

Equality and Human Rights Commission
Research report 90

Crime and disabled people

Baseline statistical analysis of measures
from the formal legal inquiry
into disability-related harassment

Nick Coleman, Wendy Sykes
and Alison Walker

Independent Social Research

Crime and disabled people
Baseline statistical analysis of measures
from the formal legal inquiry
into disability-related harassment

Nick Coleman, Wendy Sykes and Alison Walker

Independent Social Research

© Equality and Human Rights Commission 2013

First published Autumn 2013

ISBN 978-1-84206-503-7

Equality and Human Rights Commission Research

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

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:
<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/>

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

Contents		Page
	List of tables	i
	Acknowledgements	iv
	Executive summary	v
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Purpose of this report	1
1.3	Analysis	2
1.4	Notes for interpreting findings in this report	4
1.5	Notes on the text and tables	6
2	Disability-related crime and other identity crime	7
2.1	Number of victims of hate crimes (Measure 1)	8
2.2	Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police (Measure 2)	15
2.3	Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter (Measure 3)	17
2.4	Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents (Measure 4)	19
3	Experience of crime (Measure 5)	21
3.1	Adults in England and Wales	22
3.2	Adults in Scotland	36
3.3	10-15 year olds in England and Wales	45
4	Worry about being the victim of crime (Measure 6)	52
4.1	Adults in England and Wales	53
4.2	Adults in Scotland	66
	Conclusions	78
	Appendices	82
	Appendix 1: Data Implications	82
	Appendix 2: Questions on disability	85
	Appendix 3: Measures of crime	88

Tables	Page	
Table 1	Number of incidents of hate crime and all BCS crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime, 2007/08-2009/10	9
Table 2	Number of incidents of hate crime and all BCS crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime, 2008/09-2010/11 and 2009/10-2011/12	10
Table 3	Incidence rate of hate crime and all BCS crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime	11
Table 4	Proportion of adults and households who were victims of hate crime and all BCS crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime	13
Table 5	Number of adults and households who were victims of hate crime and all BCS crime, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime	14
Table 6	Proportion of BCS crime incidents reported to the police, England and Wales	16
Table 7	Reasons for not reporting crime incident to the police, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime	18
Table 8	Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime	20
Table 9	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females and males combined)	23
Table 10	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by disability	24
Table 11	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)	26
Table 12	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)	27
Table 13	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by gender and disability	28
Table 14	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type	30
Table 15	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability	32
Table 16	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by religion and disability	34

Table 17	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by sexual orientation	35
Table 18	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females and males combined)	37
Table 19	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by disability	38
Table 20	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females)	39
Table 21	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (males)	40
Table 22	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by gender and disability	41
Table 23	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by impairment type	42
Table 24	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by ethnicity and disability	43
Table 25	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by religion and disability	44
Table 26	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by sexual orientation	45
Table 27	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by disability	46
Table 28	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)	47
Table 29	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)	48
Table 30	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)	48
Table 31	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by gender and disability	49
Table 32	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability	50
Table 33	Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by religion and disability	51
Table 34	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by disability	54

Table 35	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females and males combined)	55
Table 36	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)	57
Table 37	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)	58
Table 38	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by gender and disability	60
Table 39	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type	61
Table 40	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability	63
Table 41	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by religion and disability	65
Table 42	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by sexual orientation	66
Table 43	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by disability	67
Table 44	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females and males combined)	69
Table 45	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females)	71
Table 46	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (males)	72
Table 47	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by gender and disability	73
Table 48	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by impairment type	74
Table 49	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by ethnicity and disability	75
Table 50	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by religion and disability	76
Table 51	Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by sexual orientation	77

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 for their help with queries on the datasets.

We are very grateful to Andrew Nocon, Karen Hurrell, Jackie Driver and Vivienne Stone at the EHRC for their support throughout the project.

Crown Copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland.

Executive summary

Introduction

The Commission's inquiry into disability-related harassment in 2010/11 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 numbers of crimes that are reported to and recorded by the police, but the number of people who experience disability-related harassment may be considerably higher.

The 'Manifesto for Change', which followed the initial inquiry, noted that, while the data currently available do not provide a full picture of disability-related harassment, crime surveys do provide data on disabled people's experiences of crime, disability hate crime more specifically, and the extent to which disabled people report crime that they have experienced. The Manifesto for Change identified a set of measures from these surveys that can help to gauge progress over time.

This report sets out data on the following six measures, primarily in relation to disabled people:

- Number of victims of hate crimes (Measure 1);
- Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police (Measure 2);
- Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter (Measure 3);
- Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents (Measure 4);
- Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months (Measure 5);
- Worry about being a victim of crime (Measure 6).

This report provides baseline data for disabled people in England and Wales and, where available, for Scotland, in respect of these six measures, together with follow-up data that show changes over time¹. To allow detailed breakdown of the views and experiences of disabled people, the study merged survey data collected over a period of years via:

¹ For England and Wales, baseline data is from the three year period 2007/8-2009/10, with separate analysis of later three year periods: 2008/9-2010/11 and 2009/10-2011/12; analysis of change over time compares the baseline period (2007/8-2009/10) with the last two years covered by the analysis (2010/11-2011/12). For Scotland, all data is based on the three year period 2008/9-2010/11.

- The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), previously known as the British Crime Survey (BCS)²;
- The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS)³.

Number of victims of hate crimes (Measure 1 - England and Wales)

Four sets of survey estimates provide information relevant to this measure which looks at the number victims of hate crime and of disability hate crime in particular:

- There were around 72,000 **incidents of disability hate crime per year** in the baseline period. These were evenly divided between personal crimes against the respondent (such as assault) and household crimes experienced by members of the respondent's household, such as burglary or car crime. There were no statistically significant changes over time. In total, there were 448,000 hate crime incidents per year in the baseline period.
- The **number of hate crimes per 10,000 adults/households (incidence rate)** in the baseline period was 8 incidents per 10,000 adults of personal disability hate crime and 15 household disability hate crime incidents per 10,000 households. Figures were similar in later years.
- The **percentage of adults who were the victim of disability hate crime** in the 12 months before being interviewed was an estimated 0.1 per cent in the baseline period, with 0.8 per cent the victim of any type of hate crime. There were no changes in later years.
- The **number of adults in the population who were victims of hate crime:** an estimated 39,000 adults per year were victims of disability hate crime, with 288,000 adults the victims of any type of hate crime. These figures remained very similar over time.

Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police (Measure 2 - England and Wales)

Some crimes never come to the attention of the police, for example because victims do not report them. Over the baseline period, the police were more likely to come to know about disability hate crime incidents (56 per cent) than they were to hear about crime incidents not motivated by identity (38 per cent). However, there was no significant difference between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime.

² Based on interviews with adults aged 16 and over in England and Wales and a separate sample of 10-15 year olds.

³ Based on interviews with adults aged 16 and over in Scotland.

The proportion of disability hate crimes that came to the attention of the police was similar for both personal crimes (56 per cent) and household crimes (55 per cent). Figures were similar in later time periods: the proportion of disability hate crime incidents reported to the police was 55 per cent in 2008/9-2010/11 and 58 per cent in 2009/10-2011/12.

Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter (Measure 3 - England and Wales)

In the baseline period, the most common reasons that were given for not reporting disability hate crime incidents were that: the police could not have done anything (36 per cent); the police would not have been interested (31 per cent); or the incident was too trivial to report (17 per cent).

Compared with victims of crime incidents unrelated to identity, those who experienced disability hate crime were: less likely to say the incident was too trivial to report (17 compared with 29 per cent); and more likely to say they were fearful of offender reprisal (11 compared with two per cent).

Once again figures for later analysis time periods are similar to those seen in the baseline period.

Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents (Measure 4 - England and Wales)

Satisfaction with how crime incidents were handled by the police was assessed through questions asked of victims of crime who had had contact with the police. Over the three year period 2009/10 to 2011/12, victims of 58 per cent of disability hate crime incidents who had contact with the police said they were satisfied with police handling of the matter. This was similar to the proportion for other hate crime incidents (57 per cent). However, the proportion of crime incidents not related to identity where victims were satisfied was much higher – 70 per cent.

A similar pattern is evident over the same period in terms of the percentage of victims of crime who thought the police had treated them fairly and with respect. People who had experienced disability hate crime were less likely to think they had been treated fairly (68 per cent) or with respect (77 per cent) than victims of crime incidents not related to identity (80 per cent and 90 per cent respectively).

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

Adults in England and Wales

Over the baseline period 2007/8 to 2009/10, disabled people in all age groups in England and Wales were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the 12 months prior to interview. Differences were greatest in the younger age groups; for example, 42 per cent of disabled people aged 16-24 had been victims of crime in the preceding 12 months, compared with 33 per cent of their non-disabled counterparts.

The effect of age is more marked in relation to women than men, again especially in the younger age bands. In the baseline period, 42 per cent of disabled 16-24 year old women had been victims of crime in the previous 12 months compared with 31 per cent of their non-disabled counterparts. In contrast, differences between disabled and non-disabled men within age groups were smaller or not significant.

Overall, however, the proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men. In the baseline period, 20 per cent of both disabled women and disabled men had experienced a crime in the previous 12 months. This is different to the non-disabled population, where men were more likely than women to experience a crime.

There were no significant changes over time for disabled people in any age groups (men or women), although there were some significant decreases for non-disabled people in younger age groups.

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 (31 per cent compared with 26 per cent in the baseline period) and in the gay, lesbian or bisexual group (48 per cent compared with 34 per cent)⁴.

Adults in Scotland

In all age groups, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to have been the victim of crime. As in England and Wales, the gap between disabled people and non-disabled people narrowed with age but remained statistically significant. In most age bands, disabled women were more likely than non-disabled women to have

⁴ Sexual orientation is only collected for people aged 16 to 59 since it is asked as part of the self-completion module. This needs to be taken into account when interpreting these findings

been a recent victim of crime; For example, 40 per cent of disabled women aged 25-34 had experienced a crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 24 per cent of non-disabled women in this age group; differences between disabled and non-disabled men were less pronounced, and were significant in only a small number of age bands.

As in England and Wales, the overall proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men (17 per cent and 18 per cent respectively).

10-15 year olds in England and Wales

Based on BCS/CSEW data available since 2009/10 from a sample of young people aged 10-15, findings from the three year period 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12 show that disabled young people in this group were much more likely than their non-disabled counterparts to have been the victims of crime (22 per cent compared with 13 per cent). This applies equally to 10-12 year olds and 13-15 year olds and is true of both boys and girls, with 19 per cent of disabled girls experiencing a crime compared with nine per cent of non-disabled girls; and 25 per cent of disabled boys compared with 17 per cent of non-disabled boys.

Worry about being a victim of crime (Measure 6)

Adults in England and Wales

In the baseline period, disabled adults in England and Wales were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime (41 per cent compared with 34 per cent). This difference applied to all age bands, with the greatest difference evident among 25-34 year olds (52 per cent of disabled people compared with 36 per cent of non-disabled people).

Over the analysis period as a whole, there was a decrease in the proportion of both disabled and non-disabled people who said they were worried about crime (down by four and three percentage points respectively). Among disabled people, this decrease was concentrated in the older age groups, with significant decreases in the 55-64 age band (down six percentage points) and among those aged 75 and over (down seven percentage points); but there were no changes for younger disabled people. By contrast, non-disabled people became less worried over time in most age groups.

Worry about being the victim of crime was more likely among women (disabled and non-disabled) than among men, and disabled women and men were more likely to be worried than their non-disabled counterparts (46 per cent compared with 38 per cent for women and 36 per cent compared with 29 per cent for men in the baseline period).

Worry about being the victim of crime affects people in most impairment groups more than people with no impairments. In the baseline period, figures were highest for people with a learning difficulty or disability (50 per cent) and those with a mental health condition (48 per cent).

In all of the time periods covered by the analysis, White disabled people were more likely than White non-disabled people to worry about crime. In addition, in later time periods, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime in the Pakistani/Bangladeshi and Indian ethnic groups.

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 (46 per cent compared with 33 per cent in the baseline period) and in the gay, lesbian or bisexual group (55 per cent compared with 33 per cent).

Adults in Scotland

Disabled people in Scotland were less likely than non-disabled people to say they were worried about being the victim of crime (65 per cent versus 69 per cent). The questions asked were very different from those asked in England and Wales (the survey in Scotland asked about 11 different types of crime, while in England and Wales respondents gave an overall assessment of their worry about being the victim of crime) so it is not possible to compare the figures.

