

Risk factors for victimization and the impact of victim status on perceptions of police legitimacy in Australia

Previous research highlights that important differences exist between victim groups, but the impact victim status can have on perceptions of police legitimacy remains underexplored. The following paper contributes to this body of literature by utilizing the National Security and Preparedness Survey (NSPS, 2011-2012) to explore the risk/protective factors for victimization and differences between prejudice motivated crime (PMC) victims, non-PMC victims and non-victims in the Australian context, using Multinomial Logit Regression models. This study provides new insights into key differences between victim groups and perceptions of government and police legitimacy in the victimization context.

Keywords: victimization; risk factors; policing/law enforcement; hate crimes

Introduction

There has been increasing interest in the impact of victim status and crime type on perceptions of police legitimacy (see, e.g., Aviv & Weisburd, 2016; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Studies across varying geographical and policing contexts consistently suggest that people who have experienced a crime have more negative attitudes towards police compared with people who have no experience with victimization (Aviv & Weisburd, 2016); while other studies have found that the type of crime is another factor in need of consideration (Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Positive public perceptions of the police and their legitimacy are important, as the police depend on the public's cooperation to solve crime. Authorities, laws and institutions possess legitimacy when individuals voluntarily feel obligated to follow decisions and directives dictated by those bodies (Tyler, 2003). Sunshine and Tyler (2003, p. 514) define police legitimacy as "a property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that that authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed". Perceptions of police legitimacy, however, are also interlinked with the type of crime victims experience, as well as individual attributes that are likely to increase a person's risk of being victimized.

Early victimization theories have pointed to individual attributes that make people more prone to victimization, for example, ethnicity, gender and socio-economic status (Burgess & Regehr, 2010; Zur, 1995). Such risk factors contribute to the chance of overall victimization, but they also play a more specific role in prejudice motivated crime victimization. Prejudice motivated crime (PMC), a term that is gaining traction within the Australian context (see, e.g., Mason, 2014; Wickes, Ham, & Pickering, 2013; Wickes, Pickering, Mason, Maher, & McCulloch, 2016; XXX et al., 2018), is more commonly referred to as hate crime, bias crime or targeted violence. A PMC is a crime that is directed at people based on certain attributes, including, for example, the victim's race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity or disability. Victims of PMC vary across different areas of the world depending on historical context, cultural and ethnic differences. Our understanding of the prevalence of PMC in Australian jurisdictions is limited due to a lack of data recording by police, the issue of underreporting, as well as variations in PMC legislation across different states and territories (Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, 2010; Wickes et al., 2013). Marginalized cultural groups, such as Indigenous, Vietnamese, and Middle Eastern people as well as Indian nationals are common PMC victims within the Australian context (see, e.g., Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 1991; Johnson, 2005a; Mason, 2012, 2019). LGBTI communities, as well as the more under-researched group of Australians living with a disability, also experience high rates of harassment, violence and abuse (Disabled People's Organisations Australia, 2018; Mason, 2019).

There is only limited existing research that describes the differences between PMC victims, non-PMC victims¹ and non-victims (e.g., Benier, 2017; Chongatera, 2013), and the impact that victim status can have on perceptions of police legitimacy remains underexplored. This paper contributes to

¹ According to Mason and Dyer (2013), *parallel crimes* (p. 874) consist of comparable crimes that do not have the motive of prejudice, bias or hate. Lewis (2013) refers to *parallel non-bias-motivated offenses* (p. 57). I will refer to *non-PMC* in this context.

the body of literature exploring differences between these victim groups and the risk factors for victimization in Australia by analyzing the National Security and Preparedness Survey (2011-2012). In addition, this study provides new insights into differences in levels of perceptions of police legitimacy between victim groups, that has important consequences for PMC and non-PMC victims' reporting behavior (XXX et al., 2018).

Risk factors of victimization and impact of victim status on perceptions of police legitimacy

The literature on victimization has highlighted the existence of several risk and protective factors in relation to victimization. In a review of victimization trends, Lauritsen and Rezey (2018) point towards some key sociodemographic correlates of violent victimization, which include factors such as age, sex, race and ethnicity, as well as marital and cohabitation status. People at higher risk for violent victimization, for example, are likely to be male, from minority group backgrounds, and unmarried (see, e.g., Heimer & Lauritsen, 2008; Morgan & Oudekerk, 2019). Young people are also likely to be victimized and the risk of victimization is likely to decrease with age (Dixon, Reed, Rogers, & Stone, 2006; Hindelang, Gottfredson, & Garofalo, 1978). Explanations for victimization risk factors also include environmental exposures, such as a person's level of income, or age-related activities (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2018). Many studies have affirmed that these factors play an important role in victimization, but there is also an unequal impact of crime (Dixon et al., 2006). Although victimization trends have decreased over the years, race and ethnic disparities still persist and only minimal progress seems to have been made addressing such disparities in the victimization context (Lauritsen & Rezey, 2018).

Victimization risks need consideration within the “wider structures of inclusion and exclusion, power and subordination, containment and control” within a society which fosters such unequal distribution and experience of crime victimization (Davies, Francis, & Greer, 2017, p. 13). Groups at higher risk for falling into the victim of crime category include, for example, Black and ethnic

minorities (Dixon et al., 2006), LGBTI communities (Griner et al., 2017; Stacey, Averett, & Knox, 2018), people with disabilities (Thomas, Nixon, Ogloff, & Daffern, 2019), (un)documented immigrants (Pendergast, Wadsworth, & LePree, 2018), and the homeless (Tong, Kaplan, Guzman, Ponath, & Kushel, 2019). Those likely to be victimized by crime, therefore, tend to also be the most marginalized within society (Zedner, 2002). Many scholars have also discussed the impact of such power structures on victimization in the prejudice motivated crime context. For example, Perry (2001) states that power hierarchies and power dynamics in society are based on dominance over “difference” (e.g., difference pertaining to gender, race, sexuality and class). PMC victims are often targeted because of a central element of their identity and such risk factors for victimization lead to greater and more harmful consequences for victims and minority groups (see, e.g., Blazak, 2011; Gan, Williams III, & Wiseman, 2011; Lawrence, 1999; McDevitt, Balboni, Garcia, & Gu, 2001; Perry & Alvi, 2012).

Previous research indicates that risk factors for victimization also link to different levels of trust and confidence in the police, which is an important aspect for law abiding behavior and cooperation with police (Tyler, 2005, 2011). Cooperation with police is likely to depend on feelings of inclusion with the social group the police represent, and that people can identify with (Bradford, 2014). Especially within the Australian context, immigrant and Indigenous Australians are more likely to have an inherent distrust in the criminal justice system, such as the police (Willis, 2011), and ethnic minority groups display low levels of confidence and trust in the police, resulting in less voluntary cooperation (Cherney & Chui, 2009; Murphy & Cherney, 2011; Tyler, 2011). Such feelings of inclusion/exclusion are even further tested when victims are targeted in a prejudice motivated crime. Effective and successful responses to PMC by state agencies lead to increased trust and confidence in such agencies (Hall, 2012). People who trust the police are more likely to report such crimes; this in turn reduces the risk of community tension and leads to a positive public image of the police (Steer, 2011). Laws are likely to shape police processes and procedures and, consequently, perceptions of police and

government legitimacy will influence the reporting behaviour of PMC victims. Low perceptions of police legitimacy have been found to be a significant barrier to reporting PMC to the police (XXX et al., 2018).

