contrast to England and Wales, in Scotland about the same percentage of disabled people in Scotland as non-disabled people were worried about being the victim of crime (73.0 per cent and 73.4 per cent respectively). However, the questions asked in Scotland were very different.⁴
- Compared with the baseline period, there was a decrease in the proportion of people that were worried about being the victim of crime, and this applied to both disabled people (down 4.6 percentage points) and non-disabled people (down 5.8 percentage points).
- In the younger age groups (16-34), disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime. There were no statistically significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in the older age groups.

⁴ SCJS asks respondents how worried they are about 11 specific types of crime, and analysis is based on respondents who said they were very or fairly worried about at least one of these. BCS/CSEW analysis is based on worry about four different types of crime.

- Worry about crime decreased from the baseline period among older disabled people, with decreases in all of the age groups 45 and over. However, there were no statistically significant changes among younger disabled people. By contrast, fewer non-disabled people in all age groups were worried over time.
- Over time, lower percentages of both disabled women and men were worried about crime (down 4.8 and 4.4 percentage points respectively). There were corresponding decreases among non-disabled women and men.

Limitations and gaps in evidence

Statistics generated by the crime surveys help describe the landscape of crime among disabled people and hate crime in particular, but there are some important gaps and limitations:

- The number of victims of hate crime on which estimates are based is relatively small. Therefore, the margins of error around the estimates for hate crime are large, and it can be difficult to make comparisons over time for the monitored strands (disability, race, age and so on).
- Some sub-groups have small sample sizes and intersectional analysis (e.g. of disability within ethnicity) produces even smaller groupings that further reduce the sensitivity of any tests for statistical significance.
- The above issues are exacerbated by the fact that the overall sample size for the BCS/CSEW has reduced since 2012/13. In addition, the SCJS is now conducted only once every two years; which limits the analysis of multiple years.
- Changes to survey questions have affected the scope to examine the measures identified in the Manifesto for Change. In particular, survey data on Measure 3 – ‘Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter’ – were last collected in 2011/12. In addition, BCS/CSEW no longer asks a question on overall worry about crime, resulting in a revised definition of Measure 6; while the question on impairment type has been dropped in SCJS, so analysis by this variable is no longer possible.
- Because of data security concerns, some SCJS variables are no longer available for analysis, including sexual orientation.

1. Introduction

1.1 This report

This report was commissioned by the Equality and Human Rights Commission (the Commission) to provide the latest data for England, Wales and Scotland about crime experienced by disabled people, including disability-related hate crime. It also covers the reporting of crime by disabled people, satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents and worry about being a victim of crime.

1.2 Background

The Commission is a statutory body established under the Equality Act 2006. It operates independently to encourage equality and diversity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, and promote and protect human rights. The Commission enforces equality legislation on age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. It encourages compliance with the Human Rights Act 1998 and is accredited by the UN as an 'A status' National Human Rights Institution.

An inquiry into disability-related harassment by the Commission in 2010/11 led to the report 'Hidden in Plain Sight' (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2011). This report found that many people who experience such harassment see it as a commonplace part of everyday life, rather than as 'hate crime'. Police records provide information about the number of such crimes that are reported. However, the number of people who experience disability-related harassment may be considerably higher.

The final recommendations from an inquiry into disability-related harassment conducted by the Commission (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2011) were published in 2012 in 'Out in the Open – tackling disability-related harassment: A Manifesto for Change' (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2012). They included a list of six measures against which progress on tackling disability-related harassment should be reviewed and a timetable for this process. These measures

were to be based on data collected by national crime surveys in England and Wales and in Scotland that provide information on disabled people's experiences of crime, disability hate crime more specifically, and the extent to which disabled people report hate crime that they have experienced.

Statistics for these six measures were analysed and the findings published in 2013 in a Commission research report, 'Crime and disabled people: baseline statistical analysis of measures from the formal legal inquiry into disability-related harassment' (Coleman, Sykes and Walker, 2013). They informed the Manifesto for Change Progress Report, which was published by the Commission in 2013 (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2013). The research reported here builds on the 2013 findings and, in turn, will contribute to the Tackling disability-related harassment: progress report 2016.

1.3 Measures covered in the report

Five of the six measures mentioned above are analysed in this report using the latest data for England and Wales and, where available, for Scotland. Measure 3 in the 2013 report ('Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter') is excluded here because the Crime Survey for England and Wales no longer collects the required information. It was last collected in 2011/12.

The five measures analysed are:

- Measure 1: Number of incidents of hate crime
- Measure 2: Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police
- Measure 4: Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents
- Measure 5: Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months
- Measure 6: Worry about being a victim of crime.

They are examined primarily in relation to disabled people, and the analysis includes an assessment of change over time.

1.4 Data sources – the crime surveys

The findings reported are based on analysis of two national crime surveys:

- The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), known formerly as the British Crime Survey (BCS), which is based on interviews with a random probability

sample of adults aged 16 and over in England and Wales as well as interviews with a separate random probability sample of 10-15 year olds

- The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS), which is based on interviews with a random probability sample of adults aged 16 and over in Scotland.

Survey data collected over a period of several years were combined for the purpose of this analysis. This was in order to ensure large enough numbers of respondents to allow more detailed breakdown of the views and experiences of disabled people.

For each dataset, analysis has been carried out for a baseline period and a most recent period (see below). For presentation purposes, the tables and commentary in this report focus primarily on the most recent period, and also show change between that and the baseline. The supporting tables available on the Commission's website present a full analysis for both periods, as well as change over time.

BCS/CSEW data for adults: Data have been analysed for five measures. Baseline data are drawn from a three-year period, covering the following years of the survey:

- 2007/8, 2008/9 and 2009/10.

Additional analysis covers the most recent three-year period that is available, to provide updated analysis and to assess change over time:

- 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Analysis is based on the combined sample of England and Wales. It is not possible to provide separate analysis of the two countries, as the sample sizes in Wales are too small for the types of analysis contained in this report.

BCS/CSEW data for 10-15 year olds: data are drawn from two discrete time periods:

- The three-year baseline period: 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12 (young people aged 10-15 were first included in the survey in 2009/10)
- The most recent two-year period available: 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Analysis has been conducted for measure 5, but data are not available for other measures as the relevant questions were not asked of 10-15 year olds. Again, analysis is based on England and Wales combined.

SCJS data for adults: data are drawn from two discrete time periods:

- The three-year baseline period: 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11
- The most recent one-year period available: 2012/13.

It was not possible to extend the analysis of the most recent time period beyond the single year 2012/13, as SCJS is now run biennially – i.e. every two years. This means that it was not possible for this analysis to merge multiple waves of the survey to provide data covering a longer time period as the 2014/15 dataset is not yet available.

Data are available for measures 5 and 6 only. Questions were asked covering the other measures, but the format of these questions has changed over time, and questions only identify a small number of hate crime incidents.

1.5 Definitions used in this report

The glossary includes details of terms and definitions used in this report; however some discussion of key definitions is also given here. In general, it is important to note that the definitions and terminology used in this report reflect the conventions from the questionnaires and published reports from the source surveys. For example, the Commission refers to this area of work as ‘disability-related harassment’, whereas BCS/CSEW analysis and reporting refer to ‘disability hate crime’.

i) Disabled people

The Equality Act 2010 defines disability as a physical or a mental condition which has a substantial and long-term negative effect on a person’s ability to do normal daily activities. The definition also covers progressive conditions like HIV, cancer or multiple sclerosis, even if they currently do not interfere with normal day to day activities.

This report employs a slightly different definition. It corresponds with the definition used by the two surveys analysed here, by the Office for National Statistics in the 2011 Census and its guidelines for harmonised concepts and questions for social data sources, and by a number of other national surveys. ‘Disabled people’ are those who say that they have a long-standing health condition or disability which means that their day-to-day activities are limited.

We have adopted this definition because the questions that the crime surveys ask participants are designed around it.⁵ Some people identifying as disabled according to this definition may not, therefore, be covered by the definition in the Equality Act

⁵ BCS/CSEW and SCJS ask differently worded questions in order to collect the information they need to classify respondents as disabled or non-disabled.

which uses terms like ‘substantial’ and ‘long-term negative effect’. Conversely, the survey questions used to classify participants as disabled or non-disabled may exclude other people who *would* be covered by the Act, such as people with specific conditions or people whose daily activities would be limited without medication or other treatment.

ii. Crime

This report uses the definitions of crime employed by the source surveys – BCS/CSEW and SCJS – which provide estimates of the level of both household and personal crime experienced by respondents. Household crimes cover all vehicle and property-related crimes, for example theft or criminal damage. Respondents are asked whether *anyone* currently residing in the household has experienced any such incidents within the survey reference period. Personal crimes, on the other hand, cover all crimes against the individual, such as assault or robbery for example, and refer only to the respondents’ own personal experience (not that of other people in the household). It is important to note that the definitions of crime differ between the two surveys, as noted below in this section and in Appendix 1. In addition, the definition of crime used for adults in the main BCS/CSEW survey is different from that used for young people aged 10-15.

The surveys cover crimes that are not reported to or recorded by the police, as well as crimes that are. However, they only collect information about crimes against people living in households; crimes against businesses and other organisations are excluded. Also excluded are homicide, drug possession and some other offences about which it is difficult to collect robust data (e.g. sexual offences). A more detailed discussion, including a list of crime types included in the definitions, is in Appendix 3. For further details, see the relevant survey user guides for BCS/CSEW (Office for National Statistics, 2014) and SCJS (Scottish Government, 2014).

1.6 Notes for interpreting findings in this report

The BCS/CSEW and SCJS are household surveys and do not include people who live in institutional care (many of whom may be disabled people).

Although crime survey participants are selected at random within households, some disabled people may require communication or other support in order to take part; and without it they may be excluded. If the experiences and views of those who are excluded in this way differ from those of disabled people who take part, the survey

results may not reflect the experiences and views of all disabled people – only those of participants.

Older people are more likely than younger people to be disabled. Disabled people are also more likely than non-disabled people to be unemployed or to experience socio-economic deprivation.⁶ These are factors that may be linked to disabled people's experiences and views of crime. Caution is therefore needed when interpreting any analysis of experience of crime that does not control for these factors.

Some specific issues relating to the analysis are as follows:

- In some cases, sub-groups have small sample sizes. For example, analysis of disability within ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation produces some very small sample sizes. This means that it is more difficult to identify statistically significant differences, and caution should be used when interpreting these findings.
- Where necessary, categories have been combined to produce larger sample sizes. While increasing statistical confidence, this approach can make it more difficult to interpret the findings.
- The number of victims of hate crime upon which estimates are based is relatively small. Therefore, the margins of error around the estimates for hate crime are large, and it can be difficult to make comparisons over time for the monitored strands.
- The analysis covers several years of data (2007/08–2013/14 for BCS/CSEW and 2008/09–2012/13 for SCJS). There were changes in the survey questionnaires over these years, including to questions that are central to the analysis, such as those on disability. See Appendix 2 for details of question wording.
- The coding of crimes differs between the BCS/CSEW and the SCJS, which reflects the different criminal justice systems in which they operate. These differences should be borne in mind and comparisons between BCS/CSEW and SCJS estimates are not advisable.
- In BCS/CSEW, the definition of crime for young people aged 10-15 also differs from that for adults in the main survey. Details of specific crime types are given in Appendix 3.
- In BCS/CSEW, sexual orientation information is provided in the self-completion module. The sample size is smaller than the full sample because not all

⁶ See relevant statistics published by the Office for Disability Issues (Office for Disability Issues and the Department for Work and Pensions, 2014).

respondents complete the self-completion module, and the self-completion module is restricted to respondents aged 16-59.

- The BCS/CSEW does not ask about hate crime directly, as the concept is not well understood by the public and is likely to lead to under-reporting. Instead, victims are asked about their perception of the offender's motivation for the incident, which is an indirect measure as it represents the victim's perceptions of the offender's motivation for the crime. This may result in some over-reporting since it is possible that some crimes considered as hate crimes may actually be more a result of the victim's vulnerability to crime – for example, distraction burglary or reflect an assumption on the victim's behalf that the crime was motivated by the offender's attitude. Conversely, a victim might be unaware that they were targeted due to a personal characteristic covered by the hate crime strands.
- Since 2008/09, the questions on worry about crime (Measure 6) have been asked of a random sub-set of BCS/CSEW respondents (around a quarter of the total sample). This means that the base sizes for findings are smaller than for the findings on experience of crime.
- In BCS/CSEW, figures on worry about being the victim of crime are based on the proportion of respondents who said they were worried about at least one of a list of four types of crime. For SCJS, the figures are based on a separate list of 11 different types of crime. As a result, it is not possible to compare the findings from SCJS with those from BCS/CSEW.
- There are some differences between the figures included in this report for the baseline data, and the corresponding figures shown in the 2013 report. Details are provided in the Appendices.

Further details on these issues are set out in the Appendices.

1.7 Notes on the text and tables

This report highlights differences between groups that have been calculated to be 'statistically significant'; that is differences that are very unlikely to be attributable to chance factors. Differences between groups (or changes over time) are only highlighted in the commentary when they are statistically significant (unless stated otherwise).

A difference that is shown to be statistically significant may or may not be important to those interested in the report findings – depending on the context and background

to their interest. The main purpose of testing for statistical significance is to establish how likely it is that an observed difference is 'real' as opposed to an artefact of chance.

Statistical significance was assessed using standard tests described below. Larger sample sizes permit more sensitive testing of observed differences. This means small but real differences can be identified more readily the larger the sample size.

Testing for statistical significance was carried out using logistic regression, with one independent variable defined for each test. For example, when comparing disabled people with non-disabled people, the reference group is non-disabled people. These tests produce p values for the comparisons. The category shown in bold in the accompanying tables was used as the reference group for the purposes of significance testing of differences between groups (see Appendix 1).

In the tables, statistically significant differences are shown at the 95 per cent confidence level (i.e. we can be confident that, 19 times out of 20, it is a real difference rather than one that has occurred by chance), and also at the 99 per cent level (99 times out of 100). This is shown using asterisk notation (** denotes statistical significance at the 99 per cent level, * denotes significance at the 95 per cent level). The commentary includes all differences which are statistically significant at the 95 per cent level.

For most of the analysis, the Complex Samples module in SPSS has been used to fit these regression models, since survey design and weights can be allowed for in fitting the models. However, analysis based on the secure access version of the BCS/CSEW datasets was carried out at the ONS Virtual Microdata Laboratory, where the Complex Samples module is not available. This analysis used standard regression models in SPSS, including a design factor as specified in BCS/CSEW user guides. As a result of these differences, estimates may differ slightly from the analysis conducted at the ONS Virtual Microdata Laboratory and the rest of the analysis. Specifically, the following analysis was conducted at the ONS Virtual Microdata Laboratory:

- Measure 1: analysis of sexual orientation hate crime, gender identity hate crime, total hate crime (excluding gender and gender identity) and total hate crime (including gender but excluding gender identity); for the most recent three-year period and change over time.
- Measures 2 and 4: analysis of 'other identity-related incidents' (excluding gender and gender identity) and 'other identity-related incidents' (including gender but

excluding gender identity), for the most recent three-year period and change over time.

- Measures 5 and 6 (adults, England and Wales): analysis by sexual orientation, for the most recent three-year period and change over time.