Differences within age bands were not statistically significant except among people aged 75; 48 per cent of disabled people in this age group said they were worried about at least one type of crime, compared with 53 per cent of non-disabled people. Both disabled women and disabled men were less likely to be worried about crime than non-disabled people (67 per cent versus 72 per cent for women; and 62 per cent versus 65 per cent for men).

In the last two years covered by the analysis (2009/10 and 2010/11) there were no impairment groups where people were more likely to be worried about crime

compared with those without any impairments. However, people in some impairment groups were less likely to be worried about crime: those whose impairments were classified as 'blindness or severe vision impairment', 'deafness' or severe hearing impairment'; or 'a physical disability'.

Future work

This report is the first stage in a series of ongoing evaluation of these measures. Further data analysis is planned to take place in two and four years' time.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

In September 2011, the EHRC published the report of an inquiry into disability-related harassment, entitled 'Hidden in Plain Sight'.⁵ A year later, the report was followed by a second report, 'A Manifesto for Change. Out in the Open: tackling disability-related harassment'.⁶ In addition to setting out the responses from a range of organisations and the final recommendations from the inquiry, it listed measures against which progress on preventing and tackling disability-related harassment would be reviewed, and a timetable for doing so.

'A Manifesto for Change' recognised that the data currently available do not provide a full picture of disability-related harassment. Nevertheless, crime surveys in England and Wales and in Scotland do provide data on disabled people's experiences of crime, disability hate crime more specifically, and the extent to which disabled people report crime that they have experienced. The Manifesto for Change identified six measures from these surveys that will help to gauge progress over time.

1.2 Purpose of this report

The purpose of the report is to provide a set of baseline data for England and Wales and, where available, for Scotland, in respect of six measures that are set out below, together with follow-up data that show change over time. The measures are examined primarily in relation to disabled people. The measures are as follows:

1. Number of incidents of hate crime
2. Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police
3. Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter
4. Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents
5. Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months
6. Worry about being a victim of crime.

⁵ Available at <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/inquiries-and-assessments/inquiry-into-disability-related-harassment/hidden-in-plain-sight-the-inquiry-final-report/>.

⁶ Available at <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/inquiries-and-assessments/inquiry-into-disability-related-harassment/out-in-the-open-manifesto-for-change/>.

This report is the first stage in a series of ongoing evaluation of these measures. Further data analysis is planned to take place in two and four years' time.

1.3 Analysis

The briefing 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.

This analysis draws together data over a period of several years, so that the overall numbers are large enough to allow a more detailed breakdown of the views and experiences of disabled people.

BCS/CSEW data for adults: Data has been analysed for all six measures. Baseline data is drawn from a three year period, covering the following years of the survey:

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

Additional analysis covers two subsequent, overlapping three-year periods, to give an indication of change over time and to establish the beginnings of a rolling time series:

- 2008/9, 2009/10 and 2010/11; and
- 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12.

The tables accompanying this briefing paper show analysis for all three time periods, and also show change over time, by comparing the following discrete time periods:

- 2007/8, 2008/9 and 2009/10 (baseline data) compared with 2010/11 and 2011/12.
- 2007/08 compared with 2011/12

For presentation purposes, the tables in this report focus primarily on the baseline period (2007/8-2009/10), and also show change between this baseline period and

the last two years covered by the analysis (2010/11-2011/12). The report commentary notes any additional details from other time periods.

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 analysis contained in this report.

BCS/CSEW data for 10-15 year olds: data is drawn from the three year period: 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12. Young people aged 10-15 were first included in the survey in 2009/10. Analysis has been conducted for measure 5, but data is not available for other measures as relevant questions were not asked of 10-15 year olds. Again, analysis is based on England and Wales combined.

SCJS data for adults: data is drawn from the three year period: 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11, the last three years that are available from the UK Data Service. Data is available for measures 5 and 6 only. Questions were asked covering the other measures, but the format of these questions was different from the BCS/CSEW questions, and only identified a small number of hate crime incidents.

Analysis of 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 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.

The glossary includes details of terms and definitions used in this report.

Definitions of crime

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).

Although the surveys cover crimes that are not reported to or recorded by the police, the survey definitions are limited in coverage to crimes against those resident in households and so cannot cover all crime types (for example, homicide, crimes against businesses and other organisations and drug possession). The definition of crime used in the analysis also excludes some other offences for which it is not possible to collect robust estimates of numbers of incidents (such as 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/CSEW⁷ and SCJS⁸.

It is also important to note that the definitions of crime differ between the two surveys, as noted below in this Introduction and in Appendix 1.

1.4 Notes for interpreting findings in this report

People who are disabled are more likely than non-disabled people to be older, unemployed or to experience socio-economic deprivation⁹. It may be that the latter factors are influential in disabled people's experiences of crime. Caution is therefore needed in any analysis of experience of crime that does not take account of such factors.

In addition, the BCS/CSEW is a household survey and does not include people who live in institutional care (many of whom may be disabled people).

⁷ ONS (2013) [User Guide to Crime Statistics for England and Wales](#).

⁸ Scottish Government Social Research (2011) 2010/11 Scottish Crime and Justice Survey: Technical Report. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/933/0122908.pdf>

⁹ See relevant statistics on the website for the Office for Disability Issues. <http://odi.dwp.gov.uk/disability-statistics-and-research/disability-facts-and-figures.php#ls>.

Although participants are selected at random within households, some disabled people may require communication or other support in order to take part. Without this, they may not be able to participate. It may be that their views and experiences are different from those of the disabled people who do not experience such barriers to participation. Their exclusion can therefore mean that the results may only reflect the views of disabled participants, rather than all disabled people.

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 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. While increasing statistical confidence, this approach makes it more difficult to interpret the findings.
- The analysis covers several years of data (five years for BCS/CSEW and three years 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 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 if comparisons are made between BCS/CSEW and SCJS estimates.
- In BCS/CSEW, the definition of crime is also different for young people aged 10-15 than for adults in the main survey. Details of specific crime types are given in Appendix 3.
- In both surveys, sexual orientation information is provided in the self-completion module. The sample size is smaller than the full sample because not all respondents complete the self-completion module. In addition, in BCS/CSEW 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 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.

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

1.5 Notes on the text and tables

All findings reported in the commentary are statistically significant unless stated otherwise. Percentages refer to weighted samples. Key data are included in tables in this report, with full tables also provided separately on the EHRC website¹⁰.

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). Comments in the text on differences between figures refer to statistically significant differences at the 95 per cent level.

Testing for statistical significance was carried out using logistic regression, with one independent variable defined for each test; for example, when comparing people with a limiting disability/illness and those with no limiting disability/illness, the reference group is those with no limiting disability/illness. These tests produce p values for the comparisons. The Complex Samples module in SPSS has been used to fit these regression models, since this allows survey design and weights to be allowed for in fitting the models.

¹⁰ <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/publications/our-research/>

2 Disability-related crime and other identity crime

This chapter presents the findings in relation to disability-related and other identity-related crime (Measures 1-4):

- Measure 1: Number of incidents of hate crime
- Measure 2: Proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police
- Measure 3: Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter
- Measure 4: Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents.

The questions about hate crime are asked differently in SCJS than in BCS/CSEW. In SCJS, an initial question asks why the respondent thinks the offender committed the crime, with a list of unprompted answers. If this is coded, a second question is then asked about why the respondent thinks they were specifically targeted by the offender, again unprompted, with answers including disability and other protected characteristics. The result of this approach is that hardly any incidents of hate crime are recorded; for example, there were only 12 incidents of disability hate crime across all three years of the SCJS analysis. Because of these very small numbers and the different way of recording these types of crime, this report does not include analysis of Scotland for these measures.

Findings for these measures are therefore based on adults in England and Wales; the relevant questions are not asked of 10-15 year olds in England and Wales.

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

Main findings for this chapter (all findings relate to the baseline period (2007/08 to 2009/10) except where specified):

- There were around 72,000 incidents of disability hate crime per year.
- Incidence rate per year was: 8 personal crime incidents per 10,000 adults, and 15 household hate crime incidents per 10,000 households.
- An estimated 0.1 per cent of adults were victims of disability hate crime per year, the equivalent of 39,000 adults in the population.
- The police were more likely to come to know about disability hate crime incidents (56 per cent) than they were to hear about crime incidents not

motivated by identity (38 per cent). However, there was no significant difference in reporting rates between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime.

- The most common reasons for not reporting disability hate crime incidents were that: the police could not have done anything (36 per cent); the police would not have been interested (31 per cent); or the incident was too trivial to report (17 per cent).
- Over the three year period 2009/10 to 2011/12, victims of 58 per cent of disability hate crime incidents said they were satisfied with police handling of the matter. This was similar to the proportion for other hate crime incidents (57 per cent). However, the proportion of crime incidents not related to identity where victims were satisfied was much higher – 70 per cent.

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 religion or religious beliefs; their sexuality or sexual orientation; their age; their gender; or any they disability they had.

In this section, we examine the various types of hate crime, with an emphasis on disability hate crime, as well as hate crime as a whole (i.e. incidents that were motivated by any of the factors). We firstly look at the number of individual incidents, and then look at the proportion of adults affected.

Overall, in the baseline period, BCS/CSEW data indicate that there were around 448,000 incidents of hate crime per year, compared with around 10,139,000 incidents of crime overall (Table 1)¹¹.

There were around 72,000 incidents of disability hate crime per year in the baseline period. This was lower than the number of age hate crime incidents (around 183,000) and race hate crime incidents (151,000). The least common type of hate crime was religious hate crime (35,000 incidents per year).

Crimes can be divided into 'personal' and 'household' crimes. Personal crimes (e.g. assault) relate to all crimes against the individual and only relate to the respondent's own personal experience (not that of other people in the household). Household

¹¹ In Table 1 and throughout the report, the term 'BCS crime' is used to describe crime included in the definition of crime used in the BCS/CSEW.

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 baseline period, there were around 270,000 incidents of personal hate crime and 178,000 incidents of household hate crime per year, compared with a total of around 3,768,000 incidents of personal crime and 6,371,000 incidents of household crime per year overall (Table 1). There were around 37,000 incidents of personal disability hate crime per year, and a similar number (35,000) of incidents of household disability hate crime.

Table 1 Number of incidents of hate crime and all ‘BCS crime’, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime, 2007/08-2009/10

Numbers (000s) per year	2007/08 – 2009/10		
	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime
Type of hate crime			
Age	132	51	183
Disability	37	35	72
Race	80	71	151
Religion	14	21	35
Sexual orientation	40	23	64
Total hate crime	270	178	448
Total ‘BCS crime’	3,768	6,371	10,139
Unweighted base	137,097	137,097	137,097

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S1.1¹²
 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, 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. Excludes gender as questions on this were not included until 2009/10.

Estimates for the different types of hate crime were similar in later time periods, as shown in Table 2. The estimated number of disability hate crimes was 58,000 per year in the three year period 2008/09-2010/11 and 63,000 per year in 2009/10-2011/12. The small changes over time were not statistically significant.

¹² Full supplementary tables are available on the Commission's website.

Analysis of the three-year period 2009/10-2011/12 allows examination of gender hate crime; this was only included in the question from 2009/10 onwards. This shows that there were around 94,000 incidents of gender hate crime per year.

When comparing the figures for the baseline period (2007/08-2009/10) with the last two years covered by the analysis (2010/11-2011/12), there were no significant changes for any types of hate crime, or for hate crime as a whole.

Table 2 Number of incidents of hate crime and all ‘BCS crime’, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime, 2008/09-2010/11 and 2009/10-2011/12

Numbers (000s) per year	2008/09 – 2010/11			2009/10 – 2011/12		
	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime
Type of hate crime						
Age	111	51	161	99	45	144
Disability	26	32	58	30	34	63
Gender	n/a	n/a	n/a	71	24	94
Race	84	62	145	94	58	152
Religion	16	18	35	25	27	52
Sexual orientation	36	18	54	24	18	42
Total hate crime (excluding gender)	244	156	399	235	152	387
Total ‘BCS crime’	3,781	6,183	9,964	3,724	5,853	9,577
Unweighted base:	137,678			137,423		

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.

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. This shows how common hate crime incidents are in the population.

This analysis shows that, in the baseline period, the estimated number of disability hate crime incidents was:

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

In total, in the baseline period, there were an estimated:

- 61 incidents per 10,000 adults of personal hate crime (compared with 851 incidents per 10,000 adults of personal crime overall); and
- 75 household hate crime incidents per 10,000 households (compared with 2,691 incidents per 10,000 households of household crime overall); see Table 3.