The literature has consistently established that victims have more negative attitudes towards the police compared to non-victims, likely due to victims' positive/negative first-hand and vicarious experiences with police, or due to the trauma of victimization as well as possible secondary victimization when dealing with police (Aviv & Weisburd, 2016). Research into procedural justice and the willingness to report crime to police indicates that it is important to differentiate between crime types (Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Victimization context matters and it is, therefore, important to not examine victims as just one homogenous group or in isolated studies (Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Previous research already highlights some important differences between victim groups in that being a PMC victim can have an effect on important aspects of people's lives (e.g., Benier, 2017; Chongatera, 2013). For example, recent work by Benier (2017) in the Australian context has assessed differences in community participation of PMC, non-PMC and non-victims, and has found that PMC victims displayed lower feelings of safety in their community, took part in fewer neighboring activities, had fewer friends within the neighborhood, and less place attachment compared with non-PMC victims. Differences in perceptions of police legitimacy are likely to exist between PMC victims, non-PMC victims and non-victims.

Collectively, the studies above provide important insights into the differences in risk factors between victim groups explored within the present study, as well as differences in the way these groups perceive police legitimacy. Few studies have examined differences in perceptions of the criminal justice system between victims and non-victims (Mastrocinque & McDowall, 2016); even fewer studies have considered the differences between PMC victims, non-PMC victims and non-victims. This

study will add to this literature by exploring differences between victim groups in the Australian context.

Methodology

To explore the risk factors for victimization this study uses data from the National Security and Preparedness Survey (NSPS 2011-2012), a national probability sample, collected under the auspices of the Australian Research Council Centre for Excellence and Policing and Security (CEPS). Next to addressing factors associated with national security, disaster preparedness and perceptions of community, the survey also addresses factors associated with personal security, such as crime victimization, confidence in and perceptions of legitimacy of government authorities, as well as personal opinions of respondents' community and neighbors (XXX et al., 2013) and is a unique national survey that includes questions around PMC victimization and reporting behavior. The study recruited a random sample of Australian residents via random digit dialing of 39,387 people and recorded data and undertook computer assisted telephone interviews, of which 6,590 individuals completed a short two-minute survey on preparedness behavior. A total of 6,098 respondents agreed to complete the main survey, with 3,034 opting to complete online, while 3,064 opted to complete via hard copy mail out (XXX et al., 2013). Of those recruited, 4,258 people returned completed surveys, a response rate of almost 70%.²

Outcome variable

This study focuses on the differences between victim groups. This outcome is operationalized using a variable that captures the "victim group" respondents belong to. Three possible groups exist, including

² There was an oversample in the Australian Capital Territory. One underage respondent and one PMC victim supplying insufficient information were excluded from the survey data, resulting in a total sample of 4,256 people.

(1) respondents who have not been a victim of a crime in the past 12 months (non-victims); (2) respondents who are general crime victims (non-PMC victims); and (3) respondents who are prejudice motivated crime victims (PMC victims). The NSPS also includes items that distinguish between two types of crime victimization, property crime and violent crime (1 = “Yes”, 2 = “No”), asking the questions: “In the last 12 months, has anyone ever used violence or the threat of violence, such as in a mugging, fight assault or sexual assault, against you or anyone in your household?” and “In the last 12 months, has anyone damaged your household or personal property, stolen something from your home or vehicle, or stolen your vehicle?”. The question, “Do you feel that this incident occurred because of the skin colour, ethnicity, race or religion of anyone in the household?” (1 = “Yes”, 2 = “No”), allows for the distinction between PMC and general crime. Utilizing these items, I created a categorical variable that distinguishes between “non-victims” (0), “non-PMC victims” (1) and “PMC victims” (2). I hypothesize that there are differences between these three comparison groups based on a number of independent predictors. Out of 4,256 respondents in the NSPS and of the people who have responded to these questions,³ 294 people (7.33%) indicate being a victim of a violent crime, of those, 30 people (10.45%) indicate being a PMC victim, compared with 257 people (89.55%) who indicate no prejudice motive. 593 people (14.94%) disclose having been victims of property crimes in the previous twelve months of the survey. Of those, 20 respondents (3.45%) identified the incident as a PMC, while 559 people (96.55%) did not link the crime to a prejudice motive⁴.

Risk/protective factors for victimization

³ 244 people (or 5.73%) did not answer if they were a victim of a violent crime, compared to 286 (or 6.72%) who refused to indicate if they were victims of property crimes. 7 people (0.16%) did not indicate if the violent crime was due to prejudice, while 14 people (0.33%) did not indicate if the property crime was due to prejudice.

⁴ Coding note: Four respondents indicate experiencing both types of crime. When creating my PMC victim variable, these individuals were counted only once, reducing the number of PMC victims to a total of 46.

Six variables in the NSPS measured risk/protective factors for victimization. Risk factors include speaking a language other than English at home (*LOTE* dummy); Indigenous status (*ATSI* dummy); and immigrant status (*foreign born* dummy). I also included perceptions of racial/ethnic preferences of neighbors (*preference for Anglo-Saxons as neighbors scale*,⁵ “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5); $\alpha = 0.82$) to explore the marginalization and perceptions of isolation from the community, as minority groups who feel unwelcome in the community they reside in, may perceive themselves socially isolated from their residential community. Some variables within this study also relate to protective factors for victimization, these include having *Australian citizenship* (dummy) and *religion* (a dummy-coded variable indicating 1 for “Christian” and 0 for “Other”).

The constructs above offer a rounded picture to explore NSPS respondents’ risk/protective factors for victimization, and more specifically PMC victimization. I also controlled for demographics such as *age*, *gender*, *dependent children*, *income* (ranging from less than AU\$20,000 to AU\$150,000 or more), *education* (seven levels from “No school” to “Postgrad”), *home ownership*, marital status (*married* dummy), and employment status (*unemployed* dummy).⁶

*** Table 1 about here ***

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics of the risk/protective factors for victimization in the NSPS and illustrates that the majority of people in the NSPS speak English at home. The non-victim group displays the highest percentage of people speaking a language other than English at home (6.23%). The majority of people in the different victim groups are non-Indigenous. The PMC victim group has the majority of Indigenous people with 2.17% indicating Indigenous descent. The majority of

⁵ The NSPS used the following question to explore the marginalization and perception of isolation from the community: “How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement?” A factor analysis indicated that item (a) People in this community prefer that residents in the area are mostly Anglo Saxon and item (b) People in this community do not like having members of other ethnic groups as next door neighbours, loaded highly onto one factor.