Percentages in the report refer to weighted samples. Key data are included in tables in this report, with full tables also provided separately on the Commission website.⁷

1.8 Structure of the report

The remainder of this report includes:

- Chapter 2: disability-related crime and other identity crime (Measures 1, 2 and 4), for adults in England and Wales, based on the BCS/CSEW
- Chapter 3: experience of crime (Measure 5), for both adults and 10-15 year olds in England and Wales (based on BCS/CSEW), and for adults in Scotland (based on SCJS)
- Chapter 4: worry about being the victim of crime (Measure 6), for adults in England and Wales (based on BCS/CSEW), and for adults in Scotland (based on SCJS)
- Chapter 5: conclusions
- Appendices: covering 1) data implications, 2) question wording and 3) measures of crime.

⁷ <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/our-research>

2. Disability-related crime and other identity crime

Main findings for this chapter (all findings relate to the most recent three-year period (2011/12 to 2013/14) except where specified):

- According to the CSEW, there were around 56,000 incidents of disability hate crime per year.
- The incidence rate per year was: seven personal crime incidents per 10,000 adults, and 11 household hate crime incidents per 10,000 households.
- There was no statistically significant change in the number of disability hate crime incidents compared with the baseline period.
- An estimated 0.08 per cent of adults were victims of disability hate crime per year, the equivalent of 35,000 adults in the population. This is a small but statistically significant decrease from the baseline period (of 0.03 percentage points or 6,000 adults in the population).
- The police were more likely to come to know about disability hate crime incidents (52.1 per cent) than they were to hear about crime incidents not motivated by identity (38.5 per cent). However, there was no statistically significant difference in reporting rates between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime.
- Victims of 61.8 per cent of disability hate crime incidents said they were satisfied with police handling of the matter. This was not statistically significantly different from the proportion for other hate crime incidents (58.6 per cent) and incidents not motivated by identity (73.1 per cent). There was no statistically significant change over time for victims of disability hate crime incidents.

This chapter presents the findings in relation to disability-related and other identity-related crime (Measures 1, 2 and 4),⁸ for adults in England and Wales:

- Measure 1: Number of incidents of hate crime

⁸ As noted in the Introduction, Measure 3 (Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter) is no longer covered by CSEW, so this measure has been excluded.

- Measure 2: Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police
- Measure 4: Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents.

Throughout the chapter, findings are analysed by different types of hate crime (those related to disability, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age, gender and gender identity).

2.1 Number of victims of hate crimes (Measure 1)

Respondents who had been the victim of a crime in the previous 12 months were asked whether they thought the incident was motivated by the offender's attitude towards any of a number of factors: the respondent's race; their religion or religious beliefs; their sexuality or sexual orientation; their age; their gender; their gender identity; or any impairment they had.

In this section, we examine incidents that were reported by respondents as being motivated by any of the listed factors, and refer to such incidents as hate crimes, with an emphasis on disability hate crime. We also look at hate crime as a whole. We begin with the number of individual incidents and incidence rates; we then examine the proportion of adults and households, and the corresponding numbers in the population, that are affected. In the estimation of the number of hate crime incidents, totals for hate crime might not be equal to the sum of incidents in the related types of hate crime, as the victim may have said the crime was motivated by more than one type.

The number of victims of hate crime upon which estimates are based are relatively small. Therefore, the margins of error around the estimates for hate crime are large, and it can be difficult to make comparisons between the monitored strands or over time. As an indication, in the most recent three-year period, there were an estimated 56,000 incidents of disability hate crime per year. The margin of error⁹ for this estimate is around 13,000 – i.e. giving a range between 43,000 and 69,000 incidents per year.

In the most recent time period analysed, 2011/12– 2013/14, BCS/CSEW data indicate that there were around 338,000 incidents of hate crime per year, compared with around 8,501,000 incidents of crime per year overall (Table 2.1).¹⁰

⁹ The margin of error is based on a 95% confidence interval.

¹⁰ See glossary for definition of crime as used in this report.

As stated above, there were around 56,000 incidents of disability hate crime per year. This was lower than the annual number of race hate crime incidents (139,000), age hate crime incidents (around 118,000) and gender hate crime incidents (93,000).

Crimes can be divided into 'personal' and 'household' crimes. Personal crimes (e.g. assault) relate to crimes against the individual and only relate to the respondent's own personal experience (not that of other people in the household). Household crimes (e.g. burglary or car crime) are considered to be all property-related crimes and respondents are asked whether anyone currently residing in the household has experienced any incidents within the reference period.

In the most recent three-year period, there were around 215,000 estimated incidents of personal hate crime and 124,000 incidents of household hate crime per year, compared with a total of around 3,407,000 incidents of personal crime and 5,094,000 incidents of household crime per year overall (Table 2.1). There were around 30,000 estimated incidents of personal disability hate crime per year, and a broadly comparable number (26,000) of incidents of household disability hate crime per year.

Compared with the figures for the baseline period (2007/08– 2009/10), there was a decrease in the number of hate crime incidents, from 438,000 to 338,000 incidents per year. This reflects the wider picture: the number of crime incidents overall decreased from 10,139,000 to 8,501,000 incidents per year.

There were decreases in the number of age hate crimes (from 178,000 to 118,000 per year), and hate crimes related to sexual orientation (from 62,000 to 36,000 per year). However there were no other statistically significant changes in the other types of hate crime, including in the estimated number of disability hate crime incidents.

Table 2.1 Number of incidents of hate crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

Numbers (000s) per year	2011/12–2013/14			Change 2007/10–2011/14		
	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime
Type of hate crime						
Age	82	36	118	-45**	-15*	-59**
Disability	30	26	56	-6	-15	-21
Race	86	53	139	+10	-16	-5
Religion	26	26	52	+12	+6	+18
Sexual orientation	27	9	36	-12	-14**	-26**
Gender (2009/10 onwards)	72	22	93	-6	-8	-14
Gender identity (2012/13 onwards)	–	–	10	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total hate crime (excluding gender and gender identity)	215	124	338	-44*	-56**	-100**
Total 'BCS crime'	3407	5094	8501	-361**	-1277**	-1638**
Base, n	116,282					

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S1.1.

Notes: Figures indicate the number of incidents. Figures are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. The numbers are derived by multiplying incidence rates by the population estimates for England and Wales (as provided in the BCS/CSEW User Guides), and are averaged over the three survey years. Totals for hate crime might not be equal to the sum of incidents in the related types of hate crime, as the victim may have said the crime was motivated by more than one type. Significance testing compares figures between the two time periods, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Gender-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2009/10 onwards. Gender identity-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2012/13 onwards. The symbol '–' denotes that a figure has been withheld because of the small number of cases included in the analysis.

While the above analysis focused on the total number of incidents of hate crime, we now look at the 'incidence' of hate crime; that is, the number of incidents per 10,000

adults/households per year. This shows how common hate crime incidents are in the population (Table 2.2).

This analysis shows that, in the most recent three-year period, the estimated rate per year of disability hate crime incidents was:

- Seven incidents per 10,000 adults of personal disability hate crime; and
- 11 household hate crime incidents per 10,000 households.

and in total, there were an estimated:

- 47 incidents per 10,000 adults of personal hate crime (compared with 750 incidents per 10,000 adults of personal crime overall); and
- 52 household hate crime incidents per 10,000 households (compared with 2,134 incidents per 10,000 households of household crime overall).

Changes from the baseline period mirror those described above in relation to the number of hate crime incidents, with decreases in the incidence of hate crime overall, as well as of age hate crime and sexual orientation hate crime, but not for other types of hate crime, including disability.

Table 2.2 Incidence rate of hate crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

Rates per year (per 10,000)	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10–2011/14	
	Personal crime	Household crime	Personal crime	Household crime
Type of hate crime				
Age	18	15	-11**	-6*
Disability	7	11	-1	-6
Race	19	22	+2	-7
Religion	6	11	+3	+2
Sexual orientation	6	4	-3	-6**
Gender (2009/10 onwards)	16	9	-2	-4
Gender identity (2012/13 onwards)	–	–	n/a	n/a
Total hate crime (excluding gender and gender identity)	47	52	-11*	-24**
Total 'BCS crime'	750	2134	-102**	-558**
Base, n	116,282	116,188		

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S1.2.

Notes: Rates for personal crime are quoted per 10,000 adults. Rates for household crime are quoted per 10,000 households. The numbers are averaged over the three survey years. Rates are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. Totals for hate crime might not be equal to the sum of incidents in the related types of hate crime, as the victim may have said the crime was motivated by more than one type. Significance testing compares figures between the two time periods, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Gender-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2009/10 onwards. Gender identity-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2012/13 onwards. The symbol '–' denotes that a figure has been withheld because of the small number of cases included in the analysis.

We now look at the proportion of the adult population that was affected by hate crime. In the most recent three-year period, it is estimated that 0.59 per cent of adults were victims of hate crime in the 12 months prior to interview. Similar percentages were victims of personal hate crime (0.33 per cent) and household hate crime (0.28 per cent). Overall, 18.99 per cent of adults were victims of crime (see Table 2.3).

An estimated 0.08 per cent of adults were victims of disability hate crime.

The proportion of adults that were victims of disability hate crime was slightly lower than in the baseline period (a small but statistically significant decrease of 0.03 percentage points). There were also decreases in the proportion of adults that were victims of age hate crime (-0.09 percentage points) and sexual orientation hate crime (-0.06 percentage points).

These decreases reflect a fall in the overall proportion of adults that were victims of hate crime (a decrease of 0.20 percentage points) and in the proportion of victims of crime overall (a decrease of 3.32 percentage points).

Table 2.3 Proportion of adults and households who were victims of hate crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

	2011/12–2013/14			Change 2007/10–2011/14		
	Personal crime %	Household crime %	All crime %	Personal crime +/- pp	Household crime +/- pp	All crime +/- pp
Type of hate crime						
Age	0.14	0.09	0.22	-0.08**	-0.03*	-0.09**
Disability	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.00	-0.03*	-0.03*
Race	0.12	0.12	0.24	-0.02	-0.02	-0.06
Religion	0.03	0.05	0.09	+0.01	+0.01	+0.02
Sexual orientation	0.03	0.02	0.05	-0.02*	-0.04**	-0.06**
Gender (2009/10 onwards)	0.12	0.05	0.15	-0.02	-0.01	-0.04
Gender identity (2012/13 onwards)	–	–	0.01	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total hate crime (excluding gender)	0.33	0.28	0.59	-0.11**	-0.10**	-0.20**
Total 'BCS crime'	5.34	14.39	18.99	-0.67**	-2.69**	-3.32**
Base, n	116,282					

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S1.3.

Notes: Figures indicate the percentage of adults or households. Figures are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. The figures are averaged over the three survey years. Totals for hate crime might not be equal to the sum of incidents in the related types of hate crime, as the victim may have said the crime was motivated by more than one type. Significance testing compares figures between the two time periods, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Gender-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2009/10 onwards. Gender identity-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2012/13 onwards. The symbol '–' denotes that a figure has been withheld because of the small number of cases included in the analysis.

Table 2.4 provides population estimates of the number of adults who were victims of all crime. In the latest three-year period, an estimated 219,000 adults per year were victims of hate crime. This includes an estimated 35,000 who were victims of disability hate crime. This compares with the total number of disability hate crime

incidents (56,000 per year, as reported earlier in this section), because people can be the victim of more than one incident in any year.

The number of adults that were victims of disability hate crime was slightly lower than in the baseline period (a decrease of 6,000 adults per year). There were also decreases in the number of adults that were victims of age hate crime (-39,000) and sexual orientation hate crime (-18,000).

These decreases reflect a fall in the overall number of adults that were victims of hate crime (decrease of 67,000) and in the number of victims of crime overall (decrease of 839,000).

Table 2.4 Number of adults and households who were victims of hate crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

Number in population (000s) per year	2011/12–2013/14			Change 2007/10–2011/14		
	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime
Type of hate crime						
Age	64	22	86	-32**	-7*	-39**
Disability	22	13	35	0	-6*	-6*
Race	57	28	84	-8	-5	-14
Religion	15	13	27	+4	+3	+6
Sexual orientation	15	5	20	-10*	-9**	-18**
Gender (2009/10 onwards)	55	11	65	-9	-2	-11
Gender identity (2012/13 onwards)	–	–	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total hate crime (excluding gender and gender identity)	152	67	219	-44**	-24**	-67**
Total 'BCS crime'	2427	3435	5862	-232**	-607**	-839**
Base, n	116,282					

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S1.4.

Notes: Figures are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. The numbers are derived by multiplying rates by the population estimates for England and Wales (as provided in the BCS/CSEW User Guides), and are averaged over the three survey years. Totals for hate crime might not be equal to the sum of incidents in the related types of hate crime, as the victim may have said the crime was motivated by more than one type. 'All crime' numbers are calculated treating a household crime as a personal crime. It is the estimated number of adults who have been a victim of at least one personal crime or have been resident in a household that was a victim of at least one household crime. Significance testing compares figures between the two time periods, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Gender-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2009/10 onwards. Gender identity-motivated hate crime was only included in BCS/CSEW from 2012/13 onwards. The symbol '–' denotes that a figure has been withheld because of the small number of cases included in the analysis.

2.2 Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police (Measure 2)

The BCS/CSEW asks people who experienced crimes in the past year whether the police came to know about the incident: that is, whether they reported it or the police came to know about it in another way (for example, they arrived at the scene). A 'reporting rate' is calculated by dividing the number of 'BCS crime' incidents that victims state the police came to know about by the total number of 'BCS crime' incidents.

Because of the small number of respondents answering this question (particularly in relation to disability hate crime incidents), differences between groups and levels of change over time are often not statistically significant, despite apparently large numerical differences.

Figures for the most recent three-year period show that the police were more likely to come to know about disability hate crime than incidents not motivated by identity; 52.1 per cent of incidents of disability hate crime came to the attention of the police compared with 38.5 per cent of incidents of crime that were not motivated by identity (Table 2.5). However, there was no statistically significant difference between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime.

Looking specifically at personal crime, incidents of disability hate crime were no more likely to come to the attention of the police when compared with other types of hate crime or crime incidents not motivated by identity. However, there were differences in relation to household crime: incidents of disability hate crime were more likely to come to the attention of the police when compared with other types of hate crime and crime incidents not motivated by identity (64.4 per cent compared with 50.5 per cent and 38.1 per cent respectively).

There were no statistically significant changes in any of the figures when comparing findings with the baseline period.

Table 2.5 Proportion of ‘BCS crime’ incidents reported to the police, England and Wales

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14 +/- pp
	Incident reported to police %	n	
Personal crime			
Disability-related incidents	41.6	76	-15.0
Other identity-related incidents (exc. gender and gender identity)	42.8	286	+2.1
Incidents not motivated by identity	39.1	5,694	+1.4
Household crime			
Disability-related incidents	64.4	84	+11.2
Other identity-related incidents (exc. gender and gender identity)	50.5*	302	-5.7
Incidents not motivated by identity	38.1**	19,579	-1.2
All crime			
Disability-related incidents	52.1	160	-2.8
Other identity-related incidents (exc. gender and gender identity)	45.5	588	-1.2
Incidents not motivated by identity	38.5**	25,273	-0.2

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S2.1.

Notes: For each of the three types of crime, the reference group is ‘disability-related incidents’. Significance testing compares the other two categories with the reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of crime incidents reported to the police. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

2.3 Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents (Measure 4)

BCS/CSEW respondents who were victims of crime and had contact with the police in the last 12 months were asked about their perceptions of the way police handled the matter. This section presents findings for three questions: whether respondents were satisfied with the way police handled the matter, whether they thought the police treated them fairly and whether they were treated with respect.