Table 3 Incidence rate of hate crime and all 'BCS crime', adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

Rates per year (per 10,000 adults/households)	2007/08 – 2009/10	
	Personal crime	Household crime
Type of hate crime		
Age	30	22
Disability	8	15
Race	18	30
Religion	3	9
Sexual orientation	9	10
Total hate crime	61	75
Total 'BCS crime'	851	2,691
Unweighted base	137,097	137,097

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. 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. Excludes gender as questions on this were not included until 2009/10.

Similar figures were observed in later time periods (see Table S1.2). The incidence of disability hate crime was :

- 6 incidents per 10,000 adults of personal disability hate crime in 2008/9-2010/11, and 7 incidents per 10,000 in 2009/10-2011/12;

- 14 household hate crime incidents per 10,000 households in 2008/9-2010/11, and the same number (14) in 2009/10-2011/12.

Analysis of the three-year period 2009/10-2011/12 allows examination of gender hate crime; this was only included in the question from 2009/10 onwards. This shows that there were 16 incidents per 10,000 adults of personal hate crime, and 10 household hate crime incidents per 10,000 households.

There were no statistically significant changes in any of the figures, when comparing the baseline period (2007/8-2009/10) with the last two years covered by the analysis (2010/11-2011/12).

We now look at the proportion of the adult population that were affected by hate crime. In the baseline period, it is estimated that 0.8 per cent of adults were victims of hate crime in the 12 months prior to interview. Similar percentages were victims of personal hate crime (0.5 per cent) and household hate crime (0.4 per cent). Overall, 22 per cent of adults were victims of crime (see Table 4).

An estimated 0.1 per cent of adults were victims of disability hate crime.

Table 4 Proportion of adults and households who were victims of hate crime and all ‘BCS crime’, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

	2007/08 – 2009/10		
	Personal crime %	Household crime %	All crime %
Type of hate crime			
Age	0.2	0.1	0.3
Disability	0.1	0.1	0.1
Race	0.2	0.1	0.3
Religion	∞ ¹³	∞	0.1
Sexual orientation	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total hate crime	0.5	0.4	0.8
Total ‘BCS crime’	6.0	17.1	22.3
Unweighted base	137,097	137,097	137,097

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

Notes: Percentages for personal crime are based on adults. Percentages for household crime are based on households. Figures 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.

Excludes gender as questions on this were not included until 2009/10.

‘All crime’ percentages are calculated treating a household crime as a personal crime. It is the estimated percentage 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.

Similar estimates can be observed for later time periods (see Table S1.3). The proportion of adults that were victims of disability hate crime remained the same (0.1 per cent) in 2008/9-2010/11 and in 2009/10-2011/12. There was no significant change in the proportion of adults that were the victims of any hate crime (0.8 per cent in both 2007/8-2009/10 and 2008/9-2010/11, and 0.7 per cent in 2009/10-2011/12).

Analysis of the three-year period 2009/10-2011/12 (when gender hate crime is first included) shows that 0.2 per cent of adults were victims of gender hate crime.

Table 5 provides population estimates based on the proportion of adults who were victims of crime, based on analysis of the baseline period. An estimated 288,000

¹³ The symbol ∞ denotes a percentage of less than 0.05 but greater than zero.

adults per year were victims of hate crime. This includes an estimated 39,000 who were victims of disability hate crime. This is lower than the total number of disability hate crime incidents (72,000 per year, as reported earlier in this section), because people can be the victim of more than one incident in any year.

Table 5 Number of adults and households who were victims of hate crime and all 'BCS crime', adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

Number in population (000s) per year	2007/08 – 2009/10		
	Personal crime	Household crime	All crime
Type of hate crime			
Age	98	29	127
Disability	23	16	39
Race	67	32	100
Religion	11	10	20
Sexual orientation	24	13	37
Total hate crime	200	88	288
Total 'BCS crime'	2,659	4,042	6,700
Unweighted base	137,097	137,097	137,097

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 prevalence 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.

Excludes gender as questions on this were not included until 2009/10.

'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.

Similar figures apply to the later time periods: it is estimated that there were 37,000 victims of disability hate crime per year in 2008/9-2010/11 and 38,000 in 2009/10-2011/12. There were no significant changes over time in the number of victims of disability hate crime, or of hate crime as a whole.

Analysis of the three-year period 2009/10-2011/12 (when gender hate crime is first included) shows that 64,000 adults were victims of gender hate crime.

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.

Based on the baseline period, the police were more likely to come to know about disability hate crime than incidents not motivated by identity; 56 per cent of incidents of disability hate crime came to the attention of the police compared with 38 per cent of incidents of crime that were not motivated by identity (Table 6). However, there was no significant difference between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime.

For both personal crime and household crime, incidents of disability hate crime were more likely to come to the attention of the police, compared with crime incidents not motivated by identity (56 per cent compared with 38 per cent in relation to personal crime, and 55 per cent compared with 39 per cent in relation to household crime). However, there were no significant differences between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime, for either personal crime or household crime.

Table 6 Proportion of 'BCS crime' incidents reported to the police, England and Wales

	2007/08 – 2009/10	
	Incident reported to police %	n
Personal crime		
Disability related incidents	56.2	104
Other identity related incidents	40.5	487
Incidents not motivated by identity	*37.8	8,159
Household crime		
Disability related incidents	55.1	130
Other identity related incidents	55.5	469
Incidents not motivated by identity	**39.0	28,772
All crime		
Disability related incidents	55.7	234
Other identity related incidents	46.1	956
Incidents not motivated by identity	**38.4	37,672

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, and 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.

Figures are similar in later time periods (see Table S2.1). The proportion of disability hate crime incidents reported to the police was 55 per cent in 2008/9-2010/11 and 58 per cent in 2009/10-2011/12. In each time period, the police were more likely to come to know about disability hate crime than incidents not motivated by identity: in 2008/9-2010/11, 55 per cent of incidents of disability hate crime came to the attention of the police compared with 38 per cent of crime incidents that were not motivated by identity; and in 2009/10-2011/12, the figures were 58 per cent for disability hate crime incidents and 38 per cent for crime incidents not motivated by identity.

In the baseline period and in 2008/9-2010/11, differences between disability hate crime and other types of hate crime were not statistically significant. However, in 2009/10-2011/12, the police were more likely to come to know about disability hate crime than other hate crime incidents (58 per cent compared with 46 per cent).

There were no statistically significant changes in any of the figures, when comparing the baseline period (2007/8-2009/10) with the last two years covered by the analysis (2010/11-2011/12).

2.3 Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter

(Measure 3)

Victims of crime who did not report incidents to the police were asked why they did not do so. Respondents answered in their own words, and responses were then coded by interviewers. The most frequently mentioned reasons for not reporting disability hate crime incidents were that victims perceived that the police could not have done anything (36 per cent), that they perceived that the police would not have been interested (31 per cent) or that it was too trivial to report (17 per cent).

Responses were similar in relation to other types of hate crime. Victims of disability hate crime were less likely than victims of crime incidents not related to identity to say that the incident was too trivial to report to the police (17% compared with 29%). Conversely, they were more likely to say it was because of fear of reprisal from the offenders (11 per cent compared with two per cent); see Table 7.

Table 7 Reasons for not reporting crime incident to the police, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

	2007/08 – 2009/10		
	Disability related incidents %	Other identity related incidents %	Incidents not related to identity %
Private / personal / family matter	5.3	4.2	6.3
Dealt with matter myself/ourselves	12.5	11.5	8.4
Reported to other authorities (e.g. superiors, company security staff, etc)	4.6	6.3	4.4
Fear of reprisal by offenders/ make matters worse	10.5	9.6	**1.8
Police could have done nothing	35.6	32.9	35.8
Police would not have bothered/not been interested	30.8	25.9	22.6
Inconvenient/too much trouble	4.3	5.1	5.4
No loss/damage	1.7	3.6	1.8
Too trivial/ not worth reporting	17.2	23.0	*29.3
Common event/just one of those things/just something that happens	4.4	4.4	2.1
Other	6.4	*15.9	7.8
Unweighted base	99	446	21,198

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S3.1

Notes: Base is crime incidents not reported to police. Figures may add to more than 100 as more than one reason could be given. 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, and 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 as questions on this strand were not included until 2009/10. The 'other' category includes: something that happens as part of job; partly my/friend's/relative's fault; offender not responsible for actions; thought someone else had reported incident/similar incidents; tried to report but was not able to contact the police/police not interested; other.

Similar findings can be observed for the later time periods (see Table S3.1). As in the baseline period, the two most common answers given by victims of disability hate crime were that the police could not have done anything (34 per cent in 2008/9-2010/11 and 31 per cent in 2009/10-2011/12) and that the police would not have been interested (34 per cent and 29 per cent respectively in the two later time

periods). Because of the small sample sizes, it is not advisable to scrutinise change over time on this question.

2.4 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.

Based on the three-year period 2009/10-2011/12¹⁴, in 58 per cent of disability hate crime incidents, victims were satisfied with the way that the police handled the matter. Victims of disability hate crime expressed similar levels of satisfaction as victims of other types of hate crime (57 per cent satisfied). Both groups of respondents were less satisfied with the way the police handled the matter than victims of incidents not related to identity: in 70 per cent of such incidents, victims were satisfied with the way the police handled the matter (see Table 8).

Victims of crime were also asked whether they thought the police had treated them fairly and with respect. On these issues, too, findings were similar between victims of disability hate crime incidents and victims of other types of hate crime. Specifically, victims of 68 per cent of disability hate crime incidents said police had treated them fairly (compared with 67 per cent for other types of hate crime), and 77 per cent said they were treated with respect (compared with 81 per cent).

However, victims of disability hate crime were less likely to think the police had treated them fairly or with respect, compared with victims of crime incidents not related to identity. For example, in 68 per cent of disability hate crime incidents victims thought the police treated them fairly, compared with 80 per cent of crime incidents not related to identity. Similarly, in 77 per cent of incidents of disability hate crime, victims thought the police treated them with respect, compared with 90 per cent of crime incidents not related to identity (Table 8).

¹⁴ The three questions included in Table 8 were all asked in 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12, but the questions on being treated fairly and with respect were not asked in 2007/08 or 2008/09. Analysis is therefore based on this later time period rather than the baseline period.

Table 8 Satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents, adults in England and Wales, by type of hate crime

	2009/10 – 2011/12		
	Disability related incidents %	Other identity related incidents %	Incidents not related to identity %
Satisfied with the way the police handled the matter	57.9	56.8	*70.1
Think the police treated you fairly	67.8	67.2	*80.0
Police treated you with respect	76.9	81.4	**89.6
Unweighted base	109	399	13,056

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, and is indicated as follows: * significant difference at 95% level; ** significant difference at 99% level.

Data is based on the 3-year period 2009/10-2011/12 as not all of the questions were asked before 2009/10. '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

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.

Main findings for this chapter:

Adults in England and Wales:

- Over the baseline period 2007/8 to 2009/10, 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.
- Overall, the proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men.
- There were no significant changes over time for disabled people in any age groups (men or women), although there were some significant decreases for non-disabled people in younger age groups.

Adults in Scotland (2008/9-2010/11):

- In all age groups, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to have been the victim of crime.
- As in England and Wales, the overall proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men.

10-15 year olds in England and Wales (2009/10-2011/12):

- Disabled young people were much more likely than their non-disabled counterparts to have been the victims of crime (22 per cent compared with 13 per cent).
- This applies equally to 10-12 year olds and 13-15 year olds and is true of both boys and girls.

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 primarily on the baseline period, which covers the three years 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10. In addition, findings from the two later three-year periods¹⁵ are included where appropriate. Tables and commentary also examine changes over the five years covered by the analysis, by comparing the baseline period with the last two years (2010/11 and 2011/12).

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, 42 per cent had been victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 33 per cent of non-disabled people of the same age. The difference between disabled people and non-disabled people becomes increasingly smaller as age increases, so that among disabled people aged 75 or over, nine per cent had been victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with seven per cent of non-disabled people of the same age. However, as with all age groups, this difference is still significant (see Table 9¹⁶).

These same patterns continue in subsequent years (see Table S5.1). In both of the later three-year periods (2008/09-2010/11 and 2009/10-2011/12), disabled people in all age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the past 12 months.

Analysis of change shows that non-disabled people in the younger age groups were less likely to experience a crime in later years (2010/11-2011/12) compared with the base line period (2007/08-2009/10), but that otherwise there was no significant change for disabled or non-disabled people in the various age groups.

¹⁵ 1) 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11. 2) 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12.