⁶ For more detailed information about the demographic variables please refer to XXX (2016).

people in the NSPS and in the different victim groups were Australian citizens. Non-victims had a higher percentage than the other victim groups of having foreign citizenship status, with 90.74% indicating Australian citizenship. The majority of people in the different victim groups did not indicate having been born outside of Australia, with 25.10% of non-victims, 19.94% of non-PMC victims and 28.26% of PMC victims indicating having been born outside of Australia. PMC victims, however, had a higher percentage of being foreign born, compared to the other victim groups. PMC victims were slightly more neutral on the feeling that people in their community preferred Anglo-Saxons in their area with an average score of 2.946, compared with non-PMC victims ($M=2.751$) and non-victims ($M=2.721$), who had lower mean scores and tended to lean more towards the disagree side.

Exploring the descriptive statistics of religion, the majority of people were of Christian faith, with PMC victims indicating the least percentage of Christians (58.70%), compared to non-victims (63.44%) and non-PMC victims (63.48%). 2.17% of PMC victims were Buddhist, compared with 0.91% of non-victims and 0.84% of non-PMC victims. 2.17% of PMC victims were of Islam faith, compared with 0.42% of non-PMC victims and 0.34% of non-victims. 28.23% of non-PMC victims declared not having a religion, compared to 26.09% of PMC victims and 25.61% of non-victims.

Explanatory variables

After consulting the literature and the available items within the NSPS, a factor analysis informed the creation of the scales around the policing context but I also considered items around the social identity context discussed below. In addition, a separate factor analysis for the selection of the perception of

isolation in the community context was necessary, as a combined factor analysis has been inconclusive.⁷

*** Table 2 about here ***

The factors utilised in the creation of the scale have an Eigenvalue of higher than one, and only items with high loadings define the factors, as well as the items having a uniqueness score of lower than 0.6.⁸ After deciding on the factors, I have created the scales and only include scales with a high alpha level (above 0.7).

Multiple studies utilizing police legitimacy scales have been consulted for the selection of survey items from the NSPS (see, i.e., Bradford, 2014; Gau, 2011; Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Murphy & Cherney, 2012; Murphy, Murphy, & Mearns, 2010; Reisig, Bratton, & Gertz, 2007). The police legitimacy scale for this study includes eleven items that asked participants to rate how strongly they disagreed (1) or agreed (5) with each of the following statements about the police: (a) police try to be fair when making decisions, (b) police treat people fairly, (c) police treat people with dignity and respect, (d) police are always polite when dealing with people, (e) police listen to people before making decisions, (f) police make decisions based upon facts, not their personal biases or opinions, (g) police respect people's rights when decisions are made, (h) overall, I think that police are doing a good job in

⁷ I have run a separate factor analysis of items around the following attitudes: "People in this community prefer that residents in the area are mostly Anglo Saxon" (Q47a); "People in this community do not like having members of other ethnic groups as next door neighbours" (Q47b); "People in this community are comfortable with the current levels of ethnic diversity here" (Q47c; reverse-coded); "Some people in this community have been excluded from social events because of their skin colour, ethnicity, race or religion" (Q47d); "Within Australia, I see myself first and mainly as a member of my race/ethnic group" (Q47e); and "People from my race/ethnic group should try to keep a separate cultural identity" (Q47f), with an indication that only Q47a (0.7843) and Q47b (0.8198) load highly onto one factor displaying an Eigenvalue of 2.18712. The alpha of 0.8167 also indicates a good fit for a scale being over 0.7.

⁸ If the uniqueness score is high, then the variables do not explain the factor well.

my community, (i) I trust the police in my community, (j) I have confidence in the police in my community, and (k) police are accessible to the people in this community ($\alpha = 0.95$).⁹

Four items created an additional scale to measure the likelihood of different victim groups cooperating with police (*willingness to cooperate with police*). Participants were asked to respond using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “very unlikely” (1) to “very likely” (5) to “If the situation arose, please indicate how likely you would be to do any of the following”: (a) call the police to report a crime, (b) help police find someone suspected of committing a crime by providing them with information, (c) report dangerous or suspicious activity to police, and (d) willingly assist police if needed ($\alpha = 0.90$).

Identifying with Australia and its community was another scale deemed important, as Bradford (2014) established that cooperation with police likely depends on feelings of inclusion in the social group the police represent and respondents identify with. Four items tapped into this construct, using a 5-point Likert scale, asking respondents how strongly they disagree (1) to agree (5) with the following statements: (a) I see myself first and mainly as a member of the Australian community, (b) it is important for me to be seen by others as a member of the Australian community, (c) I am proud to be Australian, and (d) what Australia stands for is important for me ($\alpha = 0.84$).

Further explanatory variables include perceptions of federal and state government legitimacy with a factor analysis indicating loadings onto two separate factors. The items establishing federal government legitimacy asked respondents how much of the time they can trust the Australian government to do what is right, which included response categories of “just about always” (1) to “just about never” (4). This item was reverse-coded to fit in with the direction of other scale items: (a) How

⁹ This scale includes police legitimacy items as well as procedural justice items because of high loadings onto one factor during a factor analysis. Prior research also confirmed that there is a tendency for trust to load with procedural justice items (see Gau, 2011; Tankebe, 2013; Tankebe, Reisig, & Wang, 2016).

much confidence do you have in the Prime Minister of Australia?, (b) How much confidence do you have in Federal Politicians?, and (c) How much confidence do you have in Federal Parliament? ($\alpha = 0.82$; 1 for “hardly any confidence” to 3 for “a great deal of confidence”). Items establishing perceptions of state government legitimacy included questions on (a) how much confidence do you have in your State Premier? And (b) how much confidence do you have in your State Politicians? ($\alpha = 0.81$; from 1 “hardly any confidence” to 3 “a great deal of confidence”). Prior research measures the legitimacy of authority figures and government agencies similarly (see, e.g., Useem & Useem, 1979; van der Toorn, Tyler, & Jost, 2011; Weatherford, 1992).

Further, Tyler (2003) established that the legitimacy of local laws and legal authorities can be measured by an index of perceived obligation to obey (see also Murphy et al., 2010; Murphy, Tyler, & Curtis, 2009). Three items in the NSPS measured attitudes and obligations toward the law by asking respondents how much they “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5) with the following statements: (a) you should always obey the law even if it goes against what you think is right, (b) I feel a moral obligation to obey the law, and (c) people should do what our laws tell them to do even if they disagree with them ($\alpha = 0.86$).