As noted above, differences between groups and levels of change over time are often not statistically significant, despite apparently large numerical differences. This is because of the small number of respondents answering this question (particularly in relation to disability hate crime incidents).

Based on the most recent three-year period (2011/12–2013/14), in 61.8 per cent of disability hate crime incidents that came to the attention of the police, victims were satisfied with the way that the police handled the matter. This level of satisfaction was not statistically significantly different from the levels of satisfaction among victims of other types of hate crime (58.6 per cent satisfied) and victims of incidents not motivated by identity (73.1 per cent); see Table 2.6.

Victims of crime were also asked whether they thought the police had treated them fairly and with respect. On these issues, too, findings were not statistically significantly different between victims of disability hate crime incidents and victims of other types of hate crime. Specifically, victims of 66.5 per cent of disability hate crime incidents said police had treated them fairly (66.8 per cent for other types of hate crime). Victims of 74.8 per cent of disability hate crime incidents said they were treated with respect (81.1 per cent for other types of hate crime).

When comparing the figures with the baseline period (2007/08–2009/10), there was an increase in victims' satisfaction with the way the police handled the matter, for victims of other types of hate crime (+7.9 percentage points) and victims of incidents not motivated by identity (+9.3 percentage points). However, there was no statistically significant change for victims of disability hate crime incidents. There were also no statistically significant changes over time for the other measures (whether police treated victims fairly and whether they treated them with respect).

Table 2.6 Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14 +/- pp
	Incident reported to police %	n	
Satisfied with the way the police handled the matter			
Disability-related incidents	61.8	73	+18.8
Other identity-related incidents (exc. gender and gender identity)	58.6	261	+7.9*
Incidents not motivated by identity	73.1	9,439	+9.3**
Think the police treated you fairly			
Disability-related incidents	66.5	72	+6.2
Other identity-related incidents (exc. gender and gender identity)	66.8	258	+0.8
Incidents not motivated by identity	81.3	9,356	+2.0
Police treated you with respect			
Disability-related incidents	74.8	73	-2.5
Other identity-related incidents (exc. gender and gender identity)	81.1	259	+6.1
Incidents not motivated by identity	89.3	9,329	-0.2

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S4.1.

Notes: Base is crime incidents reported to police. Figures are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. The reference group is 'disability-related incidents'. Significance testing compares the other two categories with the reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. 'Other identity-related incidents' include those related to race, religion, sexuality and age; excludes gender to provide comparability with other tables.

3. Experience of crime

Main findings for this chapter:

Adults in England and Wales (2011/12–2013/14):

- Disabled people in all age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the 12 months prior to interview.
- Compared with the baseline period, there was a decrease in the proportion of disabled people experiencing a crime (of 1.1 percentage points), but this was smaller than the decrease among the population of non-disabled people (3.7 percentage points).
- Disabled people aged 45-54 and 75 or over were less likely to experience a crime in the most recent period compared with the baseline period, but there was no statistically significant change for disabled people in other age groups. By contrast, every non-disabled age group bar one (65-74) experienced a drop in experience of crime.
- Overall, the proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men.

Adults in Scotland (2012/13):

- Disabled people in a number of age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the past 12 months: the three youngest age groups (16-24, 24-34 and 35-44), as well as the 65-74 age group.
- The overall proportion of disabled men that experienced a crime was higher than the proportion of disabled women.
- Disabled people aged 45-54 were less likely to experience a crime in the most recent period compared with the baseline period, but there was no statistically significant change for disabled people in other age groups.

10-15 year olds in England and Wales (2012/13–2013/14):

- Disabled young people were much more likely than their non-disabled counterparts to have been the victims of crime (22 per cent compared with 12 per cent).

- This applies equally to 10-12 year olds and 13-15 year olds and is true of both boys and girls.
- There was no statistically significant change in the proportion of disabled young people that had experienced a crime between the baseline period and the most recent period.

This chapter covers Measure 5: ‘experience of any crime in the previous 12 months’, and presents findings for:

- England and Wales, among both adults (16 or over) and young people aged 10-15
- Scotland among adults aged 16 or over

Experience of crime is examined among both disabled and non-disabled people, overall and within a number of equality groups: age, gender, ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation.

3.1 Adults in England and Wales

The findings in this section are drawn from the BCS/CSEW, and cover adults aged 16 or over in England and Wales. Analysis focuses on the most recent three-year period, which covers the three years 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14. Tables and commentary also examine changes from the baseline period (2007/08–2009/10).

The overall proportion of disabled people who said they had experienced a crime was almost identical to the proportion of non-disabled people (18.9 per cent compared with 19.0 per cent), as shown in Table 3.1. However, this comparison masks patterns by age: in general, older people are less likely than younger people to experience a crime. Because disabled people have an older age profile than non-disabled people, this brings the figures for the two groups close together; but, as seen later in this section, there are large differences when looking at individual age groups.

Table 3.1 shows the change from the baseline period (2007/08–2009/10). There was a decrease in the proportion of disabled people experiencing a crime (of 1.1 percentage points), but this was smaller than the decrease among the population of non-disabled people (3.7 percentage points). In the baseline period, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime (19.9 per cent compared with 22.7 per cent), but this difference no longer applied in the most recent

three-year period. These findings suggest that the overall drop in the proportion experiencing a crime has affected disabled people less than non-disabled people.

Table 3.1 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
Non-disabled people	19.0	91,480	-3.7**
Disabled people	18.9	25,549	-1.1*
Total	19.0	116,282	-3.3**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: The reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level.

Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

In every age group, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the previous 12 months. Among disabled young people aged 16-24, for instance, 39.0 per cent had been victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 26.4 per cent of non-disabled people of the same age. The difference between disabled people and non-disabled people becomes increasingly small as age increases, so that among disabled people aged 75 or over, 7.3 per cent had been victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 6.0 per cent of non-disabled people of the same age. However, as with all age groups, this difference is still statistically significant (see Table 3.2).

Analysis of change shows that disabled people aged 45-54 and 75 or over were less likely to experience a crime in the most recent period compared with the baseline period, but that there was no statistically significant change for disabled people in other age groups. By contrast, non-disabled people in most age groups (all except 65-74) were less likely to experience a crime in the most recent three-year period.

Table 3.2 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	26.4	8678	-6.7**
Disabled people	39.0**	683	-2.9
Total	27.3	9374	-6.3**
25-34			
Non-disabled people	22.9	15685	-5.7**
Disabled people	34.0**	1370	-3.3
Total	23.7	17080	-5.4**
35-44			
Non-disabled people	21.1	16966	-2.9**
Disabled people	29.8**	2220	-2.4
Total	22.1	19220	-2.7**
45-54			
Non-disabled people	18.9	16262	-3.3**
Disabled people	24.4**	3412	-2.8*
Total	19.7	19716	-3.3**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	14.3	14396	-1.4**
Disabled people	19.0**	4637	-1.4
Total	15.3	19081	-1.4**
65-74			
Non-disabled people	9.8	12076	-0.7
Disabled people	12.7**	5162	0.1
Total	10.6	17283	-0.5
75+			
Non-disabled people	6.0	7417	-1.3**
Disabled people	7.3**	7065	-1.3*
Total	6.6	14528	-1.3**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance

testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

The overall proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men. In the most recent three-year period, 18.8 per cent of disabled women and 19.0 per cent of disabled men had experienced a crime in the previous 12 months (see Table 3.3), and in each case there was no statistically significant change from the baseline period.

This is different from the non-disabled population, where men were more likely than women to experience a crime (19.7 per cent compared with 18.3 per cent), and where both groups saw a decrease from the baseline period (-4.2 percentage points for men and -3.3 percentage points for women).

Table 3.3 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by gender and disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
Females			
Non-disabled people	18.3	49047	-3.3**
Disabled people	18.8	14155	-1.1
Total	18.4	63338	-2.9**
Males			
Non-disabled people	19.7	42433	-4.2**
Disabled people	19.0	10394	-0.9
Total	19.6	52944	-3.8**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

The pattern seen above by age group also applies when looking specifically at women. Disabled women were more likely than non-disabled women to be victims of crime in all age groups except the oldest (75+), and again the differences were large in the younger age bands. In the 16-24 age group, for instance, 43.2 per cent of disabled women were victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 26.3 per cent of non-disabled women (see Table 3.4).

Table 3.4 shows that disabled women aged 45-54 and 75 or over were less likely to experience a crime than in the baseline period. There were no statistically significant changes for disabled women in other age groups. This is in contrast to non-disabled women, for whom there were decreases in all age groups except those aged 65-74.

The patterns for disabled men were similar to those for disabled women (see Table 3.5). In most age groups, disabled men were more likely to be victims of crime than non-disabled men; for example, 35.4 per cent of disabled men aged 25-34 had experienced a crime, compared with 23.1 per cent of non-disabled men in this age group. In the youngest age band (16-24), there was no statistically significant difference between disabled and non-disabled men, although the small sample size for disabled men aged 16-24 (249) means that a large difference is required to reach statistical significance.

Table 3.5 shows changes from the baseline period (2007/09–2009/10). There were no statistically significant changes for disabled men in any of the age groups, while there were some decreases for non-disabled men in the younger age groups.

Table 3.4 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	26.3	4534	-4.9**
Disabled people	43.2**	434	1.4
Total	27.6	4975	-4.2**
25-34			
Non-disabled people	22.7	8896	-4.9**
Disabled people	32.9**	872	-5.4
Total	23.5	9782	-4.7**
35-44			
Non-disabled people	20.5	9018	-2.1**
Disabled people	30.8**	1307	-2.5
Total	21.7	10350	-2.1**
45-54			
Non-disabled people	18.3	8520	-3.5**
Disabled people	23.5**	1971	-3.6*
Total	19.2	10510	-3.5**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	13.1	7514	-2.2**
Disabled people	19.3**	2485	-0.5
Total	14.5	10024	-1.7**
65-74			
Non-disabled people	9.1	6349	-0.9
Disabled people	12.3**	2816	-0.9
Total	10.0	9187	-0.9
75+			
Non-disabled people	5.8	4216	-1.6**
Disabled people	6.8	4270	-2.0**
Total	6.3	8510	-1.8**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated

as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. Table 3.5 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	26.6	4144	-8.5**
Disabled people	33.0	249	-9.1
Total	27.0	4399	-8.4**
25-34			
Non-disabled people	23.1	6789	-6.4**
Disabled people	35.4**	498	-0.6
Total	23.8	7298	-6.0**
35-44			
Non-disabled people	21.7	7948	-3.6**
Disabled people	28.5**	913	-2.3
Total	22.4	8870	-3.4**
45-54			
Non-disabled people	19.4	7742	-3.2**
Disabled people	25.5**	1441	-1.8
Total	20.2	9206	-3.1**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	15.5	6882	-0.5
Disabled people	18.7**	2152	-2.4
Total	16.2	9057	-1.0
65-74			
Non-disabled people	10.5	5727	-0.4
Disabled people	13.1**	2346	1.2
Total	11.2	8096	0.0
75+			
Non-disabled people	6.2	3201	-0.9
Disabled people	8.0*	2795	-0.2
Total	7.0	6018	-0.6

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

The BCS/CSEW questions on impairment type, and resulting categorisations, changed in 2012/13. We therefore need to examine the findings separately for the baseline period and for the most recent survey period.

In the baseline period,¹¹ breakdowns by impairment groups¹² show that 31.3 per cent of people with a mental health condition had experienced a crime, higher than for non-disabled people (21.9 per cent); see Table 3.6.

By contrast, people in other impairment groups were less likely to experience a crime than non-disabled people: people with 'blindness, deafness or another communication impairment' (13.4 per cent) and people with a 'mobility impairment' (16.3 per cent).

It is suggested that these findings are related to differences by age. The age profiles of certain impairment types (mental health conditions) are younger than others (communication and mobility impairments).¹³ Because younger people as a whole are more likely than older people to experience a crime (as described above), this has a bearing on the proportions in various impairment groups who experience a crime.

¹¹ Impairment type was first asked in 2009/10. Therefore figures for the baseline period are restricted to 2009/10 only.

¹² Findings are based on the impairment categorisation used in the survey questions (see Appendix 2 for question wording).

¹³ See for example the findings from the Life Opportunities Survey (Office for Disability Issues, 2011).

Table 3.6 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type

	2009/10	
	%	n
Non-disabled	21.9	35,507
Blindness, deafness or other communication impairment	13.4**	1,393
Mobility impairment, such as difficulty walking	16.3**	4,934
Learning difficulty or disability, such as Down's syndrome	24.2	170
Mental health condition, such as depression	31.3**	1,261
Long-term illness, such as multiple sclerosis or cancer	20.4	816
Other long-standing health condition or disability	21.1	4,575
Any impairment	19.2**	9,052

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares each impairment type with the reference group, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

In the most recent two-year period (2012/13–2013/14)¹⁴, people with certain types of impairment were again more likely to experience a crime than non-disabled people (Table 3.7): 35.3 per cent of people with a social or behavioural impairment (for example associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome) had experienced a crime, as had 29.6 per cent of people with a mental health condition, 23.2 per cent of people with an impairment related to learning, understanding or concentrating, and 20.4 per cent of those with an 'other' condition

¹⁴ The categorisation was changed in 2012/13, and as a result, analysis of the most recent survey period is based on 2012/13 and 2013/14 only.

or illness. In each case, the proportion was higher than for non-disabled people (18 per cent).

By contrast, people in other impairment groups were less likely to experience a crime than non-disabled people: people with a 'hearing impairment' (14.4 per cent) and people with a 'mobility impairment' (15.6 per cent).

As noted above, it is suggested that these findings are related to differences by age.

Because the categorisation of impairment has changed over time in BCS/CSEW, it is not possible to analyse change between the baseline period and the most recent two-year period. However, a broad comparison indicates that the patterns are similar in the two time periods, and also that there have been no major changes in the proportions with different types of impairment that have experienced a crime.

Further examination of specific impairment groups shows that:

- The proportion of people with a mental health condition that experienced a crime was similar in the two time periods (31.3 per cent in 2009/10 and 29.6 per cent in 2012/13–2013/14), and in each of the survey periods this was significantly higher than the proportion of non-disabled people that experienced a crime.

The proportion of people with a learning difficulty or disability that experienced a crime was 24.2 per cent in 2009/10. There is no matching impairment group in 2012–14, however of the two related groups: 23.2 per cent with a learning or understanding or concentrating impairment had experienced any crime, while 35.3 per cent with a social or behavioural impairment had experienced any crime. In the later period, both these percentages were higher than the proportion of non-disabled people that experienced a crime, but the difference was not significant in 2009/10.

Table 3.7 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type

	2012/13–2013/14	
	%	n
Non-disabled people	17.8	56180
Vision (for example, blindness or partial sight)	17.2	1841
Hearing (for example, deafness or partial hearing)	14.4**	1980
Mobility (for example, walking short distances or climbing stairs)	15.6**	8803
Dexterity (for example, lifting and carrying objects, using a keyboard)	17.3	3481
Learning or understanding or concentrating	23.2**	1016
Memory	20.6*	1777
Mental health	29.6**	2099
Stamina or breathing or fatigue	18.3	4686
Social or behavioural (for example associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome)	35.3**	236
Other condition or illness	20.4**	2731
Any impairment	18.1	14071

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares each impairment type with the reference group, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Analysis by ethnicity shows that there were no significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in any ethnic group in the most recent three-year period (2011/12–2013/14); see Table 3.8. This reflects the pattern seen in Table 3.1 for the population as a whole.