¹⁶ This table is similar to Table 1 in a previous EHRC report 'Disabled people's experiences and concerns about crime' (EHRC Briefing Paper 3). Some individual figures are different, because: a) this table uses two categories for analysing disability, whereas the previous report used three; b) 'total' figures in this table include all respondents in the relevant age group (including those with 'unknown' disability status); the previous report only included those with known disability status.

Table 9 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	%	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
16-24			
No limiting disability/illness	33.2	10,885	-2.8**
Limiting disability/illness	**41.9	570	-1.1
Total	33.6	11,478	-2.6**
25-34			
No limiting disability/illness	28.5	17,852	-2.5**
Limiting disability/illness	**37.3	1,250	+1.3
Total	29.0	19,133	-2.2**
35-44			
No limiting disability/illness	24.0	22,986	-0.6
Limiting disability/illness	**32.2	2,590	-0.1
Total	24.8	25,614	-0.4
45-54			
No limiting disability/illness	22.2	18,614	-0.8
Limiting disability/illness	**27.2	3,571	-1.0
Total	23.0	22,226	-0.8
55-64			
No limiting disability/illness	15.7	17,790	+0.4
Limiting disability/illness	**20.4	5,507	+0.2
Total	16.7	23,347	+0.4
65-74			
No limiting disability/illness	10.4	13,200	+0.5
Limiting disability/illness	**12.6	5,728	-0.1
Total	11.1	18,961	+0.3
75+			
No limiting disability/illness	7.3	8,976	-0.3
Limiting disability/illness	**8.6	7,889	-0.4
Total	7.9	16,923	-0.3

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Disabled people as a whole were less likely than non-disabled people to report that they had experienced a crime (20 per cent and 23 per cent respectively in the baseline period of 2007/08-2009/10), as shown in Table 10. However, this overall difference 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, as a whole they are less likely to experience a crime.

Figures are similar in both of the later three-year periods (2008/09-2010/11 and 2009/10-2011/12), with disabled people as a whole less likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime (see accompanying Table S5.1). Table 10 shows the change from the baseline period, compared with the last two years covered by the analysis (2010/11-2011/12). There was a decrease in the proportion of non-disabled people experiencing a crime (of one percentage point), but this was not matched among the population of disabled people, where the proportion remained similar.

Table 10 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by disability

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	%	n	2007/10-2010/12
			+/- percentage points
No limiting disability/illness	22.7	110,303	-1.0**
Limiting disability/illness	**19.9	27,105	-0.1
Total	22.3	137,682	-0.9**

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.1
 Notes: The reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' 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.

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, and again the differences were largest in the younger age bands. In the 16-24 age group, for instance, 42 per cent of disabled women in the baseline period were victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 31 per cent of non-disabled women (see Table 11).

The differences were smaller for men, and in some age groups differences were not significant. In the youngest (16-24) and oldest age bands (65-74 and 75+), there was

no significant difference between disabled and non-disabled men (see Table 12), a pattern that remained in later years. Other age groups followed the general pattern whereby disabled people were more likely to be victims of crime than non-disabled people; for example, 36 per cent of disabled men aged 25-34 had experienced a crime, compared with 30 per cent of non-disabled men in this age group.

The same patterns were evident in the later years covered in the analysis (see Table S5.1), with very little change in the percentages.

Tables 11 and 12 show that there was little change over the time period covered by the analysis. There were no significant changes for disabled people in any of the age groups (for women or men), while there were some significant decreases for non-disabled people in the younger age groups.

Table 11 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	%	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
16-24			
No limiting disability/illness	31.1	5,801	-1.9
Limiting disability/illness	**41.8	344	+3.6
Total	31.7	6,160	-1.4
25-34			
No limiting disability/illness	27.6	9,981	-2.3**
Limiting disability/illness	**38.3	778	-1.1
Total	28.3	10,780	-2.1*
35-44			
No limiting disability/illness	22.7	12,422	-0.2
Limiting disability/illness	**33.3	1,537	+0.4
Total	23.8	13,983	-0.1
45-54			
No limiting disability/illness	21.8	9,610	-0.7
Limiting disability/illness	**27.1	2,000	-2.8
Total	22.7	11,628	-1.0
55-64			
No limiting disability/illness	15.3	9,535	-0.5
Limiting disability/illness	**19.8	2,835	+1.0
Total	16.3	12,400	0.0
65-74			
No limiting disability/illness	10.0	7,097	-0.1
Limiting disability/illness	**13.2	3,170	-1.4
Total	10.9	10,283	-0.4
75+			
No limiting disability/illness	7.4	5,238	-0.8
Limiting disability/illness	*8.8	4,935	-1.1
Total	8.1	10,212	-0.9

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

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

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change 2007/10- 2010/12
	%	n	+/- percentage points
16-24			
No limiting disability/illness	35.1	5,084	-3.6**
Limiting disability/illness	42.1	226	-7.6
Total	35.4	5,318	-3.8**
25-34			
No limiting disability/illness	29.5	7,871	-2.8**
Limiting disability/illness	*36.1	472	+4.0
Total	29.8	8,353	-2.2*
35-44			
No limiting disability/illness	25.4	10,564	-1.0
Limiting disability/illness	**30.8	1,053	-0.5
Total	25.8	11,631	-0.8
45-54			
No limiting disability/illness	22.6	9,004	-1.0
Limiting disability/illness	**27.3	1,571	+1.3
Total	23.3	10,598	-0.7
55-64			
No limiting disability/illness	16.1	8,255	+1.4
Limiting disability/illness	**21.1	2,672	-0.6
Total	17.2	10,947	+0.9
65-74			
No limiting disability/illness	10.9	6,103	+1.1
Limiting disability/illness	11.9	2,558	+1.5
Total	11.2	8,678	+1.2
75+			
No limiting disability/illness	7.1	3,738	+0.4
Limiting disability/illness	8.2	2,954	+0.6
Total	7.6	6,711	+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 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Overall, the proportion of disabled women that experienced a crime was very similar to the proportion of disabled men. In the baseline period, 20 per cent of both disabled women and disabled men had experienced a crime in the previous 12 months (see Table 13), and these proportions remained very similar in later years (see Table S5.1).

This is different to the non-disabled population, where men were more likely than women to experience a crime (for example, 24 per cent compared with 22 per cent in the baseline period).

Table 13 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by gender and disability

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	%	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
Females			
No limiting disability/illness	21.6	59,684	-0.9**
Limiting disability/illness	**19.9	15,599	-0.5
Total	21.3	75,446	-0.9**
Males			
No limiting disability/illness	23.9	50,619	-1.1**
Limiting disability/illness	**19.9	11,506	+0.5
Total	23.3	62,236	-0.9**

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

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Breakdowns by impairment groups¹⁷ show that, in the three year period 2009/10-2011/12¹⁸, 31 per cent of people with a mental health condition and 27 per cent of people with a learning difficulty or disability had experienced a crime (Table 14). These two groups were significantly more likely to experience a crime than people without any impairment (22 per cent).

¹⁷ Findings are based on the impairment categorisation used in the survey questions (see Appendix 2 for question wording).

¹⁸ Impairment type was first asked in 2009/10. Therefore figures are given for the later three-year period (2009/10-2011/12) rather than the baseline period.

By contrast, people in other impairment groups were less likely to experience a crime than people without an impairment: people with 'blindness, deafness or another communication impairment' (16 per cent), people with a 'mobility impairment' (17 per cent) and people with 'other long-standing health condition or disability' (21 per cent).

These findings are related to differences by age. The age profiles of certain impairment types (learning difficulties/disabilities and mental health conditions) are younger than others (communication and mobility impairments). 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. In fact, if age is taken into account in the analysis, many differences between impairment groups are no longer significant (Table S5.1).

Table 14 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
No impairments	21.9	96,145
Blindness, deafness or other communication impairment	**15.8	6,530
Mobility impairment, such as difficulty walking	**16.6	16,681
Learning difficulty or disability, such as Down's syndrome	*26.7	741
Mental health condition, such as depression	**31.1	5,984
Long-term illness, such as Multiple Sclerosis or cancer	20.6	3,539
Other long-standing health condition or disability	**20.5	22,649
Any impairment	**20.1	41,199

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

Notes: The reference group is 'no impairments'. 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 no clear pattern for disabled and non-disabled people. Among White people, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to be the victim of a crime (20 per cent compared with 23 per cent in the baseline period); this reflects the pattern seen in Table 10 for the population as a whole. There were no significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in other ethnic groups, with the exception of the Chinese/Other¹⁹ group, where disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be the victim of a crime (28 per cent compared with 21 per cent). As noted above in relation to other characteristics, these findings may be related to the age profile of different groups.

¹⁹ 'Other' includes those respondents who described themselves as being in 'another ethnic group' (other than 'White', 'Mixed', 'Asian or Asian British', 'Black or Black British' or 'Chinese').

There were no significant changes over time for disabled people in any ethnic group. As shown in Table 15, there were some changes for non-disabled people: White respondents were less likely to be the victim of a crime in 2010/11-2011/12 compared with the baseline period (2007/8-2009/10), while Pakistani/Bangladeshi respondents were more likely to have experienced a crime in the later time period.

Table 15 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change 2007/10- 2010/12
	%	n	+/- percentage points
White			
No limiting disability/illness	22.7	101,827	-1.4**
Limiting disability/illness	19.5**	25,833	-0.1
Total	22.2	127,854	-1.3**
Mixed			
No limiting disability/illness	29.8	771	-2.3
Limiting disability/illness	40.5	99	-5.9
Total	30.9	871	-2.4
Indian			
No limiting disability/illness	23.5	1,812	+1.3
Limiting disability/illness	20.5	299	+0.4
Total	23.1	2,118	+1.2
Pakistani/Bangladeshi			
No limiting disability/illness	25.3	1,293	+4.6*
Limiting disability/illness	26.2	193	+1.3
Total	25.6	1,492	+4.1
Black			
No limiting disability/illness	22.2	2,349	+1.4
Limiting disability/illness	21.7	373	+1.5
Total	22.1	2,732	+1.5
Chinese/Other			
No limiting disability/illness	20.8	2,211	+1.5
Limiting disability/illness	27.6*	298	-1.8
Total	21.5	2,518	+1.1

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

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Table 16 shows the proportions of disabled and non-disabled people who experienced a crime, broken down by religion. Disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime in two groups: Christian (18 per cent compared with 21 per cent in the baseline period) and Jewish (16 per cent compared with 29 per cent). The same patterns also occurred in later years; in all of the three-year periods in relation to Christian people, and also in 2009/10-2011/12 for Jewish people (see Table S5.1). As noted above in relation to other characteristics, these findings may be related to the age profile of different groups.

There were no significant changes over time for disabled people in any religion group. As shown in Table 16, there were decreases for non-disabled people in the 'no religion' and Christian groups, when comparing the baseline period (2007/8-2009/10) with later years (2010/11-2011/12).

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

Table 16 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by religion and disability

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change 2007/10- 2010/12
	%	n	+/- percentage points
No religion			
No limiting disability/illness	27.9	21,011	-2.0**
Limiting disability/illness	28.2	3,309	0.0
Total	27.9	24,340	-1.7**
Christian			
No limiting disability/illness	21.2	83,546	-1.2**
Limiting disability/illness	**18.3	22,723	-0.2
Total	20.7	106,339	-1.1**
Buddhist			
No limiting disability/illness	20.6	522	+0.3
Limiting disability/illness	24.3	96	+13.0
Total	21.1	618	+1.6
Hindu			
No limiting disability/illness	21.0	1,120	+2.3
Limiting disability/illness	20.7	166	+4.9
Total	21.0	1,286	+2.6
Jewish			
No limiting disability/illness	29.2	393	-0.4
Limiting disability/illness	*15.6	96	+3.6
Total	27.1	490	-0.3
Muslim			
No limiting disability/illness	24.9	2,534	+1.4
Limiting disability/illness	26.7	403	-0.6
Total	25.1	2,939	+1.2
Sikh			
No limiting disability/illness	25.3	468	+2.0
Limiting disability/illness	22.7	90	-8.9
Total	24.9	558	+0.3
Any other religion			
No limiting disability/illness	25.9	537	+0.3
Limiting disability/illness	27.4	188	-3.5
Total	26.3	725	-0.6

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

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

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 (31 per cent compared with 26 per cent in the baseline period) and in the gay, lesbian or bisexual group (48 per cent compared with 34 per cent). This pattern continued in later years for the heterosexual/straight group, but not the gay, lesbian or bisexual group, where differences were not significant in 2008/09-2010/11 or in 2009/10-2011/12 (see Table S5.1).