Analytic approach

Multinomial Logit Regression (MNL) with three dependent (categorical) variables was carried out using STATA to examine whether or not there are differences in the three victimization groups, controlling for the variables described above. This model is partly comparable to running three binary logits (Long, 1997). MNL is a great fit for such an analysis, as it “do[es] not require the predictors to be linearly related, normally distributed, or to have equal variations within each group” (Chongatera, 2013, p. 54), unlike Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression, which calls for distributional requirements for predictors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). According to Long and Freese (2006), the formal MNL model takes the following form:

$$\ln\Omega_{m|b}(x) = \ln \frac{\Pr(y = m|x)}{\Pr(y = b|x)} = x\beta_{m|b} \text{ for } m = 1 \text{ to } J$$

In this equation, b is the base category, which is compared with the other groups in the model. As the log odds of an outcome compared with itself are always 0 ($\ln\Omega_{m|m}(x) = \ln 1 = 0$), the effects of the independent variables (or predictors) must also be 0 ($\beta_{b|b} = 0$). I transformed the estimated coefficients into relative risk ratios ($\exp(b)$ rather than just b), with an RRR score bigger than one indicating that the risk of falling into the comparison group, compared with the risk of falling into the base group, increases as the control or explanatory variable increases, holding everything else constant. Similarly, an RRR score lower than one indicates that the risk of falling into the comparison group compared to the risk of falling into the base group decreases as the control or explanatory variable increases. The following predicted probabilities equation is computed by solving the J equation:

$$\Pr(y = m|x) = \frac{\exp(x\beta_{m|b})}{\sum_{j=1}^J \exp(x\beta_{j|b})}$$

This paper aims to explore the risk factors for victimization and the significant differences between victim groups through an examination of the influence of control and explanatory variables, the relative risk ratios (RRR) for the multinomial logit models, the related confidence intervals (CIs), as well as the indication for significance of the p-value (*).

Results

Similar to previous findings (see Home Office, Ministry of Justice, & Office for National Statistics, 2013; Johnson, 2005b, 2005c), data from the NSPS suggests that PMC is a rare event. A breakdown of victim groups demonstrates that 1.08% of the 4,256 survey respondents were victims of a PMC, while 16.73% were victims of a non-PMC, compared to 82.19% who indicated no victimization within the

past twelve months. These percentages closely resemble Chongatera's (2013) findings in the Canadian context (1.6% PMC victims, 15.8% non-PMC victims and 82.7% non-victims) and Benier's (2017) findings in the Australian context, with 1.87% of the survey sample reporting PMC victimization.

The three tables below illustrate associations between the independent variables and the different victimization groups, as well as how these variables differ when comparing non-PMC victims with non-victims, non-victims with PMC victims, and non-PMC victims with PMC victims. Although MNLR is appropriate for rare event data, the analysis below requires a more explorative and cautious approach and interpretation of the output.¹⁰ However, the significant variables (especially of under-represented variables and categories) and consistencies across the three models and intuitive results suggest some confidence in the data output.

Comparing non-PMC victims to non-victims

*** Table 3 about here ***

Table 3 compares non-PMC victims to non-victims and demonstrates a significant association with variables *age*, *education* and *marital status* and the likelihood of being in one group over the other. Model 3 indicates that a one year increase in age (RRR: 0.981; p-value: 0.000) or being married (RRR: 0.676; p-value: 0.000) decrease the likelihood of being in the non-PMC group, while a one unit increase in education (RRR: 1.138; p-value: 0.001) increases the likelihood of being in the non-PMC group. People with higher educational attainment, however, were more likely to be in a non-PMC group, compared with the non-victim group. All other control variables (demographic and risk/protective factors for victimization) are not significantly related to non-PMC victim or non-victim status.

¹⁰ This study is an exploration of certain variables indicating a likelihood of being in one group over another, this does not indicate causality.

Throughout the addition of the explanatory variables in this model, the variable *police legitimacy* is significantly associated with the non-victim group. For a one unit increase in perception of police legitimacy (where higher scores indicate more favorable views), the relative risk of being in the non-PMC group relative to the non-victim group decreases by 0.838 (p-value: 0.023). More generally, the higher the perception of police legitimacy, the less likely respondents are in the non-PMC group and the more likely they are in the non-victim group.

None of the variables *cooperation with police*, *identifying with Australia and its community* or *law legitimacy* suggests a significant association with belonging to one group over the other. With the introduction of *federal government legitimacy* into Model 3, the variable is significantly associated with the non-victim group. A one unit increase in federal government legitimacy decreases the relative risk ratio of being in the non-PMC group relative to the non-victim group by a factor of 0.673 (p-value: 0.000). In other words, the higher the perception of federal government legitimacy (the more favorably the views towards the federal government), the less likely people will be in the non-PMC group and the more likely they will be in the non-victim group. This association was only visible with respondents' perceptions of federal, but not state government legitimacy.

Comparing non-victims to PMC victims

*** Table 4 about here ***

Table 4 displays the comparison between non-victims and PMC victims. Model 3 illustrates that the demographic variable *age* (RRR: 1.025; p-value: 0.041) is significantly associated with being in the non-victim group, while *employment status* (RRR: 0.292; p-value: 0.037) and being *foreign born* (RRR: 0.491; p-value: 0.049) is significantly associated with being in the PMC victim group.

Additionally, the explanatory variable *police legitimacy* is significantly associated with being in the non-victim group compared with the PMC victim group. For one unit increase in perception of police legitimacy (higher scores indicate more favorable views), the relative risk ratio of being in the

non-victim group relative to the PMC victim group increases by a factor of 2.269 (p-value: 0.000), holding all other variables constant. In other words, the higher the perception of police legitimacy, the more likely it is that respondents are in the non-victim group and the less likely they are in the PMC victim group. Fair procedures and police effectiveness could have influenced lower perception of police legitimacy of people with police contact or crime experience compared with people who have not been victimized. Hall (2012) suggests that successful responses to PMC incidents influence the victims' desire to cooperate with police. The NSPS, unfortunately, does not question respondents on the outcome of police contact.

The demographic variables *gender, dependent children, income, education, home ownership* and *marital status* are not significantly associated with being in one group over the other. Only the risk factor variable *foreign born* indicates a significant association in the final model. The explanatory variables *cooperation with the police, identifying with Australia and its community, law legitimacy, federal government legitimacy* and *state government legitimacy* are not significantly associated with belonging to one group over the other.

Comparing non-PMC to PMC victims

*** Table 5 about here ***

The comparison between PMC victims and non-PMC victims suggests that victims are not distinguishable demographically from non-PMC victims, as none of the demographic variables showed significance in being in one group over the other. However, Model 2 and 3 in table 5 illustrate that the risk factor variable *foreign born* is significantly associated with being in the PMC victim group compared with the non-PMC victim group. For respondents who are foreign born, the relative risk ratio for being in the non-PMC victim group compared with the PMC victim group is expected to decrease by a factor of 0.448 (p-value: 0.032), holding all other variables constant. More generally,

people who have been born overseas are less likely to be in the group that has been victimized without a prejudice motive and more likely to be in the PMC victim group.