White disabled people were less likely to be the victim of a crime than in the baseline period (2007/8–2009/10), although this decrease was smaller than for White non-

disabled people (1.1 per cent compared with 4.0 per cent); this reflects the overall pattern seen in Table 3.1. There were no statistically significant changes over time in any ethnic group apart from White, for disabled or non-disabled people.

Table 3.8 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
White			
Non-disabled people	18.7	82554	-4.0**
Disabled people	18.5	23152	-1.1*
Total	18.6	105897	-3.5**
Mixed			
Non-disabled people	26.4	839	-3.5
Disabled people	26.9	147	-13.5
Total	26.4	987	-4.4
Black or Black British			
Non-disabled people	19.7	2482	-2.5
Disabled people	20.9	417	-0.8
Total	19.8	2904	-2.2
Asian/Asian British/other			
Non-disabled people	21.3	5537	-1.8
Disabled people	23.9	817	-0.5
Total	21.6	6366	-1.7

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Table 3.9 shows the proportions of disabled and non-disabled people who experienced a crime in the most recent three-year period, broken down by religion. Disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime in two groups: the 'no religion' group (25.3 per cent compared with 21.7 per cent) and

Buddhist (34.6 per cent compared with 15.0 per cent). By contrast, in the Christian group, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime. There were no statistically significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in the other religion groups.

As noted above in relation to other characteristics, these findings may be related to the age profile of different groups.

As shown in Table 3.9, there were decreases for disabled people in the 'no religion' and Christian groups, compared with the baseline period (2007/8–2009/10), but there were no statistically significant changes for disabled people in the other religion groups. Among non-disabled people, there were decreases in a number of groups: 'no religion', Christian, Jewish and Muslim.

Caution should be used when interpreting the findings for some groups, due to small sample sizes.

Table 3.9 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by religion and disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
No religion			
Non-disabled people	21.7	24782	-6.2**
Disabled people	25.3**	4408	-2.9*
Total	22.1	29249	-5.8**
Christian			
Non-disabled people	17.4	60907	-3.7**
Disabled people	16.7*	18994	-1.7**
Total	17.3	80025	-3.4**
Buddhist			
Non-disabled people	15.0	441	-5.6
Disabled people	34.6**	73	+10.3
Total	17.1	515	-4.0
Hindu			
Non-disabled people	19.0	1201	-2.0
Disabled people	20.0	169	-0.7
Total	19.2	1372	-1.8
Jewish			
Non-disabled people	20.3	376	-8.9*
Disabled people	19.1	104	+3.6
Total	20.0	481	-7.1*
Muslim			
Non-disabled people	21.8	2774	-3.0*
Disabled people	25.6	471	-1.1
Total	22.3	3247	-2.8*
Sikh			
Non-disabled people	25.5	439	+0.2
Disabled people	18.6	98	-4.2
Total	24.3	537	-0.6
Any other religion			
Non-disabled people	29.6	417	+3.6
Disabled people	30.4	204	+2.9
Total	29.8	622	+3.5

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures

indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Sexual orientation is only collected for people aged 16 to 59 since it is asked as part of the self-completion module. As seen for previous analysis, the relationship between disability and experience of crime is different for younger and older people, and the gay, lesbian and bisexual group has a younger age profile than the other two groups: this needs to be taken into account when interpreting these findings.

Analysis by sexual orientation shows that disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be the victim of a crime in both the heterosexual/straight group (28.3 per cent compared with 21.4 per cent) and in the gay, lesbian or bisexual group (37.3 per cent compared with 28.5 per cent), as shown in Table 3.10.

Disabled and non-disabled people were less likely to have experienced a crime in the most recent three-year period, compared with the baseline period, in both the heterosexual/straight group (-2.3 and -5.0 percentage points respectively) and in the gay, lesbian or bisexual group (-10.2 and -5.4 percentage points respectively).

Table 3.10 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by sexual orientation

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
Heterosexual or straight			
Non-disabled people	21.4	58131	-5.0**
Disabled people	28.3**	8311	-2.3**
Total	22.1	66519	-4.6**
Gay or lesbian, bisexual			
Non-disabled people	28.5	1438	-5.4**
Disabled people	37.3*	327	-10.2*
Total	29.8	1768	-5.8**
Don't wish to answer			
Non-disabled people	21.8	1433	-1.8
Disabled people	22.9	288	+1.1
Total	21.8	1733	-1.6

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1.

Notes: Within each sexual orientation group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

3.2 Adults in Scotland

The findings in this section are drawn from the SCJS, and cover adults (aged 16 or over) in Scotland. The analysis focuses on the most recent survey period (2012/13), and comparisons are made with the baseline period (2008/09–2010/11).

The overall proportion of disabled people who said that they had experienced a crime was almost identical to the proportion of non-disabled people (17.1 per cent compared with 16.9 per cent), as shown in Table 3.11. The same pattern was seen in England and Wales, and again this overall difference masks patterns by age (discussed below).

Table 3.11 shows the change from the baseline period (2008/09–2010/11), compared with the most recent survey period (2012/13). There was no statistically significant change in the proportion of disabled people experiencing a crime. This was in contrast to the findings for non-disabled people, which show a decrease of 2.6 percentage points. The findings suggest that, although the proportion experiencing a crime has fallen overall, this decrease has not been seen among disabled people in Scotland.

The overall proportions of disabled and non-disabled people that experienced a crime were similar in Scotland to those in England and Wales. As noted in the Introduction, it is not possible to make direct comparisons between countries, as the definitions of crime differ between the two surveys (BCS/CSEW and SCJS).

Table 3.11 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by disability

	2012/13		Change 2008/11- 2012/13
	%	n	+/- percentage points
Non-disabled people	16.9	9,249	-2.6**
Disabled people	17.1	2,759	-0.5
Total	16.9	12,045	-2.2**

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.1.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Analysis by age group (Table 3.12) shows that, in general, younger people were more likely than older people to experience a crime in 2012/13. When comparing disabled and non-disabled people, disabled people in a number of age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the past 12 months: the three youngest age groups (16-24, 24-34 and 35-44), as well as the 65-74 age group.

Analysis of change shows that disabled people aged 45-54 were less likely to experience a crime than in the baseline period, but that there was no statistically significant change for disabled people in other age groups. Non-disabled people in

the 16-24 and 35-44 age groups were less likely to experience a crime in 2012/13 than in the baseline period.

Table 3.12 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2012/13		Change
	%	n	2008/11– 2012/13 +/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	22.5	883	-5.3**
Disabled people	38.3**	85	4.3
Total	23.7	970	-4.4*
25-34			
Non-disabled people	21.9	1512	-2.2
Disabled people	31.6*	177	-0.4
Total	22.8	1692	-1.9
35-44			
Non-disabled people	19.2	1641	-3.3**
Disabled people	28.7**	243	-3.4
Total	20.5	1895	-3.0*
45-54			
Non-disabled people	16.7	1721	-2.2
Disabled people	19.6	415	-5.7*
Total	17.2	2140	-2.7*
55-64			
Non-disabled people	11.9	1465	-2.1
Disabled people	15.1	548	-1.1
Total	12.7	2019	-1.8
65-74			
Non-disabled people	8.7	1238	+0.1
Disabled people	12.3*	576	+0.9
Total	9.8	1821	+0.3
75+			
Non-disabled people	5.0	789	+0.1
Disabled people	5.8	715	-0.7
Total	5.4	1508	-0.3

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.2.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

In the 2012/13 period, the proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was lower than the proportion of disabled men (15.1 per cent and 19.5 per cent respectively). There were no statistically significant differences between disabled and non-disabled women, or between disabled and non-disabled men in the 2012/13 survey period (Table 3.13).

Non-disabled women and men were less likely to have experienced a crime than in the baseline period. There were no statistically significant changes for disabled men or disabled women.

Table 3.13 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by gender and disability

	2012/13		Change
	%	n	2008/11– 2012/13 +/- percentage points
Females			
Non-disabled people	16.0	5218	-2.7**
Disabled people	15.1	1596	-2.2
Total	15.8	6838	-2.6**
Males			
Non-disabled people	17.9	4031	-2.5**
Disabled people	19.5	1163	1.5
Total	18.2	5207	-1.9*

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.2.

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

There are differences between disabled and non-disabled people in various age groups, when looking separately at the findings for women and for men. Disabled

women were more likely than non-disabled women to have experienced a crime in the younger age groups (16-24, 25-34 and 35-44). For example, 30.6 per cent of disabled women aged 25-34 had experienced a crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 21.0 per cent of non-disabled women in this age group (see Table 3.14).

The patterns were different for disabled and non-disabled men. Disabled men were more likely than non-disabled men to have experienced crime in three age groups: the 35-44, 55-64 and 65-74 age groups (see Table 3.15).

There were few changes between the baseline period and the most recent survey period in the proportions that had experienced a crime (see Tables 3.14 and 3.15). There were decreases among disabled women aged 45-54, as well as among non-disabled women aged 16-24.

Table 3.14 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females)

	2012/13		Change
	%	n	2008/11– 2012/13 +/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	19.0	484	-6.4*
Disabled people	33.9*	48	+1.7
Total	20.3	533	-5.4*
25-34			
Non-disabled people	21.0	872	-3.0
Disabled people	30.6*	110	-9.8
Total	22.0	985	-3.3
35-44			
Non-disabled people	19.7	936	-2.8
Disabled people	27.6*	147	-5.7
Total	20.7	1089	-2.9
45-54			
Non-disabled people	16.2	979	-2.3
Disabled people	17.5	228	-8.1*
Total	16.5	1210	-3.2*
55-64			
Non-disabled people	12.7	823	-1.1
Disabled people	12.3	305	-3.1
Total	12.6	1132	-1.6
65-74			
Non-disabled people	9.1	647	+1.3
Disabled people	10.6	303	+0.2
Total	9.5	955	+0.9
75+			
Non-disabled people	3.4	477	-1.0
Disabled people	6.0	455	-1.1
Total	4.7	934	-1.1

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.2.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures

indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Table 3.15 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (males)

	2012/13		Change 2008/11– 2012/13
	%	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	25.8	399	-4.2
Disabled people	43.2	37	+7.2
Total	27.0	437	-3.3
25-34			
Non-disabled people	22.8	640	-1.4
Disabled people	32.7	67	+9.4
Total	23.7	707	-0.5
35-44			
Non-disabled people	18.8	705	-3.7
Disabled people	30.2*	96	-0.6
Total	20.2	806	-3.2
45-54			
Non-disabled people	17.3	742	-2.0
Disabled people	21.8	187	-3.3
Total	18.1	930	-2.2
55-64			
Non-disabled people	11.1	642	-3.2
Disabled people	17.9*	243	+0.9
Total	12.9	887	-2.0
65-74			
Non-disabled people	8.3	591	-1.3
Disabled people	14.1*	273	+1.7
Total	10.1	866	-0.3
75+			
Non-disabled people	7.3	312	+1.7
Disabled people	5.6	260	0.0
Total	6.5	574	+0.9

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.2.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis by ethnicity in Scotland is based on just two categories: White respondents and ethnic minority respondents.

Among ethnic minority respondents, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime (33.8 per cent compared with 16.3 per cent). Among White respondents, there was no statistically significant difference between disabled and non-disabled people (see Table 3.16).

Non-disabled White respondents were less likely to have experienced a crime than in the baseline period, in line with the change for the population as a whole. However, there were no statistically significant changes for disabled White or ethnic minority respondents, or for non-disabled ethnic minority respondents.

Table 3.16 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by ethnicity and disability

	2012/13		Change 2008/11- 2012/13
	%	n	+/- percentage points
White			
Non-disabled people	16.9	8956	-2.6**
Disabled people	16.7	2721	-0.8
Total	16.9	11711	-2.3**
Ethnic minority			
Non-disabled people	16.3	281	-2.6
Disabled people	33.8*	37	+8.0
Total	18.0	318	-1.3

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.2.

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis of religion in Scotland is based on three categories: 'no religion', Christian and 'religious minority'.

In the most recent survey period, there were no differences between disabled and non-disabled people in any of the three religion groups.

As shown in Table 3.17, disabled people in the Christian group were less likely to have experienced a crime than in the baseline period, but there were no statistically significant changes for disabled people in the other groups. Among non-disabled people, there were decreases in the 'no religion' and Christian groups.

Table 3.17 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by religion and disability

	2012/13		Change 2008/11– 2012/13
	%	n	+/- percentage points
No religion			
Non-disabled people	19.1	3608	-2.8**
Disabled people	21.7	854	2.2
Total	19.5	4468	-2.1*
Christian			
Non-disabled people	15.3	5271	-2.4**
Disabled people	14.3	1796	-2.4*
Total	15.1	7086	-2.4**
Religious minority			
Non-disabled people	16.5	295	-4.1
Disabled people	22.4	81	2.0
Total	17.7	377	-2.9

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.2.

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

3.3 10-15 year olds in England and Wales

Since 2009/10, the BCS/CSEW has included a separate sample of young people aged 10-15. Findings in this section are based on data from the most recent two-year period covering 2012/13 and 2013/14. This analysis is restricted to a two-year period, in order to provide a discrete time period with which to compare the baseline period, which covered 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12. As noted in the Introduction, the definition of crime is different for young people aged 10-15 than for adults in the main survey.

In the most recent two-year period (2012/13–2013/14), disabled young people were much more likely than non-disabled young people to have experienced a crime (22.4 per cent compared with 12.0 per cent), as shown in Table 3.18.

There was no change in the proportion of disabled young people that experienced a crime since the baseline period (2009/10–2011/12). By contrast, non-disabled young

people were less likely to have experienced a crime (decrease of 1.4 percentage points).

Table 3.18 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by disability

	2012/13 and 2013/14		Change 2009/12– 2012/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
Non-disabled people	12.0	5,507	-1.4*
Disabled people	22.4**	279	0.0
Total	12.4	5,812	-1.4*

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.3.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of 10-15 year olds who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Analysis by age group (Table 3.19) indicates that the overall difference noted above applies equally to 10-12 year olds and 13-15 year olds. In both age groups, disabled young people were more likely than non-disabled young people to have experienced a crime. Among 10-12 year olds, 25.5 per cent of disabled young people experienced a crime, compared with 12.4 per cent of non-disabled young people, while 20.5 per cent of disabled 13-15 year olds experienced a crime, compared with 11.6 per cent of non-disabled 13-15 year olds.

There were no statistically significant changes since the baseline period for disabled young people aged 10-12 or 13-15. However, non-disabled young people aged 13-15 were less likely to have experienced a crime in the most recent two-year period (-1.9 percentage points).

Table 3.19 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2012/13 and 2013/14		Change 2009/12– 2012/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
10-12			
Non-disabled people	12.4	2642	-0.9
Disabled people	25.5**	107	+2.3
Total	12.8	2764	-0.9
13-15			
Non-disabled people	11.6	2865	-1.9*
Disabled people	20.5**	172	-1.3
Total	12.0	3048	-1.8*

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.3.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of 10-15 year olds who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

As seen above, disabled young people were more likely than non-disabled young people to experience a crime in the most recent two-year period. Table 3.20 shows that this difference applied to both girls and boys, with 17.6 per cent of disabled girls experiencing a crime compared with 9.6 per cent of non-disabled girls, and 25.3 per cent of disabled boys experiencing a crime compared with 14.3 per cent of non-disabled boys.