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

Table 17 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in England and Wales: by sexual orientation

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	%	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
Heterosexual or straight			
No limiting disability/illness	26.4	62,644	-2.0**
Limiting disability/illness	**30.6	7,170	-0.5
Total	26.7	69,847	-1.8**
Gay or lesbian, bisexual			
No limiting disability/illness	33.9	1,244	-3.0
Limiting disability/illness	**47.5	238	-9.8
Total	35.6	1,482	-3.7
Don't wish to answer			
No limiting disability/illness	23.6	1,426	+3.1
Limiting disability/illness	21.8	267	+4.2
Total	23.4	1,698	+3.1

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 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

3.2 Adults in Scotland

The findings in this section are drawn from the SCJS, and cover adults (aged 16 or over) in Scotland. All findings are taken from the three year period covering 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11.

Analysis by age group (Table 18) shows that, in general, younger people were more likely than older people to experience a crime. When comparing disabled and non-disabled people, disabled people in the various age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime in the past 12 months. For example, among disabled young people aged 25-34, 32 per cent had been victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 24 per cent of non-disabled people of the same age. The one exception was the 16-24 age group; because of the small sample size for disabled people in this age group, the difference was not statistically significant.

The difference between disabled people and non-disabled people becomes increasingly smaller as age increases, so that among disabled people aged 75 or over, seven per cent had been victims of crime in the previous 12 months, compared with five per cent of non-disabled people of the same age. However, as with all age groups except 16-24 year olds, this difference is still significant.

These patterns were the same as identified in England and Wales (see Section 3.1).

Table 18 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
16-24		
No limiting disability/illness	27.8	3,519
Limiting disability/illness	34.0	196
Total	28.0	3,721
25-34		
No limiting disability/illness	24.1	5,266
Limiting disability/illness	**32.0	475
Total	24.7	5,744
35-44		
No limiting disability/illness	22.5	6,840
Limiting disability/illness	**32.1	848
Total	23.5	7,696
45-54		
No limiting disability/illness	18.9	6,404
Limiting disability/illness	**25.3	1,382
Total	20.0	7,804
55-64		
No limiting disability/illness	14.1	5,948
Limiting disability/illness	*16.2	1,983
Total	14.5	7,949
65-74		
No limiting disability/illness	8.6	4,649
Limiting disability/illness	**11.3	1,970
Total	9.4	6,636
75+		
No limiting disability/illness	4.9	2,862
Limiting disability/illness	*6.6	2,621
Total	5.7	5,490

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Disabled people as a whole were less likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime (18 per cent and 20 per cent respectively), as shown in Table 19. The same pattern was seen in England and Wales, and again this overall difference masks patterns by age.

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

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
No limiting disability/illness	19.5	35,495
Limiting disability/illness	**17.6	9,476
Total	19.2	45,049

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S5.1
 Notes: The reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' 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.

As seen above, in most age groups, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced a crime. These differences still apply when focusing specifically on disabled women in various age groups. Disabled women were significantly more likely than non-disabled women to have experienced crime in most age groups (all except the 16-24 and 55-64 age groups). For example, 40 per cent of disabled women aged 25-34 had experienced a crime in the previous 12 months, compared with 24 per cent of non-disabled women in this age group (see Table 20).

Differences were less pronounced between disabled and non-disabled men. In only three age groups were disabled men significantly more likely than non-disabled men to have experienced crime: the 35-44 ,45-54 and 65-74 age groups (see Table 21).

Table 20 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females)

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
16-24		
No limiting disability/illness	25.4	1,860
Limiting disability/illness	32.1	105
Total	25.7	1,970
25-34		
No limiting disability/illness	24.0	3,038
Limiting disability/illness	**40.4	261
Total	25.2	3,301
35-44		
No limiting disability/illness	22.5	3,908
Limiting disability/illness	**33.3	487
Total	23.6	4,398
45-54		
No limiting disability/illness	18.6	3,494
Limiting disability/illness	**25.5	761
Total	19.7	4,264
55-64		
No limiting disability/illness	13.8	3,288
Limiting disability/illness	15.5	1,092
Total	14.2	4,388
65-74		
No limiting disability/illness	7.8	2,549
Limiting disability/illness	*10.4	1,109
Total	8.6	3,666
75+		
No limiting disability/illness	4.5	1,694
Limiting disability/illness	**7.1	1,692
Total	5.8	3,389

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Table 21 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (males)

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
16-24		
No limiting disability/illness	30.0	1,659
Limiting disability/illness	36.0	91
Total	30.3	1,751
25-34		
No limiting disability/illness	24.2	2,228
Limiting disability/illness	23.3	214
Total	24.1	2,443
35-44		
No limiting disability/illness	22.5	2,932
Limiting disability/illness	**30.8	361
Total	23.3	3,298
45-54		
No limiting disability/illness	19.3	2,910
Limiting disability/illness	**25.1	621
Total	20.2	3,540
55-64		
No limiting disability/illness	14.3	2,660
Limiting disability/illness	17.0	891
Total	14.9	3,561
65-74		
No limiting disability/illness	9.6	2,100
Limiting disability/illness	*12.5	861
Total	10.4	2,970
75+		
No limiting disability/illness	5.6	1,168
Limiting disability/illness	5.5	929
Total	5.6	2,101

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Overall, the proportion of disabled women that experience a crime is very similar to the proportion of disabled men (17 per cent and 18 per cent respectively).

Disabled men are less likely than non-disabled men to have experienced a crime (18 per cent compared with 20 per cent), but the difference for women is not statistically significant.

Table 22 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by gender and disability

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
Females		
No limiting disability/illness	18.7	19,836
Limiting disability/illness	17.3	5,508
Total	18.4	25,383
Males		
No limiting disability/illness	20.4	15,659
Limiting disability/illness	**18.0	3,968
Total	20.0	19,666

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

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Breakdowns by impairment groups show that, in the last two years covered in this analysis (2009/10 and 2010/11)²⁰, 34 per cent of people with a learning difficulty (such as dyslexia or dyspraxia) and 29 per cent of those with a mental health condition had experienced a crime (Table 23). These two groups were significantly more likely to experience a crime than people without any impairment (19 per cent).

By contrast, people in some of the other impairment groups were less likely to experience a crime than people without an impairment: people with 'blindness or severe vision impairment' (12 per cent), those with 'deafness or severe hearing impairment' (12 per cent), and people with a 'physical disability' (15 per cent).

²⁰ Impairment type was first asked in 2009/10. Therefore figures are given for 2009/10 and 2010/11 only.

These findings are similar to those seen in England and Wales, although the definitions of impairment type are slightly different. As in England and Wales, these variations are also related to differences by age. The age profiles of certain impairment types (learning disabilities and mental health conditions) are younger than others (blindness, deafness and physical impairments). Because younger people as a whole are more likely than older people to experience a crime (as described above), the findings will be driven by the different age profiles for the various impairment groups.

Table 23 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by impairment type

	2009/10 – 2010/11	
	%	n
No impairments	18.7	19,856
Deafness or severe hearing impairment	**12.3	1,539
Blindness or severe vision impairment	**11.6	597
A physical disability (a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, lifting or carrying)	**15.2	4,286
A learning disability (such as Down's Syndrome)	24.4	56
A learning difficulty (such as dyslexia or dyspraxia)	**34.2	289
A mental health condition (such as depression or schizophrenia)	**29.1	1,410
A chronic illness (such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, heart disease or epilepsy)	17.6	3,763
Other condition	*23.2	775
Any impairment	18.1	9,190

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

Notes: The reference group is 'no impairments'. 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.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis by ethnicity in Scotland is based on just two categories: White and non-White people.

Among White respondents, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime (reflecting the overall pattern for the Scottish population as a whole). Among non-White respondents, there was no significant difference between disabled and non-disabled people.

Table 24 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by ethnicity and disability

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
White		
No limiting disability/illness	18.9	21,884
Limiting disability/illness	**16.7	6,533
Total	18.5	28,455
Non-white		
No limiting disability/illness	19.8	505
Limiting disability/illness	32.9	48
Total	20.7	554

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

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis of religion in Scotland is based on four categories: 'no religion', Christian, Muslim and 'any other religion'.

Among those with no religion, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime (in line with the difference for the Scottish population as a whole). However there were no significant differences for the other religion groups.

Table 25 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by religion and disability

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
No religion		
No limiting disability/illness	21.9	14,032
Limiting disability/illness	*19.6	2,725
Total	21.6	16,779
Christian		
No limiting disability/illness	17.7	20,385
Limiting disability/illness	16.7	6,440
Total	17.5	26,850
Muslim		
No limiting disability/illness	21.0	298
Limiting disability/illness	18.4	37
Total	20.7	336
Any other religion		
No limiting disability/illness	20.3	625
Limiting disability/illness	20.9	218
Total	20.4	846

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

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Sexual orientation is asked as part of the self- completion module, and is therefore not completed by all respondents (although unlike in the BCS/CSEW, the SCJS self-completion module is available to all age groups).

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.

Among heterosexual or straight respondents, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime (reflecting the overall pattern for the Scottish population as a whole). There were no significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in the other two groups.

Table 26 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, adults in Scotland: by sexual orientation

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	%	n
Heterosexual		
No limiting disability/illness	19.9	27,421
Limiting disability/illness	*18.4	6,843
Total	19.6	34,282
Gay or lesbian, bisexual		
No limiting disability/illness	32.9	364
Limiting disability/illness	24.7	92
Total	31.6	456
Don't wish to answer		
No limiting disability/illness	15.1	329
Limiting disability/illness	18.3	81
Total	15.5	414

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

Notes: Within each sexual orientation group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

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 a three year period covering 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12.

Extending the BCS/CSEW to encompass children's experience of crime 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.

Disabled young people were much more likely than non-disabled young people to have experienced a crime (22 per cent compared with 13 per cent), as shown in Table 27.

Table 27 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by disability

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
No limiting disability/illness	13.3	11,029
Limiting disability/illness	**22.4	484
Total	13.8	11,541

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See data table S5.3
 Notes: The reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the reference group, and 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 28) 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, and the respective figures in the two age groups were very similar. Among 10-12 year olds, 23 per cent of disabled young people experienced a crime, compared with 13 per cent of non-disabled young people, while 22 per cent of disabled 13-15 year olds experienced a crime, compared with 13 per cent of non-disabled 13-15 year olds.

Table 28 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)

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
10-12		
No limiting disability/illness	13.2	5,202
Limiting disability/illness	**23.2	224
Total	13.7	5,445
13-15		
No limiting disability/illness	13.4	5,827
Limiting disability/illness	**21.7	260
Total	13.8	6,096

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related reference group, and 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 10-12 were more likely than non-disabled girls of this age to have experienced a crime (24 per cent compared with 10 per cent), and the same applied to disabled girls aged 13-15 (16 per cent of whom experienced a crime compared with nine per cent of non-disabled girls of this age); see Table 29.

Among disabled boys (Table 30), those aged 13-15 were more likely than non-disabled boys of the same age to experience a crime (27 per cent compared with 18 per cent). However, there was no significant difference for boys aged 10-12.

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

Table 29 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
10-12		
No limiting disability/illness	9.5	2,574
Limiting disability/illness	**24.4	75
Total	9.9	2,658
13-15		
No limiting disability/illness	9.0	2,847
Limiting disability/illness	*16.3	124
Total	9.3	2,973

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related reference group, and 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.

Table 30 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
10-12		
No limiting disability/illness	16.9	2,628
Limiting disability/illness	22.7	149
Total	17.4	2,787
13-15		
No limiting disability/illness	17.6	2,980
Limiting disability/illness	*26.8	136
Total	18.0	3,123

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related reference group, and 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. Table 31 shows that this difference applied to both girls and boys, with 19 per cent of disabled girls experiencing a crime compared with

nine per cent of non-disabled girls, and 25 per cent of disabled boys experiencing a crime compared with 17 per cent of non-disabled boys.

There was a general pattern whereby boys were more likely than girls to experience a crime. This was significant for the total sample (18 per cent compared with 10 per cent) and among non-disabled young people (17 per cent compared with nine per cent), but the difference was not significant for disabled young people.

Table 31 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by gender and disability

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
Females		
No limiting disability/illness	9.3	5,421
Limiting disability/illness	**19.3	199
Total	9.6	5,631
Males		
No limiting disability/illness	17.3	5,608
Limiting disability/illness	**24.6	285
Total	17.7	5,910

Source: British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales.. See data table S5.3
 Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related reference group, and 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 non-White respondents.

Among White respondents, disabled young people were more likely than non-disabled young people to experience a crime (23 per cent compared with 14 per cent). This reflects the overall pattern seen for disabled young people as a whole. Among non-White respondents, the difference between disabled and non-disabled young people was not statistically significant; the small sample size for disabled non-White respondents makes it difficult to identify significant differences.