Further, the explanatory variable *police legitimacy* is significantly associated with being in the non-PMC victim group relative to the PMC victim group. With the addition of the explanatory variable *police legitimacy* to Model 3, the relative risk ratio for police legitimacy indicates a significant association with being in the non-PMC victim group. The relative risk ratio of belonging to the non-PMC victim group compared with the PMC victim group increases by a factor of 1.901 (p-value: 0.007), given a one unit increase in perception of police legitimacy, holding all other variables constant. In other words, people with higher perceptions of police legitimacy will be more likely part of the victimized group without prejudice motive and less likely to be in the PMC victim group. None of the other explanatory variables, such as *cooperation with the police*, *identifying with Australia and its community*, *law legitimacy*, *federal government legitimacy* and *state government legitimacy* were significantly associated with belonging to one group over the other. None of the demographic variables are significantly associated with being in either the non-PMC victim group or the PMC victim group.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study is the low prevalence of prejudice motivated crime captured within the NSPS survey. PMC victimization is a rare event, with few respondents identifying as a victim experiencing a crime where prejudice towards the person's skin color, ethnicity, race or religion is a factor. Other victimization surveys that include PMC items also experience a low prevalence of victimization resulting in large margins of error around the estimates for PMC (Home Office et al., 2013). The limitation of low PMC numbers in the survey was addressed by using appropriate statistical techniques, which can adequately deal with rare event data, such as MNL for the victimization patterns (see, for example, Chongatera, 2013). The NSPS only measures PMC victimization related to race, religion and nationality, therefore, the survey results omit a large number of PMC victims by not

including items requesting information on victimization related to, for example, sexual orientation, gender identity or disability. Further, it was not possible to distinguish between the time (before or after the crime occurred) or the nature of contact with police (i.e., being a victim, offender or any other police contact), which may have had an influence on victims' perceptions of police legitimacy.

An additional limitation of this research is that the NSPS is based on respondents' self-reported experiences and perceptions of victimization. Shively, McDevitt, Cronin, and Balboni (2001) suggest that this could lead to an overestimation of prejudice motivated crime, where victims identify the crime as a PMC although no prejudice motive was present, or the underestimation of PMC, with victims unable to distinguish a PMC from a non-PMC. Such self-reported victimization estimation discrepancies might only be rectified by further research into the facts around victims' perceptions that the crime was motivated by a prejudice bias of the perpetrator (Shively et al., 2001). In the NSPS, minority groups, such as the Indigenous population and respondents who do not speak English at home are under-represented, which most likely leads to an under-representation of PMC victimization. For the purpose of addressing these limitations, any missing PMC victims on variables were carefully considered and recoding techniques used to avoid any dropout throughout the statistical analysis.

Discussion and conclusion

This study aimed to explore the differences between PMC victims, non-PMC victims and non-victims in the Australian context, analyzing the NSPS using Multinomial Logit Regression models. In doing so, it contributed to the literature by establishing that the higher the perception of police legitimacy, the more likely respondents are in the non-victim group as compared to the victim group, and this non-victim group also has higher levels of government trust. This is an important finding, especially in terms of prior interactions with authority and future reporting of victimization, discussed further below. This study has also shown that perceptions of police legitimacy (in respondents) stands out as a key factor distinguishing between PMC victims and non-PMC victims. This is a significant result and has

implications for victims' reporting patterns. With 1.08% of respondents having been victimized by a crime motivated by prejudice, the low prevalence of PMC victimization within the NSPS is consistent with findings from previous research within other parts of the world (Chongatera, 2013; Home Office et al., 2013; Johnson, 2005b, 2005c).

The present study was designed to determine the differences between victim groups. The findings suggest that differences between non-PMC victims – respondents who experienced a crime without a prejudice motive – to non-victims exist in that older and married respondents were less likely to be in the non-PMC victim group. This finding is consistent with prior research pointing towards the risk of victimization decreasing with age and increasing for people who are not married (Dixon et al., 2006; Hindelang et al., 1978). This phenomenon is explained through lifestyle exposure hypothesis, whereas differences in personal lifestyles may be linked to situations with higher probabilities for victimization (Hindelang et al., 1978; Morris, Rockett, & Elechi, 2014). Further, respondents with higher educational attainment were more likely to be in a non-PMC group. In a Canadian study, Gabor and Mata (2004) also found that higher levels of education increased the likelihood of victimization. Demographic differences also exist when comparing PMC victims to non-victims, in that, similarly to non-PMC victims, older respondents tend to be in the non-victim group. Further, respondents who were unemployed were more likely to be in the PMC victim group in comparison to the non-victim group (similarly seen in Medoff, 1999). As previously suggested, proponents of high unemployment rates as a factor of PMC victimization propose that competition for resources, such as jobs and housing space, leads to more PMC occurrences amongst visible minority groups (Chongatera, 2013). The finding of no demographic differences between PMC victims and non-PMC victims is somewhat surprising. The expectation was to at least find income disparity between the two groups, as prior Canadian research indicates that “income to some extent minimizes the likelihood of exposure to hate-crime victimization” (Chongatera, 2013, p. 58).

In contrast to the existing literature that informed the decision to add risk/protective factors for victimization into the models, certain attributes, such as ethnicity and minority group status (Burgess & Regehr, 2010; Culotta, 2005; von Hentig, 1948), were not significantly associated with being in the non-PMC group over the non-victim group. A possible explanation for this result may be that these risk factors for victimization as well as visible minority group status are less likely linked to non-PMC victimization and rather linked to PMC victimization (Chongatera, 2013). Key results indicate, however, that the only clear distinction in regards to the risk/protective factors for victimization between who will experience a crime with or without a prejudice motive is the respondent's immigrant status. Being born outside of Australia was the most likely indicator of being victimized by a prejudice motivated crime. Prior research within the Western European context found that young people and migrants are especially at risk of PMC victimization (Van Kesteren, 2016), that ethnic minorities and immigrants have a greater likelihood of victimization (Burgess & Regehr, 2010; Culotta, 2005; von Hentig, 1948), and that visible minority group status is linked to PMC victimization, but less likely to be linked to non-PMC victimization (Chongatera, 2013). The data analysis in this study did indicate a clear distinction between the immigrant status of PMC victims and the other victim groups. But what explains why the other risk/protective factor variables were inconclusive in the NSPS data and overall the Australian context? The NSPS includes a number of different items that tap into ethnicity, including ancestry, religion and country of birth which Connelly, Gayle, and Lambert (2016) have described as the "multiple characteristics" approach. Surveys within other countries, such as the United Kingdom, use the "mutually exclusive category" approach, where respondents self-identify into group categories that include their national origins and other more visible differences (e.g., White English, White and Black Caribbean, Asian British, Black British, etc.; Connelly et al., 2016). In Australia, however, ethnicity is measured by, for example, a common language, a common birth country or a common religion, which does not distinguish between the visible differences of minority groups. Descriptive

statistics around the *foreign born* variable, for example, indicate a high percentage of PMC victims born in Australia. This, however, does not automatically indicate that they do not belong to a visible minority group, nor does an indication of a birth country of India and Peru indicate that the respondent belongs to a visible minority.

A further key finding suggests that respondents with higher perceptions of police legitimacy and more favorable views towards the federal government were more likely to be in the group indicating no victimization within the past twelve months. Individuals who see the government as legitimate will be more likely to accept laws implemented by the government and take on the responsibility to abide by such laws and cooperate with government bodies. As the police is a government agency, a lack of fair contact with the police could influence perceptions towards the government, as the state has responsibility for the peace and protection of individuals (Tyler, 2003). Contact with the police (both unsatisfactory and positive) can have an influence on people's confidence in the police (Bradford, Jackson, & Stanko, 2009). People who have not experienced any crime in the past twelve months may be less likely to have had recent police contact, which may explain their more positive attitudes towards police.