There were no statistically significant changes between the baseline period and the most recent two-year period for disabled boys or girls. However, non-disabled boys were less likely to have experienced a crime in the most recent two-year period (-3.0 percentage points).

Table 3.20 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by gender and disability

	2012/13 and 2013/14		Change 2009/12– 2012/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
Females			
Non-disabled people	9.6	2665	+0.3
Disabled people	17.6*	100	-1.8
Total	9.8	2776	+0.2
Males			
Non-disabled people	14.3	2842	-3.0**
Disabled people	25.3**	179	+0.8
Total	14.8	3036	-2.9**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.3.

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of 10-15 year olds who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

When looking at young people separately by gender, disabled girls aged 13-15 were more likely than non-disabled girls of this age to have experienced a crime (22.8 per cent compared with 9.2 per cent); see Table 3.21. It is not possible to analyse the findings for disabled girls aged 10-12 due to the small base size.

Among disabled boys (Table 3.22), those aged 10-12 were more likely than non-disabled boys of the same age to experience a crime (33.7 per cent compared with 14.6 per cent). There was no statistically significant difference between disabled and non-disabled boys aged 13-15.

There were no statistically significant changes from the baseline period for disabled boys or girls in either of the age groups (where the base sizes are large enough). However, non-disabled boys aged 13-15 were less likely to have experienced a crime in the most recent two-year period (-3.6 percentage points).

Caution should be taken when interpreting these findings, due to the small base sizes.

Table 3.21 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)

	2012/13 and 2013/14		Change 2009/12– 2012/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
10-12			
Non-disabled people	–	1252	–
Disabled people	–	[28]	–
Total	9.8	1287	-0.1
13-15			
Non-disabled people	9.2	1413	+0.2
Disabled people	22.8**	72	+6.4
Total	9.8	1489	+0.5

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.3.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of 10-15 year olds who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. The symbol '–' denotes that a figure has been withheld because of the small number of cases included in the analysis.

Table 3.22 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)

	2012/13 and 2013/14		Change
	%	n	2009/12– 2012/14 +/- percentage points
10-12			
Non-disabled people	14.6	1390	-2.3
Disabled people	33.7**	79	+11.0
Total	15.4	1477	-1.9
13-15			
Non-disabled people	14.0	1452	-3.6**
Disabled people	18.8	100	-8.0
Total	14.3	1559	-3.8**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.3.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of 10-15 year olds who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis by ethnicity can only be conducted using two categories; White and ethnic minority respondents (Table 3.23).

Among White respondents, disabled young people were more likely than non-disabled young people to experience a crime (22.6 per cent compared with 12.3 per cent). This reflects the overall pattern seen for disabled young people as a whole. Among ethnic minority respondents, the difference between disabled and non-disabled young people was not statistically significant; the small sample size for disabled ethnic minority respondents makes it difficult to identify statistically significant differences.

There were no statistically significant changes since the baseline period for disabled or non-disabled young people in either of the two ethnic groups.

Table 3.23 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability

	2012/13 and 2013/14		Change 2009/12– 2012/14
	%	n	+/- percentage points
White			
Non-disabled people	12.3	4,562	-1.3
Disabled people	22.6**	246	-0.4
Total	12.8	4,825	-1.2
Ethnic minority			
Non-disabled people	10.7	940	-1.4
Disabled people	22.3	32	+4.2
Total	10.9	980	-1.5

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.3.

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of 10-15 year olds who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis by religion can only be conducted using three categories; 'no religion', Christian and 'religious minority' (Table 3.24).

Among both the 'no religion' and Christian groups, disabled young people were more likely than non-disabled young people to experience a crime: 27.4 per cent compared with 13.4 per cent in the 'no religion' category, and 20.4 per cent compared with 11.8 per cent in the Christian group. It is not possible to analyse the findings for disabled young people in the 'religious minority' group due to the small base size.

There were no statistically significant changes since the baseline period for disabled or non-disabled young people in any of the religion groups.

Table 3.24 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by religion and disability

	2012/13 and 2013/14		Change
	%	n	2009/12– 2012/14 +/- percentage points
No religion			
Non-disabled people	13.4	2097	-2.1
Disabled people	27.4**	128	+4.7
Total	14.1	2236	-1.7
Christian			
Non-disabled people	11.8	2799	-1.1
Disabled people	20.4**	133	-2.3
Total	12.2	2940	-1.2
Religious minority			
Non-disabled people	–	538	–
Disabled people	–	[11]	–
Total	8.4	553	-2.0

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales.. See data table S5.3

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of 10-15 year olds who have experienced any crime in the previous 12 months. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. The symbol ‘–’ denotes that a figure has been withheld because of the small number of cases included in the analysis.

4. Worry about being the victim of crime

Main findings for this chapter:

Adults in England and Wales (2011/12–2013/14):

- Disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime. This difference applied to all age bands.
- Worry about crime decreased among older disabled people, with decreases in the 55-64 age group and those aged 75 or over. However, there were no statistically significant changes among younger disabled people. By contrast, non-disabled people in all age groups were less likely to be worried over time.
- Worry about being the victim of crime was more likely among women (disabled and non-disabled) than among men.
- Comparing the baseline period with the most recent three-year period, there was a decrease in the proportion of people that were worried about being the victim of crime, and this applied to both disabled people (down 2.5 percentage points) and non-disabled people (down 5.2 percentage points).

Adults in Scotland (2012/13):

- In contrast to England and Wales, disabled people in Scotland were no more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime. However, the questions asked were very different.
- In the younger age groups (16-24 and 25-34), disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime. There were no statistically significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in the other age groups.
- Disabled women were less likely than non-disabled women to be worried about being the victim of crime. There was no statistically significant difference between disabled and non-disabled men.
- Comparing the baseline period with the most recent survey period, there was a decrease in the proportion of people that were worried about being the victim of crime, and this applied to both disabled people and non-disabled people.

This chapter covers Measure 6: ‘worry about being the victim of crime’, and presents findings for:

- England and Wales, among adults aged 16 or over (this information was not obtained from the sample of 10-15 year olds);
- Scotland among adults aged 16 or over.

Findings are analysed for both disabled and non-disabled people, overall and within a number of equality groups: age, gender, ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation.

In general, there is less variation by age group on this issue than was the case for experience of crime. As a result, the differences by disability are clearer, as described below.

4.1 Adults in England and Wales

The findings in this section are drawn from the BCS/CSEW, and cover adults (aged 16 or over) in England and Wales. Once again, analysis focuses on the most recent three-year period, which covers the three years 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14. Tables and commentary also examine changes between the baseline period (2007/08–2009/10) and the most recent three-year period.

Disabled people as a whole were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime (46.4 per cent compared with 36.0 per cent) in the most recent three-year period; see Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 shows the change from the baseline period. There was a decrease in the proportion of people that were worried about being the victim of crime, and this applied to both disabled people (down 2.5 percentage points) and non-disabled people (down 5.2 percentage points).

Table 4.1 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
Non-disabled people	36.0	22,336	-5.2**
Disabled people	46.4**	5,984	-2.5*
Total	37.8	28,385	-4.6**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Disabled people in all age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime in the most recent three-year period; see Table 4.2. The differences were broadly consistent across the various age groups, with the exception of the oldest age group (75+), where the difference was small (but still statistically significant). There was a large difference in the 16-24 age group: 60.0 per cent of disabled people in this age group said they were worried, compared with 39.8 per cent of non-disabled people.

Table 4.2 examines change from the baseline period. Worry about crime decreased among older disabled people, with decreases in the 55-64 age group (down 4.8 percentage points) and those aged 75 or over (down 3.9 percentage points). However, there were no statistically significant changes among younger disabled people. By contrast, non-disabled people in all age groups were less likely to be worried over time.

Table 4.2 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	39.8	2100	-7.2**
Disabled people	60.0**	153	-5.5
Total	40.9	2254	-6.8**
25-34			
Non-disabled people	39.9	3827	-4.5**
Disabled people	53.1**	336	-3.5
Total	40.9	4169	-4.2**
35-44			
Non-disabled people	34.9	4189	-4.5**
Disabled people	49.5**	558	-3.5
Total	36.3	4757	-4.4**
45-54			
Non-disabled people	34.7	3924	-4.3**
Disabled people	51.7**	796	-1.5
Total	37.3	4732	-3.8**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	33.2	3501	-6.0**
Disabled people	47.7**	1170	-4.8*
Total	36.5	4683	-5.7**
65-74			
Non-disabled people	34.4	2996	-4.9**
Disabled people	48.2**	1242	1.0
Total	38.3	4252	-3.4**
75+			
Non-disabled people	29.9	1799	-3.7*
Disabled people	35.8**	1729	-3.9*
Total	32.7	3538	-3.8**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated

as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

In general, women were more likely than men to be worried about being the victim of crime. This applied to both disabled people (53.2 per cent compared with 37.7 per cent in the most recent three-year period) and non-disabled people (44.2 per cent compared with 27.9 per cent); see Table 4.3.

Among both men and women, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of a crime. More than half (53.2 per cent) of disabled women were worried, compared with 44.2 per cent of non-disabled women, while 37.7 per cent of disabled men were worried, compared with 27.9 per cent of non-disabled men.

Comparing the baseline period with the most recent three-year period, over time disabled women became less likely to be worried about being the victim of a crime (down 3.7 percentage points). There was no statistically significant change among disabled men.

Table 4.3 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by gender and disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
Females			
Non-disabled people	44.2	11980	-4.6**
Disabled people	53.2**	3450	-3.7**
Total	45.9	15459	-4.3**
Males			
Non-disabled people	27.9	10356	-5.6**
Disabled people	37.7**	2534	-2.0
Total	29.4	12926	-5.0**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures

indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

In all age groups except the oldest group (75+), disabled women were more likely than non-disabled women to worry about being the victim of a crime (see Table 4.4). For example, among those aged 16-24, 73.1 per cent of disabled women were worried about being the victim of crime, compared with 50.4 per cent of non-disabled women.

A similar pattern applied to men. In most age groups, disabled men were more likely than non-disabled men to be worried about being the victim of crime. For example, among 25-34 year olds, 45.2 per cent of disabled men were worried about being the victim of crime, compared with 31.1 per cent of non-disabled men. However, there was no statistically significant difference between disabled and non-disabled men in the youngest age group (16-24). The small sample size for disabled men aged 16-24 means that a very large difference would be needed for statistical significance (see Table 4.5).

Looking at change over time in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 (comparing the latest findings with the baseline period), disabled women in two age groups were less likely to be worried: 55-64 and 75 or over (down 6.0 and 5.3 percentage points respectively). Otherwise there were no statistically significant changes for disabled men and women in other age groups.

Table 4.4 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	50.4	1112	-5.5*
Disabled people	73.1**	100	2.6
Total	51.9	1213	-4.6*
25-34			
Non-disabled people	48.9	2199	-2.9
Disabled people	59.2*	211	-9.5
Total	49.7	2412	-3.2*
35-44			
Non-disabled people	43.4	2231	-5.0**
Disabled people	55.7**	318	-5.6
Total	44.7	2556	-5.0**
45-54			
Non-disabled people	42.3	2031	-4.0*
Disabled people	58.0**	457	-1.9
Total	45.1	2492	-3.3*
55-64			
Non-disabled people	39.5	1800	-7.5**
Disabled people	56.6**	631	-6.0*
Total	43.6	2438	-6.9**
65-74			
Non-disabled people	41.9	1588	-3.6
Disabled people	56.7**	678	-0.3
Total	46.2	2270	-2.6
75+			
Non-disabled people	36.4	1019	-2.4
Disabled people	40.4	1055	-5.3*
Total	38.3	2078	-3.7*

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated

as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Table 4.5 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	29.9	988	-9.1**
Disabled people	40.5	53	-17.7
Total	30.4	1041	-9.2**
25-34			
Non-disabled people	31.1	1628	-6.1**
Disabled people	45.2**	125	5.3
Total	32.1	1757	-5.2**
35-44			
Non-disabled people	26.4	1958	-4.0**
Disabled people	42.0**	240	-1.8
Total	27.9	2201	-3.8*
45-54			
Non-disabled people	27.3	1893	-4.2**
Disabled people	43.5**	339	-2.0
Total	29.5	2240	-4.0**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	27.0	1701	-3.9*
Disabled people	37.7**	539	-4.8
Total	29.4	2245	-4.1**
65-74			
Non-disabled people	26.1	1408	-6.2**
Disabled people	38.3**	564	0.8
Total	29.5	1982	-4.5**
75+			
Non-disabled people	21.6	780	-5.2*
Disabled people	28.7**	674	-2.2
Total	24.7	1460	-3.9*

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

As noted above, the categorisations for impairment type changed in 2012/13, and so we examine the findings separately for the baseline period and for the most recent survey period.

In the baseline period,¹⁵ people in most impairment groups were more likely to worry about being the victim of crime, compared with non-disabled people. There were high figures for people with a learning difficulty or disability (72.2 per cent) and those with a mental health condition (55.5 per cent); see Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type

	2009/10	
	% very/fairly worried	n
Non-disabled people	38.5	8,864
Blindness, deafness or other communication impairment	38.7	371
Mobility impairment, such as difficulty walking	43.3**	1,281
Learning difficulty or disability, such as Down’s syndrome	72.2**	38
Mental health condition, such as depression	55.5**	321
Long-term illness, such as multiple sclerosis or cancer	44.0	222
Other long-standing health condition or disability	46.6**	1,112
Any impairment	46.1**	2,308

¹⁵ Impairment type was first asked in 2009/10. Therefore figures for the baseline period are restricted to 2009/10 only.

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares each impairment type with the reference group, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

In the most recent two-year period (2012/13–2013/14),¹⁶ people in all impairment groups were more likely to worry about being the victim of crime, compared with non-disabled people. There were high figures for people with a mental health condition (55.7 per cent), those with memory impairment (52.8 per cent), those with an impairment related to learning, understanding or concentrating (52.5 per cent) and those with a social or behavioural impairment (52.3 per cent); see Table 4.7.

Because the categorisation of impairment has changed over time in BCS/CSEW, it is not possible to analyse change between the baseline period and the most recent two-year period. However, a broad comparison indicates that the patterns are similar in the two time periods.

Further examination of specific impairment groups shows that:

- The proportion of people with a mental health condition that were worried about being the victim of crime was very similar in the two time periods (55.5 per cent in 2009/10 and 55.7 per cent in 2012/13–2013/14), and in each of the survey periods this was significantly higher than the proportion of non-disabled people that were worried about being the victim of crime.
- High percentages of people with a learning difficulty or disability in 2009/10 and with impairments relating to learning, understanding or concentrating or socially or behaviourally in 2012-14 said they were worried about being the victim of crime. The actual percentages differed between the two survey periods, and cannot be compared because of the different categorisations and the small number of respondents in the relevant groups.

¹⁶ The categorisation was changed in 2012/13, and as a result, analysis of the most recent survey period is based on 2012/13 and 2013/14 only.