Table 32 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
White		
No limiting disability/illness	13.5	9,574
Limiting disability/illness	**23.0	440
Total	14.0	10,037
Non-white		
No limiting disability/illness	12.1	1,425
Limiting disability/illness	18.1	44
Total	12.4	1,474

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

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related reference group, and 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 two categories; 'no religion' and 'any religion'.

Among both groups, disabled young people were more likely than non-disabled young people to experience a crime: 23 per cent compared with 16 per cent in the 'no religion' category, and 23 per cent compared with 12 per cent among those with 'any religion'.

Table 33 Experience of any crime in the previous 12 months, 10-15 year olds in England and Wales: by religion and disability

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	%	n
No religion		
No limiting disability/illness	15.5	3,452
Limiting disability/illness	*22.7	156
Total	15.8	3,615
Any religion		
No limiting disability/illness	12.4	7,467
Limiting disability/illness	**22.6	316
Total	12.9	7,803

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

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related reference group, and 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.

4 Worry about being the victim of crime

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.

Main findings for this chapter:

Adults in England and Wales:

- In the baseline period, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime (41 per cent compared with 34 per cent). This difference applied to all age bands.
- Over the analysis period as a whole, there was a decrease in the proportion of both disabled and non-disabled people who said they were worried about crime (down by four and three percentage points respectively). Among disabled people, this decrease was concentrated in the older age groups. By contrast, non-disabled people in most age groups became less worried over time.
- Worry about being the victim of crime was more likely among women (disabled and non-disabled) than among men.

Adults in Scotland (2008/9-2010/11):

- In contrast to England and Wales, disabled people in Scotland were less likely than non-disabled people to say they were worried about being the victim of crime (65 per cent versus 69 per cent). However, the questions asked were very different.
- Both disabled women and disabled men were less likely to be worried about crime than non-disabled people (67 per cent versus 72 per cent for women; and 62 per cent versus 65 per cent for men).

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 primarily on the baseline period, which covers the three years 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10. Findings from the two later three-year periods²¹ and trends over time are included where appropriate.

Since 2008/09, the question on worry about crime has been asked of a random subset of BCS/CSEW respondents (around a quarter of the total sample). This means that the base sizes for findings in this section are smaller than for the findings on experience of crime.

Disabled people as a whole were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime (41 per cent compared with 34 per cent in the baseline period). Figures are similar in both of the later three-year periods (2008/09-2010/11 and 2009/10-2011/12), with disabled people as a whole more likely than non-disabled people to experience a crime (see Table S6.1).

Table 34 shows the change from the baseline period, compared with the last two years covered by the analysis (2010/11-2011/12). 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 four percentage points) and non-disabled people (down three percentage points).

²¹ 1) 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11. 2) 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12.

Table 34 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by disability

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change 2007/10- 2010/12
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
No limiting disability/illness	33.7	55,584	-3.4**
Limiting disability/illness	**41.3	13,834	-3.8**
Total	34.9	69,548	-3.4**

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

Notes: The reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' 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.

Disabled people in all age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime. In the baseline period (see Table 35), the differences were broadly consistent across the various age groups, although the difference was greatest in the 25-34 age group, where 52 per cent of disabled people were worried about being the victim of crime, compared with 36 per cent of non-disabled people.

These same patterns continue in subsequent years (see Table S6.1). In both of the later three-year periods (2008/09-2010/11 and 2009/10-2011/12), disabled people in all age groups were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime.

Table 35 also examines change between the baseline period (2007/08-2009/10) and later years (2010/11-2011/12). Worry about crime decreased among older disabled people, with significant decreases in the 55-64 age group (down six percentage points) and those aged 75 or over (down seven percentage points). However, there were no significant changes among younger disabled people. By contrast, non-disabled people in most age groups became less worried over time (all except the 55-64 and 65-74 age groups).

Table 35 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	% very/fairly worried	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
16-24			
No limiting disability/illness	35.2	5,557	-4.0*
Limiting disability/illness	*44.6	271	+1.0
Total	35.5	5,841	-3.6*
25-34			
No limiting disability/illness	35.7	9,178	-4.2**
Limiting disability/illness	**52.4	631	-0.7
Total	36.7	9,825	-3.6**
35-44			
No limiting disability/illness	34.0	11,751	-3.1**
Limiting disability/illness	**44.4	1,332	+1.9
Total	35.0	13,101	-2.6*
45-54			
No limiting disability/illness	33.1	9,217	-3.4**
Limiting disability/illness	**46.6	1,802	-0.6
Total	35.1	11,036	-3.1**
55-64			
No limiting disability/illness	34.4	8,890	-2.5
Limiting disability/illness	**46.8	2,904	-5.5*
Total	37.2	11,821	-3.1**
65-74			
No limiting disability/illness	30.6	6,516	-1.5
Limiting disability/illness	**39.8	2,939	-3.8
Total	33.4	9,469	-2.1
75+			
No limiting disability/illness	25.8	4,475	-5.7**
Limiting disability/illness	**31.2	3,955	-6.9**
Total	28.3	8,455	-6.0**

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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 all age groups, disabled women were more likely than non-disabled women to worry about being the victim of a crime in the baseline period (see Table 36). For example, among those aged 16-24, 55 per cent of disabled women were worried about being the victim of crime, compared with 43 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, 44 per cent of disabled men were worried about being the victim of crime, compared with 32 per cent of non-disabled men. However, there was no significant difference between disabled and non-disabled men in the youngest (16-24) or oldest (75+) age groups (see Table 37).

Findings were similar in later time periods (see Table S6.1), although women showed the same pattern as men in the three year period from 2008/09 to 2010/11: with no significant differences in the youngest (16-24) or oldest (75+) age groups.

Looking at change over time (comparing the baseline period with the last two years covered by the analysis), some groups of disabled people became less worried: disabled women aged 75 or over (down nine percentage points) and disabled men aged 45-54 (down nine percentage points) and 55-64 (down 11 points). Otherwise there were no significant changes for disabled men and women of different ages.

Table 36 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (females)

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	% very/fairly worried	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
16-24			
No limiting disability/illness	43.0	2,931	-6.2*
Limiting disability/illness	*55.1	171	-1.3
Total	43.5	3,110	-5.8*
25-34			
No limiting disability/illness	40.0	5,073	-2.5
Limiting disability/illness	**58.7	386	-7.6
Total	41.2	5,471	-2.6
35-44			
No limiting disability/illness	39.1	6,318	-3.8*
Limiting disability/illness	**50.6	774	+4.2
Total	40.2	7,105	-3.1*
45-54			
No limiting disability/illness	35.4	4,806	-2.3
Limiting disability/illness	**49.5	975	+6.6
Total	37.7	5,788	-1.1
55-64			
No limiting disability/illness	37.7	4,783	-2.8
Limiting disability/illness	**50.7	1,495	-1.2
Total	40.7	6,292	-2.2
65-74			
No limiting disability/illness	34.2	3,494	-3.0
Limiting disability/illness	**44.7	1,622	-4.6
Total	37.2	5,124	-3.2
75+			
No limiting disability/illness	28.8	2,590	-6.7**
Limiting disability/illness	**35.1	2,440	-8.6**
Total	31.8	5,045	-7.4**

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Table 37 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by age and disability (males)

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	% very/fairly worried	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
16-24			
No limiting disability/illness	28.1	2,626	-2.3
Limiting disability/illness	29.3	100	+6.8
Total	28.1	2,731	-1.8
25-34			
No limiting disability/illness	31.5	4,105	-5.9**
Limiting disability/illness	*43.7	245	+8.6
Total	32.1	4,354	-4.7*
35-44			
No limiting disability/illness	29.0	5,433	-2.5
Limiting disability/illness	**37.9	558	+0.6
Total	29.8	5,996	-2.1
45-54			
No limiting disability/illness	30.7	4,411	-4.5*
Limiting disability/illness	**43.3	827	-8.6*
Total	32.4	5,248	-5.1**
55-64			
No limiting disability/illness	30.7	4,107	-1.9
Limiting disability/illness	**42.8	1,409	-10.6**
Total	33.6	5,529	-3.9*
65-74			
No limiting disability/illness	26.7	3,022	+0.3
Limiting disability/illness	**34.9	1,317	-3.6
Total	29.3	4,345	-1.0
75+			
No limiting disability/illness	21.7	1,885	-4.3
Limiting disability/illness	25.5	1,515	-4.2
Total	23.4	3,410	-4.0*

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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 general, women were more likely than men to be worried about being the victim of crime. This applied to both disabled people (46 per cent compared with 36 per cent in the baseline period) and non-disabled people (38 per cent compared with 29 per cent).

Among both men and women, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of a crime. In the baseline period, 46 per cent of disabled women were worried, compared with 38 per cent of non-disabled women, while 36 per cent of disabled men were worried, compared with 29 per cent of non-disabled men.

The same patterns can be seen in the later years covered by the analysis (see Table S6.1).

Over time (comparing the baseline period with the last two years covered by analysis), all groups were significantly less likely to be worried. The proportion of disabled women that were worried decreased by five percentage points, while for men there was a decrease of three percentage points.

Table 38 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by gender and disability²²

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change 2007/10- 2010/12
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
Females			
No limiting disability/illness	38.0	29,995	-3.6**
Limiting disability/illness	**45.6	7,863	-4.6**
Total	39.3	37,935	-3.4**
Males			
No limiting disability/illness	29.3	25,589	-3.1**
Limiting disability/illness	**36.4	5,971	-3.0*
Total	30.4	31,613	-3.3**

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

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Breakdowns by impairment groups show that, in the three year period 2009/10-2011/12²³, people in most impairment groups were more likely to worry about being the victim of crime, compared with people without any impairments. The highest figures were for people with a learning difficulty or disability (50 per cent) and those with a mental health condition (48 per cent). The one exception was for people with 'blindness, deafness or another communication impairment', where there was no significant difference compared with people without any impairments.

²² This table is similar to Table 35 in a previous EHRC report 'Disabled people's experiences and concerns about crime' (EHRC Briefing Paper 3). Some individual figures are different, because: a) this table uses two categories for analysing disability, whereas the previous report used three; b) 'total' figures in this table include all respondents in the relevant gender group (including those with 'unknown' disability status); the previous report only included those with known disability status; c) figures in this table exclude 'don't know' and 'not applicable' answers.

²³ Impairment type was first asked in 2009/10. Therefore figures are given for the later three-year period (2009/10-2011/12) rather than the baseline period.

Table 39 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by impairment type

	2009/10 – 2011/12	
	% very/fairly worried	n
No impairments	30.6	23,897
Blindness, deafness or other communication impairment	31.2	1,695
Mobility impairment, such as difficulty walking	**34.6	4,247
Learning difficulty or disability, such as Down's syndrome	**49.7	172
Mental health condition, such as depression	**47.8	1,502
Long-term illness, such as Multiple Sclerosis or cancer	**39.0	859
Other long-standing health condition or disability	**36.0	5,721
Any impairment	**35.9	10,426

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

Notes: The reference group is 'no impairments'. 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 only one significant difference in the baseline period. Among White people, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime (40 per cent compared with 31 per cent), in line with the pattern for the overall population. There were no significant differences for other ethnicity groups in the baseline period.

The same pattern was evident for White people in later years (see Table S6.1). In addition, in the two later time periods, disabled Pakistani/Bangladeshi people were more likely to be worried about being the victim of crime than non-disabled Pakistani/Bangladeshi people (72 per cent compared with 45 per cent in 2008/9-2010/11, and 67 per cent compared with 47 per cent in 2009/10-2011/12). Also, in the latest time period (2009/10-2011/12), disabled Indian people were more likely than non-disabled Indian people to be worried (78 per cent and 55 per cent respectively).

Overall, people in the various non-White ethnic 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. For example, in the baseline period, 63 per cent of disabled Indian people were worried, compared with 40 per cent of disabled White people.

Among disabled people, the only change over time was within the White group: fewer disabled White people were worried in 2010/11-2011/12 than in 2007/08-2009/10 (down four percentage points). There were no significant changes for disabled people in other ethnicity groups.