This study also highlights that victimization context does matter as there are important differences between crime types (see, e.g., Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Perceptions of police legitimacy (in respondents) stands out as a key factor distinguishing between PMC victims and non-PMC victims, in that PMC victims had even lower perceptions of police legitimacy than non-PMC victims. This is a significant result, as both groups have experienced victimization, but higher perceptions of police legitimacy increase the likelihood of a person being in the non-PMC victim group, and lower perceptions of police legitimacy increase the likelihood of people being in the PMC victim group. These findings have implications for victims' reporting patterns, as people who lack confidence in the police are unlikely to report a crime to the police (Cherney & Chui, 2009; Murphy &

Cherney, 2011; Tyler, 2005, 2011), and are especially problematic within the PMC context, as recent findings by XXX et al. (2018) suggest that victims' low perceptions of police legitimacy are a significant barrier to reporting PMC to police. This paper adds further to these results by indicating that PMC victims differ significantly in their police legitimacy levels from the other two victim groups.

Prior research suggests that victimization experiences have an impact on attitudes towards criminal justice system agencies, such as the police (see, e.g., Sprott & Doob, 2009). As the NSPS dataset is cross-sectional data, identifying if victims' perceptions of police legitimacy were already less favorable prior to the crime incident, or if the subsequent police contact resulted in victims' lower perceptions of police legitimacy, is not possible within this study. Future research needs to explore in detail what factors influence victims' lower perceptions of police legitimacy. As recent research by Berthelot, McNeal, and Baldwin (2018) points out, a more nuanced approach may be necessary, investigating prior contact, demographics, victimization experiences, and trust and confidence in the police within one study. Considerably more work will need to be done to determine the impact of victimization experiences on perceptions of government legitimacy. Future longitudinal studies may be able to uncover, if perceptions of government legitimacy change with the experience of a crime event, if prior experiences with government agencies can taint this trust, or if demographic factors may have an impact on such trust levels. Especially within current political climates, government legitimacy becomes an important consideration; specifically as societies still grapple with disproportionate and unfair practices and procedures of government agencies and the manifestation of systemic inequalities in governments around the world.

References

- Aviv, G., & Weisburd, D. (2016). Reducing the gap in perceptions of legitimacy of victims and non-victims: The importance of police performance. *International Review of Victimology*, 22(2), 83-104. doi:10.1177/0269758015627041
- Benier, K. (2017). The harms of hate: Comparing the neighbouring practices and interactions of hate crime victims, non-hate crime victims and non-victims. *International Review of Victimology*, 23(2), 179-201. doi:10.1177/0269758017693087
- Berthelot, E. R., McNeal, B. A., & Baldwin, J. M. (2018). Relationships between agency-specific contact, victimization type, and trust and confidence in the police and courts. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(4), 768-791. doi:10.1007/s12103-018-9434-x
- Blazak, R. (2011). Isn't every crime a hate crime?: The case for hate crime laws. *Sociology Compass*, 5(4), 244-255. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00364.x
- Bradford, B. (2014). Policing and social identity: Procedural justice, inclusion and cooperation between police and public. *Policing and Society*, 24(1), 22-43. doi:10.1080/10439463.2012.724068
- Bradford, B., Jackson, J., & Stanko, E. A. (2009). Contact and confidence: Revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police. *Policing and Society*, 19(1), 20-46. doi:10.1080/10439460802457594
- Burgess, A. W., & Regehr, C. (2010). Victimology concepts and theories. In A. Burgess, C. Regehr, & A. Roberts (Eds.), *Victimology: Theories and applications* (pp. 31-66). Sudbury, Massachusetts, London: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Cherney, A., & Chui, W. H. (2009). Policing ethnically and culturally diverse communities. In R. Broadhurst & S. E. Davies (Eds.), *Policing in context: An introduction to police work in Australia* (1st ed., pp. 160-173). South Melbourne, Vic: Oxford University Press.

- Chongatera, G. (2013). Hate-crime victimization and fear of hate crime among racially visible people in Canada: The role of income as a mediating factor. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 11(1), 44-64. doi:10.1080/15562948.2013.759037
- Connelly, R., Gayle, V., & Lambert, P. S. (2016). Ethnicity and ethnic group measures in social survey research. *Methodological Innovations*, 9, 2059799116642885. doi:10.1177/2059799116642885
- Culotta, K. A. (2005). Why victims hate to report: Factors affecting victim reporting in hate crime cases in Chicago. *Kriminologija & Socijalna Integracija*, 13(2), 15-27. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Why-victims-hate-to-report-%3A-Factors-affecting-in-Culotta/7b1b6edd5281bf6b94bb2da1299cd206f69e1e5e>
- Davies, P., Francis, P., & Greer, C. (2017). Victims, crime and society: An introduction. In P. Davies, P. Francis, & C. Greer (Eds.), *Victims, crime & society: An introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 1-29). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Disabled People's Organisations Australia. (2018). Factsheet: Violence and abuse against persons with disability. Retrieved from <https://dpoa.org.au/factsheet-violence/>
- Dixon, M., Reed, H., Rogers, B., & Stone, L. (2006). *CrimeShare: The unequal impact of crime*. Retrieved from London, UK: https://www.ippr.org/files/images/media/files/publication/2011/05/crimeshare_1500.pdf
- Gabor, T., & Mata, F. (2004). Victimization and repeat victimization over the life span: A predictive study and implications for policy. *International Review of Victimology*, 10(3), 193-221. doi:10.1177/026975800401000301
- Gan, L., Williams III, R. C., & Wiseman, T. (2011). A simple model of optimal hate crime legislation. *Economic Inquiry*, 49(3), 674-684. doi:10.1111/j.1465-7295.2009.00281.x

- Gau, J. M. (2011). The convergent and discriminant validity of procedural justice and police legitimacy: An empirical test of core theoretical propositions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(6), 489-498. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.09.004>
- Griner, S. B., Vamos, C. A., Thompson, E. L., Logan, R., Vázquez-Otero, C., & Daley, E. M. (2017). The intersection of gender identity and violence: Victimization experienced by transgender college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0(0), 0886260517723743. doi:10.1177/0886260517723743
- Hall, N. (2012). Policing hate crime in London and New York City: Some reflections on the factors influencing effective law enforcement, service provision and public trust and confidence. *International Review of Victimology*, 18(1), 73-87. doi:10.1177/0269758011422477
- Heimer, K., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2008). Gender and violence in the United States: trends in offending and victimization. In A. A. Goldberger & R. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Understanding Crime Trends: Workshop Report* (pp. 45–80). Washington, DC: Natl. Acad. Press.
- Hindelang, M. J., Gottfredson, M. R., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.
- Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40(1), 27-42. doi:10.1375/acri.40.1.27
- Home Office, Ministry of Justice, & Office for National Statistics (2013). *An overview of hate crime in England and Wales*. Gov.uk. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/266358/hate-crime-2013.pdf

- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (1991). *Racist violence: Report of the national inquiry into racist violence in Australia*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Publishing Service. Retrieved from <http://apo.org.au/node/30991>
- Johnson, H. (2005a). *Crime victimisation in Australia: Key findings of the 2004 International Crime Victimization Survey*. (298). Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved from <https://aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/tandi298>
- Johnson, H. (2005b). *Crime victimisation in Australia: Key results of the 2004 International Crime Victimization Survey*. (64). Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved from <https://aic.gov.au/publications/rpp/rpp64>
- Johnson, H. (2005c). *Experiences of crime in two selected migrant communities*. (302). Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved from <https://aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/tandi302>
- Lauritsen, J. L., & Rezey, M. L. (2018). Victimization trends and correlates: Macro- and microinfluences and new directions for research. *Annual Review of Criminology, 1*(1), 103-121. doi:10.1146/annurev-criminol-032317-092202
- Lawrence, F. M. (1999). *Punishing hate: Bias crimes under American law*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lewis, C. S. (2013). *Tough on hate?: The cultural politics of hate crimes*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables* (Vol. 7). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2006). *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata* (Vol. 2). College Station, TX: Stata Press.

- Mason, G. (2012). 'I am tomorrow': Violence against Indian students in Australia and political denial. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 45(1), 4-25.
doi:10.1177/0004865811431330
- Mason, G. (2014). The hate threshold: Emotion, causation and difference in the construction of prejudice-motivated crime. *Social & Legal Studies*, 23(3), 293-314.
doi:10.1177/0964663914534459
- Mason, G. (2019). A picture of bias crime in New South Wales *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 11(1), 47-66. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5130/ccs.v11.i1.6402>
- Mason, G., & Dyer, A. (2013). 'A negation of Australia's fundamental values': Sentencing prejudice-motivated crime. *Melbourne University Law Review*, 36(3), 871-914. Retrieved from <http://search.informit.com.au/fullText;dn=454628421743698;res=IELHSS>
- Mastrocinque, J. M., & McDowall, D. (2016). Does recent victimization impact confidence in the criminal justice system? *Victims & Offenders*, 11(3), 482-499.
doi:10.1080/15564886.2014.988898
- McDevitt, J., Balboni, J., Garcia, L., & Gu, J. (2001). Consequences for victims: A comparison of bias- and non-bias-motivated assaults. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(4), 697-713.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764201045004010>
- Medoff, M. H. (1999). Allocation of time and hateful behavior: A theoretical and positive analysis of hate and hate crimes. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 58(4), 959-973.
doi:10.1111/j.1536-7150.1999.tb03403.x
- Morgan, R. E., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2019). *Criminal victimization, 2018*. (NCJ 253043). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv18.pdf>
- Morris, S.V.C., Rockett, J.L., & Elechi, O. O. (2014). Victimization patterns. In J. S. Albanese (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 1-6).

- Murphy, K., & Barkworth, J. (2014). Victim willingness to report crime to police: Does procedural justice or outcome matter most? *Victims & Offenders*, 9(2), 178-204.
doi:10.1080/15564886.2013.872744
- Murphy, K., & Cherney, A. (2011). Fostering cooperation with the police: How do ethnic minorities in Australia respond to procedural justice-based policing? *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 44(2), 235-257. doi:10.1177/0004865811405260
- Murphy, K., & Cherney, A. (2012). Understanding cooperation with police in a diverse society. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 52(1), 181-201. doi:10.1093/bjc/azr065
- Murphy, K., Murphy, B., & Mearns, M. (2010). *The 2007 Public Safety and Security in Australia survey: Survey methodology and preliminary findings*. (16). Geelong, Vic: Alfred Deakin Research Institute Retrieved from <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30051868>
- Murphy, K., Tyler, T. R., & Curtis, A. (2009). Nurturing regulatory compliance: Is procedural justice effective when people question the legitimacy of the law? *Regulation & Governance*, 3(1), 1-26. doi:10.1111/j.1748-5991.2009.01043.x
- Pendergast, P. M., Wadsworth, T., & LePree, J. (2018). Immigration, crime, and victimization in the US Context. In R. Martínez, M. E. Hollis, & J. I. Stowell (Eds.), *The Handbook of Race, Ethnicity, Crime, and Justice* (pp. 65-85): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2012). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. *International Review of Victimology*, 18(1), 57-71. doi:10.1177/0269758011422475
- XXX et al. (2013).
- Reisig, M. D., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M. G. (2007). The construct validity and refinement of process-based policing measures. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(8), 1005-1028.
doi:10.1177/0093854807301275

- Shively, M., McDevitt, J., Cronin, S., & Balboni, J. (2001). *Understanding the prevalence and characteristics of bias crime in Massachusetts high schools, Final Report*. (NCJ 200991). Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=200991>
- Sprott, J. B., & Doob, A. N. (2009). The effect of urban neighborhood disorder on evaluations of the police and courts. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55(3), 339-362. doi:10.1177/0011128707306689
- Stacey, M., Averett, P., & Knox, B. (2018). An exploration of victimization in the older Lesbian population. *Victims & Offenders*, 13(5), 693-710. doi:10.1080/15564886.2018.1468368
- Steer, G. (2011). *Policing hatred: The rise in bias motivated crime and how effective policing strategies can positively impact communities*. Paper presented at the Seventh Australasian Women and Policing Conference, Hobart. <http://www.acwap.com.au/conferences/Papers%2011/Steer.pdf>
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548. doi:10.1111/1540-5893.3703002
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Tankebe, J. (2013). Viewing things differently: The dimensions of public perceptions of police legitimacy. *Criminology*, 51(1), 103-135. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00291.x
- Tankebe, J., Reisig, M. D., & Wang, X. (2016). A multidimensional model of police legitimacy: A cross-cultural assessment. *Law and Human Behavior*, 40(1), 11-22.
- Thomas, S. D. M., Nixon, M., Ogloff, J. R. P., & Daffern, M. (2019). Crime and victimization among people with intellectual disability with and without comorbid mental illness. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 32(5), 1088-1095. doi:10.1111/jar.12598

- Tong, M. S., Kaplan, L. M., Guzman, D., Ponath, C., & Kushel, M. B. (2019). Persistent homelessness and violent victimization among older adults in the HOPE HOME study. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 0*(0), 0886260519850532. doi:10.1177/0886260519850532
- Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. *Crime and Justice, 30*, 283-357. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147701>
- Tyler, T. R. (2005). Policing in black and white: Ethnic group differences in trust and confidence in the police. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 322-342. doi:10.1177/1098611104271105
- Tyler, T. R. (2011). Trust and legitimacy: Policing in the USA and Europe. *European Journal of Criminology, 8*(4), 254-266. doi:10.1177/1477370811411462
- Useem, B., & Useem, M. (1979). Government legitimacy and political stability. *Social Forces, 57*(3), 840-852. doi:10.1093/sf/57.3.840
- van der Toorn, J., Tyler, T. R., & Jost, J. T. (2011). More than fair: Outcome dependence, system justification, and the perceived legitimacy of authority figures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(1), 127-138. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.09.003>
- Van Kesteren, J. (2016). Assessing the risk and prevalence of hate crime victimization in Western Europe. *International Review of Victimology, 22*(2), 139-160. doi:10.1177/0269758015627046
- Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission (2010). *Submission to the review of identity-motivated hate crime*. Victorian Department of Justice
- von Hentig, H. (1948). *The criminal & his victim: Studies in the sociobiology of crime*. Oxford: Yale University Press.
- Weatherford, M. S. (1992). Measuring political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review, 86*(1), 149-166. doi:10.2307/1964021
- Wickes, R., Ham, K., & Pickering, S. (2013). Prejudice motivated crime in Victoria: An examination of LEAP incidents from 2000 to 2011. *Briefing Document to the Victoria Police Service*.