Table 4.7 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type

	2012/13–2013/14	
	% very/fairly worried	n
Non-disabled people	35.8	13493
Vision (for example, blindness or partial sight)	49.7**	435
Hearing (for example, deafness or partial hearing)	48.2**	482
Mobility (for example, walking short distances or climbing stairs)	45.3**	2109
Dexterity (for example, lifting and carrying objects, using a keyboard)	48.5**	829
Learning or understanding or concentrating	52.5**	227
Memory	52.8**	405
Mental health	55.7**	488
Stamina or breathing or fatigue	48.2**	1137
Socially or behaviourally (for example associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome)	52.3*	51
Other condition or illness	46.9**	621
Any impairment	46.1**	3344

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares each impairment type with the reference group, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Analysis by ethnicity shows that, in most ethnic groups, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime in the most recent three-year period (2011/12–2013/14). Specifically, this applied to people in the White ethnic group (44.4 per cent compared with 32.2 per cent), the Mixed group (74.3 per cent compared with 43.2 per cent) and the 'Asian, Asian British or other' group (73.6 per cent compared with 64.7 per cent); see Table 4.8.

Overall, people in the various ethnic minority groups were more likely than White people to be worried about being the victim of crime: higher proportions of both disabled and non-disabled people were worried.

Among disabled people, the only change over time was within the White group: fewer disabled White people were worried about crime compared with the baseline period, 2007/08–2009/10 (down 2.9 percentage points). There were no statistically significant changes for disabled people in other ethnicity groups.

Table 4.8 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
White			
Non-disabled people	32.2	20108	-6.3**
Disabled people	44.4**	5648	-2.9**
Total	34.4	25806	-5.6**
Mixed			
Non-disabled people	43.2	192	-6.5
Disabled people	74.3**	31	+3.1
Total	46.8	223	-4.6
Black or Black British			
Non-disabled people	55.9	620	-3.3
Disabled people	58.2	94	-5.8
Total	56.1	714	-3.6
Asian/Asian British/other			
Non-disabled people	64.7	1402	0.0
Disabled people	73.6*	210	+2.5
Total	65.7	1615	+0.3

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Table 4.9 shows the proportions of disabled and non-disabled people who were worried about being the victim of crime, broken down by religion, in the most recent three-year period. Because of small sample sizes, figures for some religion categories have been withheld.

In the 'no religion' and Christian groups, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime, in line with the pattern for the overall population. For example, 40.6 per cent of disabled people with no religion were worried, compared with 28.7 per cent of non-disabled people with no religion. There were no statistically significant differences in the other religion groups.

There were no statistically significant changes over time for disabled people in the various religion groups.

Table 4.9 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by religion and disability

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
No religion			
Non-disabled people	28.7	5993	-7.4**
Disabled people	40.6**	1038	-4.2
Total	30.1	7043	-7.0**
Christian			
Non-disabled people	35.8	14877	-4.4**
Disabled people	46.2**	4650	-1.9
Total	37.9	19560	-3.7**
Buddhist			
Non-disabled people	–	121	–
Disabled people	–	[17]	–
Total	61.7	139	+1.7
Hindu			
Non-disabled people	63.1	318	-7.0
Disabled people	75.6	39	-6.9
Total	64.3	358	-7.1
Jewish			
Non-disabled people	–	92	–
Disabled people	–	[24]	–
Total	47.9	117	-5.7
Muslim			
Non-disabled people	64.0	704	0.0
Disabled people	72.6	121	+1.9
Total	65.1	825	+0.3
Sikh			
Non-disabled people	–	110	–
Disabled people	–	[29]	–
Total	60.2	139	-6.4
Any other religion			
Non-disabled people	42.9	92	-9.3
Disabled people	50.1	60	-3.8
Total	45.3	152	-7.3

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime.

Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted. The symbol '—' denotes that a figure has been withheld because of the small number of cases included in the analysis.

Analysis by sexual orientation shows that disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime in both the heterosexual/straight group (50.6 per cent compared with 35.9 per cent in the most recent three-year period) and in the gay, lesbian or bisexual group (52.9 per cent compared with 35.8 per cent); see Table 4.10.

There were no statistically significant changes over time for disabled people in any of the sexual orientation groups.

Note that sexual orientation is only collected for people aged 16 to 59 since it is asked as part of the self-completion module.

Table 4.10 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by sexual orientation

	2011/12–2013/14		Change 2007/10– 2011/14
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
Heterosexual or straight			
Non-disabled people	35.9	14191	-4.5**
Disabled people	50.6**	2012	-2.2
Total	37.4	16222	-4.1**
Gay or lesbian, bisexual			
Non-disabled people	35.8	373	-11.3**
Disabled people	52.9*	82	-16.5
Total	38.0	455	-11.4**
Don't wish to answer			
Non-disabled people	48.7	360	-7.5*
Disabled people	62.6	62	-0.9
Total	50.5	425	-6.7*

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S6.1.

Notes: Within each sexual orientation group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

4.2 Adults in Scotland

The findings in this section are drawn from the SCJS, and cover adults (aged 16 or over) in Scotland. The analysis focuses on the most recent survey period (2012/13), and comparisons are made with the baseline period (2008/09–2010/11).

As noted in the Introduction, the questions asked in SCJS are different to BCS/CSEW, so the findings are not comparable. SCJS asks respondents how worried they are about 11 specific types of crime, and the analysis in this section is based on respondents who said they were very or fairly worried about at least one of these.

In the most recent survey period (2012/13), disabled people as a whole were no more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about any of the various types of crime (73.0 per cent and 73.4 respectively), as shown in Table 4.11. This is different to the pattern seen in England and Wales, where disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried. The different pattern in Scotland may reflect the difference in questions (as described above).

Table 4.11 shows the change from the baseline period (2008/09–2010/11). There was a decrease in the proportion of people that were worried about being the victim of crime, and this applied to both disabled people (down 4.6 percentage points) and non-disabled people (down 5.8 percentage points).

Table 4.11 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by disability

	2012/13		Change 2008/11– 2012/13
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
Non-disabled people	73.4	9,249	-5.8**
Disabled people	73.0	2,759	-4.6**
Total	73.3	12,045	-5.6**

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2.

Notes: The reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

In the younger age groups, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled to be worried about being the victim of crime, in the most recent survey period; see Table 4.12. In the 16-24 age group, 80.6 per cent of disabled people said they were worried, compared with 67.3 per cent of non-disabled people. Among 25-34 year olds, 86.7 per cent of disabled people said they were worried, compared with 74.0 per cent of non-disabled people. There were no statistically significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in the other age groups.

Table 4.12 examines change from the baseline period. Worry about crime decreased among older disabled people, with decreases in all of the age groups 45 or over. However, there were no statistically significant changes among younger disabled people. By contrast, non-disabled people in all age groups were less likely to be worried over time.

Table 4.12 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2012/13		Change 2008/11– 2012/13
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	67.3	883	-8.2**
Disabled people	80.6*	85	-0.6
Total	68.3	970	-7.5**
25-34			
Non-disabled people	74.0	1512	-5.7**
Disabled people	86.7**	177	3.0
Total	75.2	1692	-4.7**
35-44			
Non-disabled people	78.1	1641	-5.0**
Disabled people	83.1	243	-1.1
Total	78.8	1895	-4.5**
45-54			
Non-disabled people	76.3	1721	-5.8**
Disabled people	78.2	415	-7.2**
Total	76.7	2140	-6.0**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	77.8	1465	-4.5**
Disabled people	79.0	548	-5.1*
Total	78.1	2019	-4.6**
65-74			
Non-disabled people	72.2	1238	-4.7**
Disabled people	71.8	576	-7.9**
Total	72.2	1821	-5.6**
75+			
Non-disabled people	57.2	789	-5.5*
Disabled people	54.1	715	-7.3**
Total	55.7	1508	-6.3**

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures

indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Disabled women were less likely than non-disabled women to be worried about being the victim of crime: 74.1 per cent of disabled women were worried, compared with 77.5 per cent of non-disabled women. There was no statistically significant difference between disabled and non-disabled men (see Table 4.13).

Over time (comparing the baseline period with the most recent survey period), both disabled women and men were less likely to be worried (down 4.8 and 4.4 percentage points respectively). There were also decreases among non-disabled men and women.

Table 4.13 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by gender and disability

	2012/13		Change 2008/11– 2012/13
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
Females			
Non-disabled people	77.5	5218	-4.3**
Disabled people	74.1*	1596	-4.8**
Total	76.8	6838	-4.4**
Males			
Non-disabled people	69.0	4031	-7.4**
Disabled people	71.5	1163	-4.4**
Total	69.5	5207	-6.8**

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2.

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Disabled women aged 16-24 and 25-34 were more likely to be worried than non-disabled women in the same age groups; this reflects the general pattern seen for younger people (as noted above); see Table 4.14.

There were no statistically significant differences between disabled men and non-disabled men in any age group (Table 4.15).

Looking at change over time (comparing the latest findings with the baseline period), disabled women in three age groups were less likely to be worried: 45-54, 65-74 and 75 or over (down 10.1, 8.4 and 7.2 percentage points respectively). There was also a decrease among disabled men aged 65-74 (down 7.0 percentage points). Otherwise there were no statistically significant changes for disabled men and women of different ages.

Table 4.14 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females)

	2012/13		Change 2008/11– 2012/13
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	72.3	484	-6.5**
Disabled people	88.4*	48	-0.6
Total	73.6	533	-5.7*
25-34			
Non-disabled people	78.4	872	-5.4**
Disabled people	90.9**	110	1.6
Total	79.8	985	-4.4**
35-44			
Non-disabled people	84.0	936	-1.2
Disabled people	85.3	147	-0.8
Total	84.2	1089	-1.0
45-54			
Non-disabled people	80.6	979	-3.9**
Disabled people	79.0	228	-10.1**
Total	80.3	1210	-5.0**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	80.0	823	-5.6**
Disabled people	82.5	305	-4.3
Total	80.6	1132	-5.3**
65-74			
Non-disabled people	77.4	647	-2.0
Disabled people	74.2	303	-8.4**
Total	76.5	955	-3.9*
75+			
Non-disabled people	58.0	477	-4.9
Disabled people	53.8	455	-7.2*
Total	55.9	934	-6.0**

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures

indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Table 4.15 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (males)

	2012/13		Change
	% very/fairly worried	n	2008/11–2012/13 +/- percentage points
16-24			
Non-disabled people	62.6	399	-9.8**
Disabled people	72.1	37	-1.2
Total	63.2	437	-9.2**
25-34			
Non-disabled people	69.8	640	-5.9**
Disabled people	82.0	67	4.0
Total	70.8	707	-5.0*
35-44			
Non-disabled people	71.9	705	-9.0**
Disabled people	80.2	96	-1.9
Total	72.9	806	-8.1**
45-54			
Non-disabled people	71.7	742	-8.0**
Disabled people	77.3	187	-3.7
Total	72.8	930	-7.2**
55-64			
Non-disabled people	75.4	642	-3.5
Disabled people	75.3	243	-5.8
Total	75.4	887	-3.9*
65-74			
Non-disabled people	66.4	591	-7.9**
Disabled people	68.9	273	-7.0*
Total	67.3	866	-7.5**
75+			
Non-disabled people	56.0	312	-6.3
Disabled people	54.7	260	-7.6
Total	55.4	574	-6.8**

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2.

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis by ethnicity in Scotland is based on just two categories: White respondents and ethnic minority respondents (Table 4.16).

Among White and ethnic minority respondents, there were no statistically significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people.

Looking at change over time (comparing the baseline period with the latest findings), disabled White respondents were less likely to be worried (down 4.8 percentage points). There was no statistically significant change among disabled ethnic minority respondents.

Table 4.16 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by ethnicity and disability

	2012/13		Change 2008/11– 2012/13
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
White			
Non-disabled people	73.4	8956	-5.7**
Disabled people	72.8	2721	-4.8**
Total	73.3	11711	-5.5**
Ethnic minority			
Non-disabled people	73.5	281	-10.7**
Disabled people	82.3	37	+9.1
Total	74.3	318	-9.1**

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2.

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is ‘non-disabled people’. Significance testing compares ‘disabled people’ with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis of religion in Scotland is based on three categories: ‘no religion’, Christian, and ‘religious minority’ (Table 4.17).

Among those with no religion, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime (73.6 per cent compared with 69.4 per cent). By contrast, disabled Christians were less likely to be worried than non-disabled Christians (71.8 per cent compared with 76.5 per cent). These variations are likely to reflect age differences in the groups (Christian respondents being generally older than those with no religion).

There were no statistically significant differences for respondents in the religious minority group.

Compared with the baseline period, disabled Christian respondents were less likely to be worried (down 6.2 percentage points). There were no statistically significant changes among disabled respondents with no religion or in religious minority groups.

Table 4.17 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by religion and disability

	2012/13		Change
	% very/fairly worried	n	2008/11–2012/13 +/- percentage points
No religion			
Non-disabled people	69.4	3608	-7.5**
Disabled people	73.6*	854	-3.3
Total	70.1	4468	-6.8**
Christian			
Non-disabled people	76.5	5271	-4.3**
Disabled people	71.8**	1796	-6.2**
Total	75.4	7086	-4.8**
Religious minority			
Non-disabled people	75.1	295	-7.9*
Disabled people	86.7	81	+6.2
Total	77.2	377	-5.5

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2.

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'non-disabled people'. Significance testing compares 'disabled people' with the related reference group. For change, significance testing compares the baseline figure with the latest figure. Statistical significance is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level. Figures indicate the proportion of adults who are very or fairly worried about being the victim of crime. Percentage findings (%) are weighted; bases (n) are unweighted.

5. Conclusions

Evidence about disability-related harassment gathered by the Equality and Human Rights Commission from a range of sources since the start of its inquiry in 2010 underlines the general extent and range of the problem, but much remains hidden. For some disabled people harassment is a part of daily life and they may fail to recognise it as ‘hate crime’; other barriers to reporting mean many incidents never come to light.

Statistics about disability hate crime in Britain are available from two important sources: the British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales (BCS/CSEW) and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS), although they do not cover all behaviour towards disabled people that was of concern to the Commission inquiry. The value of these surveys lies in the fact that both capture crime – including crime motivated by hate of particular identity groups – that has *not* been reported to the police, as well as crime that has. By analysing certain key measures from these surveys it has been possible not only to build a picture of the current situation, but also pick up on any changes that have taken place since a similar analysis was reported in 2013.

In recent years crime of all kinds has decreased, including hate crime. This is a positive trend. However, comparing the latest findings for England and Wales with the previous analysis, hate crime generally still makes up about four per cent of all crimes captured by the BCS/CSEW; and **disability hate crime** – affecting an estimated 35,000 adults (down from 42,000 in the baseline period) – still accounts for about one sixth of all hate crime.

There has been no statistically significant change over time in England and Wales in the pattern of reporting of disability hate crime to the police, who in the most recent period were told only about an estimated half of such incidents (52.1 per cent). However, as also described in the previous report, there was a higher reporting rate than for crimes not motivated by identity (38.5 per cent in the most recent reference period). Change over time in victim satisfaction with police handling of reported disability hate crime incidents was not statistically significant, although there were

increases in satisfaction for other identity-related crime and those not motivated by identity.

When it comes to **overall experience of crime**, the statistics for the current reporting period show the same general pattern as observed in the previous report. In England and Wales, and in Scotland, disabled people within each age group are more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced crime in the last 12 months. In England and Wales, although a decline in the experience of crime over time is evident for both disabled and non-disabled adults, it is more marked for non-disabled people. In Scotland non-disabled people became less likely to experience crime, yet there was no statistically significant change in the experience of crime among disabled people. These findings suggest that the overall drop in experience of crime has not benefited disabled people as much as it has non-disabled people.