Table 40 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by ethnicity and disability

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	% very/fairly worried	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
White			
No limiting disability/illness	31.2	51,430	-4.0**
Limiting disability/illness	**39.9	13,196	-4.3**
Total	32.7	64,732	-3.9**
Mixed			
No limiting disability/illness	46.1	374	-0.5
Limiting disability/illness	54.1	50	+16.7
Total	46.7	425	+1.5
Indian			
No limiting disability/illness	54.3	907	+1.4
Limiting disability/illness	63.4	157	+11.5
Total	55.6	1,068	+2.5
Pakistani/Bangladeshi			
No limiting disability/illness	51.4	632	-7.5
Limiting disability/illness	64.1	104	-1.3
Total	52.9	741	-7.0
Black			
No limiting disability/illness	57.0	1,142	-7.3
Limiting disability/illness	58.4	174	-5.1
Total	57.1	1,319	-7.0*
Chinese/Other			
No limiting disability/illness	49.7	1,077	+6.8
Limiting disability/illness	52.9	149	+6.8
Total	50.0	1,231	+6.8

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

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Table 41 shows the proportions of disabled and non-disabled people who were worried about being the victim of crime in the baseline period, broken down by religion. Because of small sample sizes, some religion categories have been combined in the analysis.

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, 37 per cent of disabled people with no religion were worried, compared with 28 per cent of non-disabled people with no religion. There were no significant differences in the other religion groups in the baseline period.

Later time periods show the same patterns for the 'no religion' and Christian groups, with disabled people more likely to be worried than non-disabled people. However, in the two later time periods there was also a difference among Muslims: disabled people were more likely to be worried than non-disabled people (62 per cent compared with 47 per cent in 2008/09-2010/11, and 61 per cent compared with 47 per cent in 2009/10-2011/12). Details are in Table S6.1.

The only change over time for disabled people was the decrease within the Christian group: disabled Christians were less likely to be worried in 2010/11-2011/12 than in 2007/08-2009/10 (down four percentage points). There were no significant changes for disabled people in other religion groups.

Overall, higher proportions of disabled Muslims and those in the 'other religion' groups were worried than either Christians or those with no religion. For example, in the baseline period, 60 per cent of Muslims and 59 per cent of those in the 'other religion' group were worried about being the victim of crime. This compares with 41 per cent of disabled Christians and 37 per cent of disabled people with no religion.

Table 41 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by religion and disability

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change 2007/10- 2010/12
	% very/fairly worried	n	+/- percentage points
No religion			
No limiting disability/illness	28.4	10,514	-3.9**
Limiting disability/illness	**37.1	1,596	-4.0
Total	29.3	12,117	-3.8**
Christian			
No limiting disability/illness	33.2	42,248	-3.2**
Limiting disability/illness	**40.7	11,684	-3.8**
Total	34.6	53,963	-3.3**
Muslim			
No limiting disability/illness	52.5	1,206	-8.5*
Limiting disability/illness	60.0	205	-2.4
Total	53.4	1,411	-7.6*
Any other religion			
No limiting disability/illness	50.8	1,524	+0.2
Limiting disability/illness	59.1	334	-5.6
Total	52.0	1,858	-0.6

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

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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 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 (46 per cent compared with 33 per cent in the baseline period) and in the gay, lesbian or bisexual group (55 per cent compared with 33 per cent).

This pattern continued in later years for the heterosexual/straight group, but not the gay, lesbian or bisexual group, where differences were not significant in 2008/09-2010/11 or in 2009/10-2011/12; this is because of small sample sizes (there were only 63 gay, lesbian or bisexual disabled respondents in 2008/09-2010/11 and 73 in 2009/10-2011/12); see Table S6.1.

There were no 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 42 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in England and Wales: by sexual orientation

	2007/08 – 2009/10		Change
	% very/fairly worried	n	2007/10-2010/12 +/- percentage points
Heterosexual or straight			
No limiting disability/illness	32.8	30,542	-2.9**
Limiting disability/illness	**45.8	3,503	-0.1
Total	33.9	34,058	-2.5**
Gay or lesbian, bisexual			
No limiting disability/illness	33.1	640	-5.5
Limiting disability/illness	*54.9	112	-15.1
Total	35.5	752	-6.4
Don't wish to answer			
No limiting disability/illness	49.0	688	-8.0
Limiting disability/illness	48.6	131	-4.3
Total	49.1	820	-7.5

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 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

4.2 Adults in Scotland

The findings in this section are drawn from the SCJS, and cover adults (aged 16 or over) in Scotland. All findings are taken from the three year period covering 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11.

The questions asked in SCJS are different to BCS/CSEW, so the findings are not comparable. BCS/CSEW has a single question on worry about being the victim of crime, whereas Scotland asks respondents how worried they are about 11 specific

types of crime. The SCJS question is also more specific about the area of worry than BCS/CSEW²⁴.

The analysis in this section is based on the proportion of respondents that said they were very/fairly worried about at least one of the 11 types of crime.

Disabled people as a whole were less likely than non-disabled people to be worried about any of the various types of crime (65 per cent and 69 per cent respectively), as shown in Table 43. 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: in Scotland, respondents were asked to consider 11 individual types of crime, whereas in England and Wales, respondents were asked to give an overall assessment of how worried they were about being the victim of crime. It is possible that, by asking respondents to consider a range of specific types of crime, the SCJS is obtaining more grounded expectations about crime, whereas the BCS/CSEW is gauging a more spontaneous sense of worry and fear. In general, however, it is difficult to compare the responses between the surveys because the questions in the two surveys are very different.

Table 43 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by disability

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
No limiting disability/illness	68.6	35,495
Limiting disability/illness	**65.1	9,476
Total	68.0	45,049

Source: Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. See data table S6.2
 Notes: The reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' 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.

There was only one statistically significant difference, when comparing disabled and non-disabled in the various age groups. Among people aged 75 or over, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim

²⁴ BCS/CSEW question is: 'And now thinking about all types of crime in general, how worried are you about being a victim of crime?'. SCJS question is: 'I am now going to read out a list of crimes and ask how worried you are about each one. ADD IF NECESSARY: I mean how worried are you about it HAPPENING, not how worried would you be if it DID happen'.

of crime (48 per cent compared with 53 per cent). Otherwise, the figures were very similar between disabled and non-disabled people in the various age groups.

Table 44 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females and males combined)

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
16-24		
No limiting disability/illness	57.9	3,519
Limiting disability/illness	61.6	196
Total	58.1	3,721
25-34		
No limiting disability/illness	67.6	5,266
Limiting disability/illness	66.1	475
Total	67.4	5,744
35-44		
No limiting disability/illness	73.8	6,840
Limiting disability/illness	71.9	848
Total	73.6	7,696
45-54		
No limiting disability/illness	74.6	6,404
Limiting disability/illness	75.1	1,382
Total	74.7	7,804
55-64		
No limiting disability/illness	74.5	5,948
Limiting disability/illness	73.5	1,983
Total	74.2	7,949
65-74		
No limiting disability/illness	68.8	4,649
Limiting disability/illness	67.9	1,970
Total	68.6	6,636
75+		
No limiting disability/illness	53.0	2,862
Limiting disability/illness	**47.9	2,621
Total	50.5	5,490

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Disabled women aged 75 or over were less likely to be worried than non-disabled women in the same age group; this reflects the general pattern seen for the 75+ age group (as noted above). By contrast, disabled women aged 16-24 were more likely to be worried than non-disabled 16-24 women (see Table 45).

There were no statistically significant differences between disabled men and non-disabled men in any age group (Table 46).

Table 45 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (females)

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
16-24		
No limiting disability/illness	60.6	1,860
Limiting disability/illness	**76.8	105
Total	61.3	1,970
25-34		
No limiting disability/illness	72.4	3,038
Limiting disability/illness	71.8	261
Total	72.3	3,301
35-44		
No limiting disability/illness	77.2	3,908
Limiting disability/illness	75.1	487
Total	77.0	4,398
45-54		
No limiting disability/illness	78.2	3,494
Limiting disability/illness	81.0	761
Total	78.7	4,264
55-64		
No limiting disability/illness	78.8	3,288
Limiting disability/illness	77.1	1,092
Total	78.3	4,388
65-74		
No limiting disability/illness	72.0	2,549
Limiting disability/illness	70.5	1,109
Total	71.6	3,666
75+		
No limiting disability/illness	53.8	1,694
Limiting disability/illness	**47.7	1,692
Total	50.7	3,389

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Table 46 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by age and disability (males)

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
16-24		
No limiting disability/illness	55.3	1,659
Limiting disability/illness	46.2	91
Total	54.9	1,751
25-34		
No limiting disability/illness	62.8	2,228
Limiting disability/illness	60.2	214
Total	62.6	2,443
35-44		
No limiting disability/illness	70.0	2,932
Limiting disability/illness	68.3	361
Total	69.9	3,298
45-54		
No limiting disability/illness	70.7	2,910
Limiting disability/illness	68.2	621
Total	70.3	3,540
55-64		
No limiting disability/illness	70.1	2,660
Limiting disability/illness	69.6	891
Total	69.9	3,561
65-74		
No limiting disability/illness	65.3	2,100
Limiting disability/illness	64.5	861
Total	65.1	2,970
75+		
No limiting disability/illness	51.9	1,168
Limiting disability/illness	48.4	929
Total	50.3	2,101

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

Notes: Within each age group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Among both women and men, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime: 67 per cent of disabled women were worried, compared with 72 per cent of non-disabled women, while 62 per cent of disabled men were worried, compared with 65 per cent of non-disabled men.

Table 47 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by gender and disability

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
Females		
No limiting disability/illness	72.1	19,836
Limiting disability/illness	**67.3	5,508
Total	71.1	25,383
Males		
No limiting disability/illness	64.9	15,659
Limiting disability/illness	*62.4	3,968
Total	64.5	19,666

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

Notes: Within female and male, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Breakdowns by impairment groups show that, in the last two years covered in this analysis (2009/10 and 2010/11)²⁵, some impairment groups were less worried about being the victim of crime, compared with those without any impairments, specifically: people with 'blindness or severe vision impairment' (56 per cent), those with 'deafness or severe hearing impairment' (59 per cent), and people with a 'physical disability' (60 per cent).

There were no impairment groups that were more likely to be worried, compared with those without any impairments.

²⁵ Impairment type was first asked in 2009/10. Therefore figures are given for 2009/10 and 2010/11 only.

Table 48 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by impairment type

	2009/10 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
No impairments	63.0	19,856
Deafness or severe hearing impairment	*59.2	1,539
Blindness or severe vision impairment	**56.0	597
A physical disability (a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, lifting or carrying)	**60.4	4,286
A learning disability (such as Down's Syndrome)	66.7	56
A learning difficulty (such as dyslexia or dyspraxia)	65.1	289
A mental health condition (such as depression or schizophrenia)	63.5	1,410
A chronic illness (such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, heart disease or epilepsy)	62.8	3,763
Other condition	67.0	775
Any impairment	61.9	9,190

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

Notes: The reference group is 'no impairments'. 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.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis by ethnicity in Scotland is based on just two categories: White and non-White people.

Among White respondents, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime (reflecting the overall pattern for the Scottish population as a whole). Among non-White respondents, there was no significant difference between disabled and non-disabled people.

Table 49 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by ethnicity and disability

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
White		
No limiting disability/illness	63.4	21,884
Limiting disability/illness	**59.8	6,533
Total	62.7	28,455
Non-white		
No limiting disability/illness	62.7	505
Limiting disability/illness	73.4	48
Total	63.4	554

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

Notes: Within each ethnicity group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Because of small sample sizes, analysis of religion in Scotland is based on four categories: 'no religion', Christian, Muslim and 'any other religion'.

Among Christians and those with no religion, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime (in line with the difference for the Scottish population as a whole). For example, 66 per cent of disabled Christians were worried, compared with 71 per cent of non-disabled Christians.

There were no significant differences for the other religion groups.

Table 50 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by religion and disability

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
No religion		
No limiting disability/illness	65.1	14,032
Limiting disability/illness	*62.2	2,725
Total	64.7	16,779
Christian		
No limiting disability/illness	71.4	20,385
Limiting disability/illness	**66.4	6,440
Total	70.3	26,850
Muslim		
No limiting disability/illness	72.1	298
Limiting disability/illness	73.8	37
Total	72.3	336
Other religion		
No limiting disability/illness	66.6	625
Limiting disability/illness	68.3	218
Total	66.9	846

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

Notes: Within each religion group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Among heterosexual respondents, disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to be worried about being the victim of crime (in line with the difference for the Scottish population as a whole). There were no significant differences between disabled and non-disabled people in the other two groups.