Among the other important findings for England and Wales is the particular **vulnerability of certain disabled groups** when it comes to overall experience of crime; people with a social or behavioural impairment, for example associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome and people with a mental health condition were much more likely to have experienced crime in the 12 months prior to being interviewed than disabled respondents generally (35.3 per cent and 29.6 per cent respectively compared with 18.1 per cent).

Findings in England and Wales for **younger disabled people** aged 10-15 are particularly concerning. In the most recent reporting period they were much more likely than their non-disabled counterparts to have been the victims of crime (22.4 per cent compared with 12.0 per cent). This pattern holds for different age groups and for both boys and girls. Moreover, there was no change from the baseline period in the proportion of disabled young people that experienced a crime although the risk to non-disabled young people, by contrast, decreased. Once again, it seems that as society generally becomes safer, disabled people do not experience this improvement to the same degree as their non-disabled peers.

Disabled people in England and Wales continue to be more likely to be worried than their non-disabled counterparts about being the victim of crime (46.4 per cent compared with 36.0 per cent). This does not hold for Scotland where no statistically significant difference between these groups was evident in the most recent survey period. In both England and Wales, and in Scotland, there has been a decrease in **worry about crime** since the baseline reporting period, for both disabled and non-disabled people, but especially the latter.

An important finding for both England and Wales and Scotland, however, is the relatively high level of worry about being the victim of crime among disabled people aged 16-24 compared with non-disabled people of the same age.

Also worth highlighting are the estimated levels of worry in England and Wales among people with a mental health condition (55.7 per cent), those with a 'memory' impairment (52.8 per cent), those with an impairment related to 'learning, understanding or concentrating' (52.5 per cent) and those with a 'social or behavioural' impairment, for example associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome (52.3 per cent). These compare with a lower level of worry (35.8 per cent) among non-disabled people.

In summary, the analysis reported here paints a picture of general improvements in the incidence of crime and hate crime. There are some positive trends in the experience of crime and satisfaction with how crime is handled by the police. However, improvements for disabled people are generally being experienced at a slower rate than for non-disabled people. Furthermore, certain groups of disabled people are at particular risk of being a victim of crime. These include children and young people and those with particular impairments such as mental health conditions and social or behavioural impairments.

Appendix 1: Data implications

A number of issues need to be borne in mind when interpreting the findings contained in this report.

Small sample sizes

In some cases, sub-groups have small sample sizes. For example, analysis of disability within ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation breakdowns produces some very small sample sizes. This means that it is more difficult to identify statistically significant differences, and caution should be used when interpreting these findings.

Where necessary, categories have been combined to produce larger sample sizes. In some cases, analysis by ethnicity uses just two categories ('White' and 'ethnic minority'), while analysis by religion sometimes uses three categories ('No religion', 'Christian', 'Religious minority'). While increasing statistical confidence, this approach makes it more difficult to interpret the findings.

The number of victims of hate crime upon which estimates are based is relatively small. Therefore, the margins of error around the estimates for hate crime are large, and it can be difficult to make comparisons between the monitored strands over time.

Changes to question wording

The analysis covers several years of data. There were changes in the survey questionnaires over these years, including to questions that are central to the analysis. The changes are as follows:

- The BCS/CSEW questions from which disability analysis has been derived changed in 2009/10, and then again in 2012/13. The questions and resulting definitions are shown in Appendix 2. The overall proportion of respondents defined as being disabled (with a limiting disability/illness) remained similar before

and after the changes. Therefore, although it is important to note this change, it should not affect interpretation of findings over time.

- The revisions that were introduced in 2009/10 included a new question on impairment type, and this question changed in 2012/13. Analysis focuses mainly on the most recent question (covering data since 2012/13), with some analysis of the earlier question. No analysis by impairment type is possible for 2007/08 or 2008/09.
- In BCS/CSEW, sexual orientation information is obtained from the self-completion module. The sample size is smaller than the full sample because not all respondents complete it, and because the BCS/CSEW self-completion module is restricted to 16-59 year olds. Also, from 2009/10 onwards, an additional category ('other') was added to the sexual orientation question; this has been excluded from the analysis.
- Questions on identity crime were included in BCS/CSEW in all of the years covered by the analysis. However, the types of identity crime have changed; specifically, gender was not included as a category until 2009/10, and gender identity was not included until 2012/13.
- In the BCS/CSEW questionnaire for 10 to 15 year olds, the questions asked about experience of crime and the resulting definitions are slightly different in 2011/12 than in the previous two years. A list of valid offence codes is provided in Appendix 3.
- In SCJS, there were also changes to questions on disability in 2009/10, and again in 2012/13. The questions and resulting definitions are shown in Appendix 2. The revisions that were introduced in 2009/10 included a new question on impairment type, but the question on impairment type was dropped in 2012/13. Therefore, no analysis by impairment type for SCJS is shown in this report.
- In the 2007/08 BCS, the questions on worry about being the victim of crime were asked of all respondents. However, from 2008/09 onwards, the questions were asked only of a sub-set (around a quarter) of the total sample. Weights have been adjusted so that the 2007/08 figures are comparable in size with those from 2008/09 onwards.

For Measure 6, analysis in the previous report was based on the BCS/CSEW question on overall worry about crime. This question is no longer included in the questionnaire (it was last asked in 2011/12). As a result, the analysis uses a different definition, based on a series of questions asking respondents how worried they are about specific types of crime. The analysis in this section is based on the proportion of respondents that said they were very/fairly worried about at least one of four types

of crime: 1) being mugged and robbed; 2) being raped; 3) being physically attacked by strangers; 4) being subject to a physical attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion. As a result of this change, findings in this report are not comparable with those produced in the 2013 report.

Differences between BCS/CSEW and SCJS

It is important to note that there are differences between the definitions included in BCS/CSEW and those in SCJS. In particular, the coding of crimes differs between the BCS/CSEW and the SCJS, which reflects the different criminal justice systems in which they operate. These differences should be borne in mind if comparisons are made between BCS/CSEW and SCJS estimates. See Appendix 3 for more detail.

The questions about hate crime are asked differently in SCJS from in BCS/CSEW. In SCJS, until 2012/13, an initial question asked why the respondent thought the offender committed the crime. Answers were unprompted, but interviewers were provided with a list of possible codes for categorising responses. Where this question was coded, a follow up item asked why the respondent thought they were targeted by the offender, again unprompted. Codes available for the interviewer to use included options for disability and other protected characteristics. This approach captured hardly any incidents of hate crime. The questions used subsequently in 2012/13 are more comparable with BCS/CSEW; these identified more incidents but, with only one wave of data available, are insufficient for analysis. Therefore, this report does not include analysis of Scotland for measures 1, 2 or 4, because of the small number of incidents identified and because of the different way of recording these types of crime in the years covered by the baseline.

For Measure 6 (worry about being the victim of crime), the questions asked in SCJS are different to BCS/CSEW, so the findings are not comparable. SCJS asks respondents how worried they are about 11 specific types of crime, and the analysis is based on respondents who said they were very or fairly worried about at least one of these. The BCS/CSEW analysis was based on worry about four different types of crime, and the question wording was also different.¹⁷

¹⁷ BCS/CSEW question is: 'How worried are you about ... ?' SCJS question is: 'I am now going to read out a list of crimes and ask how worried, if at-all, you are that each one might happen to you. ADD IF

Differences between adults and 10-15 year olds in BCS/CSEW

In BCS/CSEW, the definition of crime is different for young people aged 10-15 than for adults in the main survey. Firstly, the definition for young people focuses on personal crime (and excludes household crime). Extending the BCS/CSEW to encompass children's experience of crime also raised some difficult issues with regard to classifying criminal incidents; for example, minor incidents that are normal within the context of childhood behaviour and development can be categorised as criminal when existing legal definitions of offences are applied. Consultation with crime statistics users produced two measures for publication: the 'Broad measure' and the 'Preferred measure'. This analysis uses the 'Preferred measure' which excludes these minor incidents. This means that the definition of crime is different for young people aged 10-15 than for adults in the main survey. Appendix 3 contains more detail about the measurement of crime among both adults and young people.¹⁸

Notes on survey datasets

For the 2012/13 SCJS, some variables were deemed too sensitive to release and were removed from the publicly available datasets. This included the question on sexual orientation; therefore, no analysis by sexual orientation is possible for SCJS data.

In addition, there have been changes over time in the way in which identity crime has been categorised in the survey datasets. In 2007/08 and 2008/09, the data from the questions themselves were included in the Victim Form data file, but no other data were provided. In 2009/10, derived variables on types of 'eligible' identity crime were included in the Victim Form data file, but not in the non-Victim Form data file. In 2010/11 and 2011/12, these derived variables were added to the non-Victim Form data file. However, in 2011/12, the data from the original questions were excluded from the Victim Form data file; only the derived variables were included. As a result

NECESSARY: I mean how worried are you about it HAPPENING, not how worried would you be if it DID happen'.

¹⁸ See also user guide for discussion, page 5

http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/7252/mrdoc/pdf/7252_csew_2011-12_10-15_dataset_user_guide.pdf

of these changes, it has been difficult to ensure consistency in the analysis of identity crime over the five years covered.

Differences in figures from previous report

Note that, for analysis covering the period 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10, there are some small differences between the figures in this report and the report produced in the previous project in 2013. The differences are as follows:

- Measures 1, 2 and 4: Minor differences are the result of the treatment of missing, out of range and 'don't know' answers, which has been standardised across all years in the latest analysis shown in this table.
- Measures 5 and 6 (England and Wales), analysis by impairment type: In this report, the analysis shows respondents with each impairment type, limited to respondents who are disabled (with limiting disability/illness). Significance testing compares each impairment type with the 'Non-disabled' group (no limiting disability/illness). This is different to the previous report, where the analysis covered all respondents with each impairment type (irrespective of whether they were disabled with limiting disability/illness), and the reference group was 'respondents with no impairment'.
- Measure 6 (England and Wales): Analysis in the previous (2013) project was based on the BCS/CSEW question on overall worry about crime. This question is no longer included in the questionnaire (it was last asked in 2011/12). As a result, the analysis uses a different definition, as described above. As a result of this change, findings in this table are not comparable with those produced in the 2013 project.
- Measure 6 (Scotland): Figures in this report differ from those produced in the previous (2013) project. Although based on the same definition, the 2013 figures did not pick up all of the 11 individual components – as a result the figures in this report are higher than those produced in 2013.

Appendix 2: Questions on disability

BCS 2007/08, 2008/09

ILLNESS [ASK ALL]

Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? By long-standing I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time.

1. Yes
2. No

LIMITS [ASK IF ILLNESS = YES]

Does this illness or disability (Do any of these illnesses or disabilities) limit your activities in any way?

1. Yes
2. No

Categories for disability analysis: 'Limiting illness/disability' (code 1 at 'LIMITS'); 'No limiting disability/illness' (code 2 at ILLNESS or code 2 at LIMITS)

BCS/CSEW 2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12

DISABLEA-DISABLEI [ASK ALL]

Do you have any of the following long-standing physical or mental health conditions or disabilities that have lasted or are expected to last 12 months or more? CODE ALL THAT APPLY. IF NECESSARY: Please include those that are due to old age

1. Blindness, deafness or other communication impairment
2. Mobility impairment, such as difficulty walking
3. Learning difficulty or disability, such as Down's syndrome
4. Mental health condition, such as depression
5. Long-term illness, such as multiple sclerosis or cancer
6. Other long-standing health condition or disability
7. None of these

DISABLE2 [ASK IF DISABLE=1]

[Does/do] your health condition[s] or [disability/disabilities] mean that your day to day activities are limited? Would you say you are...READ OUT

1. Severely limited
2. Limited but not severely
3. or not limited at all?

Categories for disability analysis: 'Limiting illness/disability' (code 1 or 2 at 'DISABLE2'); 'No limiting disability/illness' (code 3 at DISABLE2 or code 7 at DISABLEA-I)

BCS/CSEW 2012/13, 2013/14

ONSDISAB [ASK ALL]

Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last for 12 months or more?

1. Yes
2. No

ONSIMPA-

ONSIMPM [ASK IF ONSDISAB = YES]

YELLOW SHOW CARD Y1

Do any of these conditions or illnesses affect you in any of the areas shown on this card? CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Vision (for example, blindness or partial sight)
2. Hearing (for example, deafness or partial hearing)
3. Mobility (for example, walking short distances or climbing stairs)
4. Dexterity (for example, lifting and carrying objects, using a keyboard)
5. Learning or understanding or concentrating
6. Memory
7. Mental health
8. Stamina or breathing or fatigue
9. Socially or behaviourally (for example associated with autism, attention deficit disorder or Asperger's syndrome)
10. Other (SPECIFY)
11. SPONTANEOUS ONLY: None of the above

ONSACT [ASK IF ONSDISAB = YES]

[Does your condition or illness/do any of your conditions or illnesses] reduce your ability to carry out day-to-day activities?

IF YES: Is that a lot or a little?

1. Yes, a lot

2. Yes, a little
3. Not at all

Categories for disability analysis: 'Limiting illness/disability' (code 1 or 2 at 'ONSACT'); 'No limiting disability/illness' (code 3 at ONS ACT or code 2 at ONSDISAB)

BCS/CSEW 10-15 year old questions 2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14
CILLNESS [ASK ALL]

I'd now like to ask you a few more questions about yourself. Do you have any long term illness or disability? IF NECESSARY: By long term I mean anything that has affected you for longer than three months or that is likely to affect you for longer than three months.

1. Yes
2. No

CLIMITS [ASK IF CILLNESS = YES]

Does this illness or disability limit your activities in any way?

1. Yes
2. No

Categories for disability analysis: 'Limiting illness/disability' (code 1 at 'CLIMITS'); 'No limiting disability/illness' (code 2 at CILLNESS or code 2 at CLIMITS)

SCJS 2008/09

QDISAB [ASK ALL]

Do you have long standing physical or mental condition or disability that has lasted, or is likely to last, at least 12 months?

1. Yes
 2. No
- DK
REF

QDISAB2 [ASK IF QDISAB = YES]

Does this long standing physical or mental condition or disability (Do any of these long standing physical or mental conditions or disabilities) limit your activities in any way?

1. Yes
 2. No
- DK

REF

Categories for disability analysis: 'Limiting illness/disability' (code 1 at 'QDISAB2'); 'No limiting disability/illness' (code 2 at QDISAB2 or code 2 at QDISAB)

SCJS 2009/10, 2010/11

DISABNEW [ASK ALL]

Do you have any of the following conditions which have lasted, or are expected to last, at least 12 months? Just read out the letters that apply.

A Deafness or severe hearing impairment

B Blindness or severe vision impairment

C A physical disability (a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, lifting or carrying)

D A learning disability (such as Down's Syndrome)

E A learning difficulty (such as dyslexia or dyspraxia)

F A mental health condition (such as depression or schizophrenia)

G A chronic illness (such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, heart disease or epilepsy)

H Other condition (SPECIFY)

I No – none of these

DK

REF

DISABLIM [ASK ALL]

Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months? Please include problems related to old age.

Yes, limited a lot

Yes, limited a little

No

DK

REF

Categories for disability analysis: 'Limiting illness/disability' (code 1 or 2 at 'DISABLIM'); 'No limiting disability/illness' (code 3 at DISABLIM).

SCJS 2012/13

ASK ALL.

QCONDIT Do you have a physical or mental health condition or illness lasting or expected to last 12 months or more?

1 Yes

2 No

DK
REF

ASK IF HAS HEALTH CONDITION (QCONDIT, CODE 1).

QLIMIT Does your condition or illness reduce your ability to carry out day-to-day activities? INTERVIEWER, IF YES: Is that a lot or a little?

- 1 Yes, a lot
- 2 Yes, a little
- 3 No

DK
REF

Categories for disability analysis: 'Limiting illness/disability' (code 1 or 2 at 'QLIMIT'); 'No limiting disability/illness' (code 3 at 'QLIMIT' or code 2 at 'QCONDIT').

Appendix 3: Measures of crime

This report is based on analysis of two data sources:

- The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), previously known as the British Crime Survey (BCS). The survey is based on interviews with adults aged 16 and over in England and Wales. A separate sample of 10-15 year olds is also interviewed.
- The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS), based on interviews with adults aged 16 and over in Scotland.

The BCS/CSEW and the SCJS are face-to-face victimisation surveys in which people resident in households in England and Wales and in Scotland are asked about their experiences of a range of crimes in the 12 months prior to the interview.

Respondents are asked directly about their experience of crime, irrespective of whether or not they reported these incidents to the police.

The key aim of both surveys is to provide robust trends for the crime types and population they cover; the surveys do not aim to provide an absolute count of crime and there are clearly identified exclusions. Both surveys exclude fraud and those crimes often termed as 'victimless' (for example, possession of drugs). As surveys that ask people whether they have experienced victimisation, homicides cannot be included. The surveys do not cover the population living in group residences (for example, care homes or halls of residence) or other institutions, nor do they cover crime against commercial or public sector bodies. For more information on BCS/CSEW see:

http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/7619/mrdoc/pdf/7619_csew_adult_userguide.pdf

The coding of crimes differs between the SCJS and BCS/CSEW, which reflects the different criminal justice systems in which they operate. Although these differences should be borne in mind when comparisons are made between SCJS and BCS/CSEW estimates, they mainly relate to differences of categorisation within the overall crime count. For more information see 2012/13 Scottish Crime and Justice Survey: Technical Report Section 9

http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/7543/mrdoc/pdf/7543_scjs_2012-13_technicalreport.pdf

The offence codes used in each survey are shown at the end of this Appendix.

Following recommendations in two related reviews of crime statistics, the BCS/CSEW was extended to children aged 10 to 15 from January 2009. The primary aim of extending it to children was to provide estimates of the levels of crime experienced by children and their risk of personal victimisation. Preliminary results from the first calendar year were published in 2010 and, following a user consultation, these statistics were refined further. The questionnaire was refined again for the 2011/12 survey to increase the level of detail relating to low level crimes which enabled them to be coded in the same way as more serious crimes. The changes to the questions and definitions used should be borne in mind when interpreting the figures. Methodological differences also mean that direct comparisons cannot be made between the adult and child data.

Extending the BCS/CSEW to encompass children's experience of crimes raised some difficult issues with regard to classifying criminal incidents; for example, minor incidents that are normal within the context of childhood behaviour and development can be categorised as criminal when existing legal definitions of offences are applied. Consultation with users produced two measures for publication: the 'Broad measure' and the 'Preferred measure'.

The 'Preferred measure' takes into account factors identified as important in determining the severity of an incident (such as level of injury, use of a weapon, value of item stolen or damaged, relationship with the perpetrator) while the 'Broad measure' counts all incidents which would be legally defined as crimes and therefore may include low-level incidents between children. (The analysis in this report uses the Preferred measure'.) For more information see:

http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/7619/mrdoc/pdf/7619_csew_10_15yold_userguide.pdf

In BCS/CSEW analysis of adults and households, the crime codes outlined below are those included in the 'all BCS crime' category. These are split into two: 'household' and 'personal' crimes.

- All household offences (variable: totalh)
- 50 Attempted burglary to non-connected domestic garage/outhouse
- 51 Burglary in a dwelling (nothing taken)
- 52 Burglary in a dwelling (something taken)

- 53 Attempted burglary in a dwelling
- 55 Theft in a dwelling
- 56 Theft from a meter
- 57 Burglary from non-connected domestic garage/outhouse-nothing taken
- 58 Burglary from non-connected domestic garage/outhouse-something taken
- 60 Theft of car/van
- 61 Theft from car/van
- 62 Theft of motorbike, motorscooter or moped
- 63 Theft from motorbike, motorscooter or moped
- 64 Theft of pedal cycle
- 65 Theft from outside dwelling (excl. theft of milk bottles)
- 71 Attempted theft of/from car/van
- 72 Attempted theft of/from motorcycle
- 80 Arson
- 81 Criminal damage to a motor vehicle (£20 or under)
- 82 Criminal damage to a motor vehicle (over £20)
- 83 Criminal damage to the home (£20 or under)
- 84 Criminal damage to the home (over £20)
- 85 Other criminal damage (£20 or under)
- 86 Other criminal damage (over £20)

All personal not including sex offences (variable: totper)

- 11 Serious wounding
- 12 Other wounding
- 13 Common assault
- 21 Attempted assault
- 32 Serious wounding with sexual motive
- 33 Other wounding with sexual motive
- 41 Robbery
- 42 Attempted robbery
- 43 Snatch theft from the person
- 44 Other theft from the person
- 45 Attempted theft from the person
- 67 Other theft
- 73 Other attempted theft

Crime codes for BCS/CSEW analysis of 10-15 year olds are as follows:

Valid core offence codes (2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12)

Assault	11 Serious wounding 12 Other wounding 13 Common assault
Attempted assault	21 Attempted assault
Sexual offences	31 Rape 32 Serious wounding with a sexual motive 33 Other wounding with a sexual motive 34 Attempted rape 35 Indecent assault
Personal theft	41 Robbery 42 Attempted robbery 43 Snatch theft from the person 44 Other theft from the person 45 Attempted theft from the person
Theft	67 Other theft
Attempted theft	73 Other attempted theft
Vandalism*	801 Arson to a motor vehicle (10-15s only) 802 Criminal damage to a motor vehicle (10-15s only) 803 Arson to the home (10-15s only) 804 Criminal damage to the home (10-15s only) 805 Arson to personal property (10-15s only) 806 Criminal damage to personal property (10-15s only)

*Three digit offence codes are used here to differentiate children's offence codes from those of adults as it is not possible to use the same offence codes because children are not asked whether the item damaged was worth more or less than £20.

In addition, in 2009/10 and 2010/11 (but not in 2011/12) the following crime code were included:

- 116 Aggressive behaviour
- 117 Attempted aggressive behaviour
- 146 Theft with aggressive behaviour
- 147 Attempted theft with aggressive behaviour
- 166 Theft
- 167 Attempted theft
- 186 Damage to property
- 187 Attempted damage to property
- 196 Intimidation/coercion.

In **SCJS** analysis of adults and households, the crime codes outlined below are those included in the 'all SCJS crime' category:

- 11 / 2 Serious assault
- 12 / 3 Minor assault with injury
- 13 / 65 Minor assault with no/negligible injury
- 14 / 4 Serious assault and fire raising
- 15 / 5 Serious assault and housebreaking
- 21 / 7 Attempted assault
- 41 / 17 Robbery
- 42 / 18 Attempted robbery
- 43 / 19 Snatch theft from the person
- 44 / 20 Other theft from the person
- 45 / 21 Attempted theft from the person
- 67 / 41 Other theft
- 73 / 46 Other attempted theft
- 51 / 25 Housebreaking in a dwelling (nothing taken)
- 52 / 26 Housebreaking in a dwelling (something taken)
- 53 / 27 Attempted housebreaking in a dwelling
- 50 / 24 Attempted housebreaking to non-connected domestic garage/outhouse
- 55 / 29 Theft in a dwelling
- 56 / 30 Theft from a meter
- 57 / 31 Housebreaking: non-connected domestic garage/outhouse – nothing taken
- 58 / 32 Housebreaking: non-connected domestic garage/outhouse – something taken
- 64 / 38 Theft of pedal bicycle
- 65 / 39 Theft from outside dwelling (excluding theft of milk bottles)
- 60 / 34 Theft of car/van
- 61 / 35 Theft from car/van
- 62 / 36 Theft of motorbike, motor scooter or moped
- 63 / 37 Theft from motorbike, motor scooter or moped
- 71 / 44 Attempted theft of/from car/van
- 72 / 45 Attempted theft of/from motorcycle, motor scooter or moped
- 80 / 48 Fire raising
- 82 / 49 Vandalism to a motor vehicle
- 84 / 50 Vandalism to the home
- 86 / 51 Other vandalism

Glossary

'BCS crime'	The definition of crime used in the British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See below under 'Crime' for further details.
Crime	<p>The report uses a definition of crime that follows the definitions used in the source surveys: BCS/CSEW and SCJS. These surveys provide estimates of the levels of household and personal crimes experienced by respondents. Household crimes are considered to be all vehicle and property-related crimes and respondents are asked whether anyone currently residing in the household has experienced any incidents within the reference period. Personal crimes relate to all crimes against the individual and only relate to the respondents' own personal experience (not that of other people in the household). Further details are provided in Appendix 3.</p> <p>It is important to note that the definitions of crime differ between the two surveys, as noted in the Introduction and in Appendix 1.</p>
Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW)	The Crime Survey for England and Wales, formerly known as the British Crime Survey (BCS) is a national survey that measures attitudes to and experience of crime in England and Wales. This includes crimes which may not have been reported to the police, or recorded by them. It therefore provides an important

complement to police recorded crime statistics.

Disability-related harassment

Unwanted, exploitative or abusive conduct on the grounds of disability which has the purpose or effect of either:

- violating the dignity, safety, security or autonomy of the person experiencing it, or
- creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading or offensive environment.

Disabled people

In this analysis, disabled people are those who say in response to one of the surveys that they have a long-standing health condition or disability which means that their day-to-day activities are limited. This is in line with the harmonised classification of disability and analysis of the 2011 Census published by the Office for National Statistics. Different question wordings have been used at different times by the two surveys analysed for this report and full details can be found in Appendix 2.

The definition used here may be broader than the definition in the Equality Act 2010, for which disability has to have 'a substantial and long-term adverse affect', so some people identifying as disabled may not be covered by the definition in the Act. Conversely, survey questions may exclude other people who would be covered by the Act, such as: people with specific conditions, people whose daily activities would be limited without medication or other treatment, and people who had a condition or disability in the past.

Ethnicity

In both surveys, respondents are read out a list of

different ethnic groups and asked: 'To which of these ethnic groups do you consider you belong?' In the report, individual categories are combined where necessary so that sample sizes are large enough for analysis. Specifically:

- Asian/Asian British/other: includes Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese, any other Asian background, any other ethnic group
- Ethnic minority: includes all categories except White.

Hate crime

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 disability or perceived disability, race, religion or sexual orientation.

Impairment group

The two surveys (BCS/CSEW and SCJS) include questions in which respondents are asked to say whether they have any of a number of listed types of impairment (see Appendix 2). The resulting categories are used for analysis, although these categories may not necessarily reflect the way impairments are labelled by disabled people themselves.

Religion

In the report, individual religion categories are combined where necessary so that sample sizes are large enough for analysis. Specifically:

- Religious minority: includes all categories except 'No religion' and 'Christian.'

Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS)

The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) is a social survey which asks people aged 16 and over about their experiences and perceptions of crime in Scotland. The SCJS provides an

alternative and complementary measure of crime to police recorded crime statistics.

Sexual orientation

In the BCS/CSEW, to collect information on sexual orientation respondents are shown a list of options and asked: 'Which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself'. The options are:

1. Heterosexual or straight; 2. Gay or lesbian; 3. Bisexual; 4. Other; 5. Don't Know; 6. Don't wish to answer.

These responses are then analysed in the report using the following categories: a) Heterosexual or straight; b) Gay or lesbian, Bisexual; c) Don't wish to answer. 'Other' and 'don't know' responses are excluded from the analysis.

Data on sexual orientation are not available from SCJS.

References

Coleman, N., Sykes, W. and Walker, A. (2013) *Crime and disabled people: Baseline statistical analysis of measures from the formal legal inquiry into disability-related harassment*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission, Research Report 90. (Available at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/rr90_pdf_final.pdf). [Accessed 18 February 2016].

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2011) *Hidden in plain sight: Inquiry into disability-related harassment*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission. (Available at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/publication/hidden-plain-sight-inquiry-disability-related-harassment>). [Accessed 18 February 2016].

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2012) *Out in the open – tackling disability-related harassment: A manifesto for change*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission. (Available at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/publication/out-open-tackling-disability-related-harassment-manifesto-change>). [Accessed 18 February 2016].

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2013) *Manifesto for change: Progress report 2013*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission. (Available at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/documents/publications/manifesto_for_change_progress_report_2013_final.pdf). [Accessed 18 February 2016].

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2016) *Tackling disability-related harassment: progress report 2016*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Office for Disability Issues (2011) *Life Opportunities Survey: Wave one results, 2009/11*. HM Government. (Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/180891/los_wave_one_200911.pdf). [Accessed 18 February 2016].

Office for Disability Issues and the Department for Work and Pensions (2014) *Disability facts and figures*. (Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/disability-facts-and-figures#ls>). [Accessed 18 February 2016].

Office for National Statistics (2014) *Crime survey for England and Wales (CSEW) Dataset User Guide: Adults aged 16 and over, 2013/14*.

(Available at:

http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/7619/mrdoc/pdf/7619_csew_adult_userguide.pdf).

[Accessed 18 February 2016].

Scottish Government (2014) *Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2012/13: Technical Report*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. (Available at:

http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/7543/mrdoc/pdf/7543_scjs_2012-13_technicalreport.pdf). [Accessed 18 February 2016].

Datasets

Home Office. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, BMRB. Social Research. (2009). *British Crime Survey, 2007-2008*. [data collection]. 3rd Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 6066, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6066-1>.

Home Office. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, BMRB. Social Research. (2010). *British Crime Survey, 2008-2009*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 6367, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6367-1>.

Home Office. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, BMRB. Social Research. (2012). *British Crime Survey, 2009-2010*. [data collection]. 2nd Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 6627, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6627-2>.

Home Office. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, TNS-BMRB. (2012). *British Crime Survey, 2010-2011*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 6937, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6937-1>.

Office for National Statistics. (2013). *Crime Survey for England and Wales, 2011-2012*. [data collection]. 2nd Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 7252, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7252-2>.

Office for National Statistics. (2014). *Crime Survey for England and Wales, 2012-2013*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 7422, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7422-1>.

Office for National Statistics. (2015). *Crime Survey for England and Wales, 2013-2014*. [data collection]. 2nd Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 7619, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7619-2>.

TNS-BMRB Scotland, Scottish Government. (2010). *Scottish Crime and Justice Survey, 2008-2009*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 6362, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6362-1>.

TNS-BMRB Scotland, Scottish Government. (2011). *Scottish Crime and Justice Survey, 2009-2010*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 6685, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6685-1>.

TNS BMRB Scotland, Scottish Government. (2013). *Scottish Crime and Justice Survey, 2010-2011*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 7229, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7229-1>.

TNS BMRB Scotland. (2015). *Scottish Crime and Justice Survey, 2012-2013*. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 7543, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7543-1>.

You can download this publication from

www.equalityhumanrights.com

© 2016 Equality and Human Rights Commission

Published: September 2016