Table 51 Worry about being the victim of crime, adults in Scotland: by sexual orientation

	2008/09 – 2010/11	
	% very/fairly worried	n
Heterosexual		
No limiting disability/illness	68.6	27,421
Limiting disability/illness	**65.9	6,843
Total	68.1	34,282
Gay or lesbian, bisexual		
No limiting disability/illness	64.7	364
Limiting disability/illness	74.5	92
Total	66.2	456
Don't wish to answer		
No limiting disability/illness	68.6	329
Limiting disability/illness	70.9	81
Total	68.8	414

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

Notes: Within each sexual orientation group, the reference group is 'no limiting disability/illness'. Significance testing compares 'limiting disability/illness' with the related 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.

Conclusions

Although the EHRC's inquiry into disability related harassment in 2010/11 focused on authorities' responses to harassment, its evidence confirmed that, for many disabled people, harassment (in the form of bullying, cyber-bullying, physical violence, sexual harassment and assault, domestic violence, financial exploitation and institutional abuse) is a commonplace experience and that cases of disability-related harassment that come to public attention, for example through the courts or the media, are only the tip of the iceberg.

The EHRC's description of the problem as one that is 'hidden in plain sight' acknowledged the fact that disability-related harassment is underreported for a range of reasons including not knowing who to report it to, fear of the consequences of reporting and fear that disabled people will not be believed by the police or other authorities. Many disabled people who experience disability harassment have come to see it as commonplace and part of everyday life, rather than as 'hate crime'. As a result, both the number of people who experience disability-related harassment and its impact are assumed to be greatly underestimated.

One of the Inquiry's key recommendations, therefore, was for better data about the scale, severity and nature of disability harassment that will also enable better monitoring of the performance of those responsible for preventing it and dealing with it when it does occur. 'Hidden in Plain Sight' states that 'there remains much which we don't know' and recommends that data systems in organisations responding to disability harassment are able to record, among other things, whether the victim is a disabled person (and/or has another type of protected characteristic); and to determine whether the incident was motivated by the victim's disability and/or any other form of protected characteristic.

While governments and public authorities move closer towards full implementation of the Inquiry recommendations within their own data systems, some information about disability hate crime in Britain is already available from two important sources: the British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. Collecting information about experiences of crime directly from large random samples of the general population, these surveys capture crime (including crime motivated by hate of particular identity groups) that has not been reported to the authorities, in addition to crime that has. They therefore have a potentially key role to play in building a robust picture of certain kinds of disability hate crime in Britain and in providing data that can be used to help assess how well it

is being tackled, although, inevitably, there are caveats that need to be taken into account when considering the survey findings and their implications.

Crime motivated by hate accounts for around four per cent of all crimes captured by the BCS/CSEW (a figure that has not changed much over the last six years), and disability hate crime for about one sixth of that. But the latter estimate is based only on the types of crime covered by the survey (see Appendix 3), and therefore measures only a portion of the behaviour towards disabled people that was of concern to the Inquiry.

In addition, currently we know little about the sources and size of measurement error associated with this statistic which is based on respondents' views about the motivation of the perpetrator. However, findings from the Inquiry suggest it is reasonable to assume that this is an underestimate, for example because victims are often reluctant to admit to themselves or others that they have been the target of disability hate crime.

Findings concerning the proportion of disability hate crime that comes to the attention of the police are interesting in the light of Inquiry findings that disability-related harassment and hate crime tend not to be reported to the authorities. According to the earlier analysis, disability hate crimes are more likely to come to the attention of the police than crime not motivated by identity. There are no simple answers to this apparent contradiction, although it may be that the disability hate crimes categorised by the survey were mainly those considered too serious by victims to be hidden or 'brushed under the carpet'. This would be consistent with a picture of a great deal of under-acknowledged, under-reported disability hate crime with only more serious incidents coming to the fore. It would also be consistent with the finding that, compared with victims of crime unrelated to identity, those who had experienced disability-related crime that did not come to the attention of the police were less likely to say that the incident was too trivial to report, though they were more likely to say that they were fearful of reprisal by perpetrators.

The clearest message from the analysis in this report remains the fact that disabled people in all age groups are more likely than non-disabled people to be the victims of crime. This is true in England and Wales and in Scotland, and the pattern has remained unchanged over the analysis period, although crime rates have fallen slightly overall.

In England and Wales, disabled people are more likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime (reflecting actual experience of crime), even though worry about crime generally has also fallen slightly over the analysis period. But this finding is not repeated in Scotland where (with a very different question) disabled people are less likely than non-disabled people to worry about being the victim of crime. Experiences of and worry about crime analysed by disability and other equality characteristics and by impairment group, also produce some statistics that do not necessarily tell a simple tale. In some cases patterns are clear, but not the reasons that underpin them (for example statistics for gender and impairment group) and in others the patterns themselves are less clear (for example in relation to ethnicity, religion or sexual orientation). In the latter cases this may in part be due to weaknesses in the survey data – especially sample size limitations.

In summary, the crime surveys provide some useful measures that help describe the landscape of disability-related harassment hate crime in Britain: how much of it there is, who the victims are; the extent to which it is reported; the reasons why it sometimes isn't; and how much disabled people worry about it. But there are limitations in the data because of the way they are constructed, including the sample size and design, factors to do with participation of disabled people and the questions that are asked. These constrain to some degree the extent to which the data can be interrogated (for example, analyses by disability and certain ethnic and religious groups); confidence that disabled people are properly represented; and what can be said about types of disability-related harassment and hate crime not covered by the survey. There is also much by way of explanation for the statistics and trends over time that cannot be drawn out from the data and that is critical for tackling disability hate crime and improving the response of public authorities.

Some specific suggestions for further work are as follows (some of these may be possible from further analysis of BCS/CSEW and SCJS; other may require additional primary research):

- Further examination of the types of crime experienced by disabled people, e.g. specific types of crime and other details, such as the extent and nature of repeat victimisation, related to motivation / perpetrator.
- Additional analysis of experience of crime among disabled people, to understand the relationship between age and other characteristics (e.g. through regression analysis).
- Further analysis of disability hate crime in the context of crime as a whole: are certain types of crime associated with disability hate crime; who are the victims

of disability hate crime (compared with other types of crime); to what extent does the incidence of disability hate crime 'explain' the differences between disabled and non-disabled people in overall experience of crime?

Appendices

Appendix 1: Data Implications

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

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 'Non-white'), while analysis by religion sometimes uses either four categories ('No religion', 'Christian', 'Muslim' and 'Any other religion') or just two categories ('No religion', 'Any religion'). While increasing statistical confidence, this approach makes it more difficult to interpret the findings.

The analysis covers several years of data (five years for BCS/CSEW and three years for SCJS). 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. The questions and resulting definitions are shown in Appendix 2. The overall proportion of respondents defined as having 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. As a result, analysis by impairment type is possible from 2009/10 onwards, but not in 2007/08 or 2008/09.
- In both surveys, 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. In addition, the BCS/CSEW self-completion module is restricted to 16-59 year olds. Also, in BCS/CSEW 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12, an additional category ('other') was added to the sexual orientation question; this has been excluded from the analysis. For the purposes of consistency, the 'other' category has also been excluded from analysis of SCJS.

- 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.
- 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. 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. As a result, analysis by impairment type is possible from 2009/10 and 2010/11, but not in 2008/09.

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

It is also 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.

In BCS/CSEW, the definition of crime is also different for young people aged 10-15 than for adults in the main survey. The BCS/CSEW questions asked of adults were adapted to make them suitable for children, and the definition for young people focuses on personal crime (and excludes household crime). See Appendix 3 for more detail²⁶.

²⁶ 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

Other points:

- In the 2007/08 BCS, the question on worry about being the victim of crime was asked of all respondents. However, from 2008/09 onwards, the question was 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.
- In SCJS, there is no single question on worry about being the victim of crime. Instead, figures are based on the proportion of respondents who said they were worried about at least one of a list of 11 types of crime. As a result, it is not possible to compare the findings from SCJS with those from BCS/CSEW.

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 10-15 year old questions 2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12

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).

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://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/method-quality/specific/crime-statistics-methodology/index.html>.

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 2010/11 Scottish Crime and Justice Survey: Technical Report Section 11.3

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/933/0122908.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://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/7252/mrdoc/pdf/7252_csew_2011-12_10-15_dataset_user_guide.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 (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 (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)19
	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 Serious assault
- 12 Minor assault with injury
- 13 Minor assault with no/negligible injury
- 14 Serious assault and fire raising
- 15 Serious assault and housebreaking
- 21 Attempted assault
- 41 Robbery
- 42 Attempted robbery
- 43 Snatch theft from the person
- 44 Other theft from the person
- 45 Attempted theft from the person
- 50 Attempted housebreaking to nonconnected dom.garage/outhouse
- 51 Housebreaking in a dwelling (nothing taken)
- 52 Housebreaking in a dwelling (something taken)
- 53 Attempted housebreaking in a dwelling

- 55 Theft in a dwelling
- 56 Theft from a meter
- 57 H'breaking non-connected dom. garage/outh'se—nothing taken
- 58 H'breaking non-connected dom. garage/outh'se—something taken
- 60 Theft of car/van
- 61 Theft from car/van
- 62 Theft of motorbike, motor scooter or moped
- 63 Theft from motorbike, motor scooter or moped
- 64 Theft of pedal cycle
- 65 Theft from outside dwelling (excluding theft of milk bottles)
- 67 Other theft
- 71 Attempted theft of/from car/van
- 72 Attempted theft of/from m'cycle, motor scooter or moped
- 73 Other attempted theft
- 80 Fire raising
- 82 Vandalism to a motor vehicle
- 84 Vandalism to the home
- 86 Other vandalism

Glossary

'BCS crime'	The definition of crime used in the British Crime Survey/Crime Survey for England and Wales. See below under 'Victim of Crime' for further details.
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• violating the dignity, safety, security or autonomy of the person experiencing it, or• creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading or offensive environment.
Disabled people	<p>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 by the two surveys analysed for this report and full details can be found in Appendix 2.</p> <p>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.</p>

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.
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 both surveys, respondents are asked: "What is your religion, even if you are not currently practicing?" In the report, individual categories are combined where necessary so that sample sizes are large enough for analysis.
Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS)	The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) is a social survey which asks people 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	<p>In the BCS/CSEW, respondents are shown a list of options and asked: "Please choose a category from this list which best describes how you would think of yourself". The options are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heterosexual or straight; 2. Gay or lesbian; 3. Bisexual; 4. Other; 5. Don't Know; 6. Don't wish to answer. <p>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.</p> <p>In SCJS, respondents are asked: "Which of the</p>

following best describes your sexual orientation? (i.e. if forming relationships: girlfriend boyfriend / wife / husband / civil partner – with which sex(es) would that be?). The options are: 1. Heterosexual (opposite sex); 2. Gay or lesbian (same sex); 3. Bisexual (both sexes); 4. Other; 5. Don't wish to answer. These responses are then analysed in the report using the following categories: a) Heterosexual b) Gay or lesbian, Bisexual; c) Don't wish to answer. 'Other' is excluded from the analysis

Victim of crime

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).

It is important to note that the definitions of crime differ between the two surveys, as noted in the Introduction and in Appendix 1.

Contacts

www.equalityhumanrights.com

The Commission's publications are available to download on our website:

www.equalityhumanrights.com.

If you would like to discuss the option of accessing a publication in an alternative format or language please contact **engagementdesk@equalityhumanrights.com**.

Equality Advisory and Support Service (EASS)

The Equality Advisory Support Service has replaced the Equality and Human Rights Commission Helpline. It gives free advice, information and guidance to individuals on equality, discrimination and human rights issues.

Telephone: 0808 800 0082

Textphone: 0808 800 0084

Opening hours:

09:00 to 20:00 Monday to Friday

10:00 to 14:00 Saturday

Website: www.equalityadvisoryservice.com

Post: FREEPOST Equality Advisory Support Service FPN4431

The Commission's inquiry into disability-related harassment set out a number of measures against which progress on preventing and tackling disability-related harassment and hate crime could be reviewed. This report presents baseline figures on disability-related crime and crime experienced by disabled people, as drawn from crime surveys in England and Wales and in Scotland.

WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC

The numbers of disability hate crimes reported to the police are lower than the actual number of hate crimes that disabled people experience.

Disabled people in all age-groups are more likely than non-disabled people in those age-groups to be victims of crime.

WHAT THIS REPORT ADDS

A full set of baseline data on six measures:

- the numbers of incidents of disability-related hate crime;
- the proportion of disability-related crime incidents reported to the police;
- reasons for not reporting such incidents to the police;
- satisfaction with police handling of crime incidents;
- disabled people's experiences of crime;
- their worries about crime.

Breakdowns, where available, by age, gender, impairment group, ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation.

Data for Scotland as well as England and Wales.

Change over time.

Data on young disabled people aged 10-15.