- Wickes, R. L., Pickering, S., Mason, G., Maher, J. M., & McCulloch, J. (2016). From hate to prejudice: Does the new terminology of prejudice motivated crime change perceptions and reporting actions? *British Journal of Criminology*, 56(2), 239-255. doi:10.1093/bjc/azv041
- XXX (2016).
- XXX et al. (2018).
- Willis, M. (2011). *Non-disclosure of violence in Australian Indigenous communities*. (No. 405). Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology Retrieved from http://www.aic.gov.au/media_library/publications/tandi_pdf/tandi405.pdf
- Zedner, L. (2002). Victims. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Zur, O. (1995). Rethinking 'don't blame the victim': The psychology of victimhood. *Journal of Couples Therapy*, 4(3-4), 15-36. doi:10.1300/J036v04n03_03

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of risk/protective factors for victimization in NSPS.

Risk/protective factors for victimization	Non-victim (%, M, Md)	Non-PMC victim (%, M, Md)	PMC victims (%, M, Md)
<i>LOTE</i>			
Yes	6.23%	2.53%	2.17%
No	93.77%	97.47%	97.83%
<i>ATSI</i>			
Yes	0.97%	0.84%	2.17%
No	99.03%	99.16%	97.83%
<i>Australian citizen</i>			
Yes	90.74%	93.82%	97.83%
No	9.26%	6.18%	2.17%
<i>Foreign born</i>			
Yes	25.10%	19.94%	28.26%
No	74.90%	80.06%	71.74%
Preference for Anglo-Saxons as neighbours	M: 2.721 (1, 5) Md: 3	M: 2.751 (1, 5) Md: 3	M: 2.946 (1,5) Md: 3
<i>Religion</i>			
Christian	63.44%	63.48%	58.70%
Other	36.56%	36.52%	41.30%

Table 2 Factor analysis for policing context utilising items to construct scales.

Item	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Perceptions of Police Legitimacy¹¹</i>						
Police try to be fair when making decisions.	0.7635					
Police treat people fairly.	0.8220					
Police treat people with dignity and respect.	0.8336					
Police are always polite when dealing with people.	0.7488					
Police listen to people before making decisions.	0.7916					
Police make decisions based upon facts, not their personal biases or opinions.	0.7985					
Police respect people's rights when decisions are made.	0.8274					
Overall, I think that police are doing a good job in my community.	0.7999					
I trust the police in my community.	0.8347					
I have confidence in the police in my community.	0.8393					
Police are accessible to the people in this community.	0.6875					
<i>Cooperation with police</i>						
Call the police to report a crime.		0.8348				
Help police find someone suspected of committing a crime by providing them with information.		0.8731				
Report dangerous or suspicious activity to police.		0.8330				
Willingly assist police if needed.		0.8480				
<i>Identifying with Australia and its community</i>						
I see myself first and mainly as a member of the Australian community.			0.8149			
It is important for me to be seen by others as a member of the Australian community.			0.7472			
I am proud to be Australian.			0.8298			
What Australia stands for is important for me.			0.8269			
<i>Perceptions of Federal Government Legitimacy</i>						
How much of the time can you trust the Australian government to do what is right?				0.7632		
How much confidence do you have in the Prime Minister of Australia?				0.8133		
How much confidence do you have in Federal Politicians?				0.7111		
How much confidence do you have in Federal Parliament?				0.7724		
<i>Perceptions of Law Legitimacy</i>						
You should always obey the law even if it goes against what you think is right.					0.8595	
I feel a moral obligation to obey the law.					0.7973	
People should do what our laws tell them to do even if they disagree with them.					0.8876	
<i>Perceptions of State Government Legitimacy</i>						
How much confidence do you have in your State Premier?						0.8013
How much confidence do you have in your State Politicians?						0.8258
Eigenvalues	7.32019	3.12270	2.76647	2.64274	2.39843	1.79408

¹¹ The perceptions of police legitimacy scale include procedural justice items, because the items load highly onto one factor and the two separate scales are highly correlated.

Table 3 Comparing non-PMC victims vs. non-victims (base).

Control & explanatory variables	Model 1 RRR [95% CI] SE	Model 2 RRR [95% CI] SE	Model 3 RRR [95% CI] SE
<i>Control Variables: Demographics</i>			
Age (18-95)	0.979***[0.973, 0.986] 0.003	0.979***[0.972, 0.986] 0.003	0.981***[0.974, 0.988] 0.004
Gender (female)	0.880 [0.740, 1.046] 0.078	0.881 [0.739, 1.051] 0.079	0.928 [0.775, 1.111] 0.085
Dependent children	1.126 [0.909, 1.394] 0.123	1.124 [0.905, 1.394] 0.124	1.125 [0.904, 1.400] 0.126
Income	1.025 [0.978, 1.073] 0.024	1.021 [0.974, 1.070] 0.024	1.025 [0.978, 1.075] 0.025
Education	1.099**[1.023, 1.179] 0.040	1.113**[1.035, 1.196] 0.041	1.138***[1.056, 1.227] 0.044
Home ownership	0.896 [0.702, 1.143] 0.111	0.870 [0.680, 1.112] 0.109	0.896 [0.698, 1.150] 0.114
Married	0.657***[0.545, 0.793] 0.063	0.652***[0.539, 0.788] 0.063	0.676***[0.558, 0.820] 0.067
Unemployed	1.370 [0.785, 2.393] 0.390	1.278 [0.721, 2.265] 0.373	1.365 [0.768, 2.428] 0.401
<i>Control Variables: Risk/Protective Factors for Victimization</i>			
LOTE		0.781 [0.443, 1.377] 0.226	0.831 [0.467, 1.479] 0.245
ATSI		0.777 [0.314, 1.921] 0.359	0.739 [0.297, 1.837] 0.343
Australian citizen		0.791 [0.534, 1.171] 0.158	0.817 [0.546, 1.223] 0.168
Foreign born		0.928 [0.733, 1.175] 0.112	0.912 [0.717, 1.159] 0.112
Preference for Anglo-Saxons as neighbours		1.052 [0.951, 1.163] 0.054	1.027 [0.926, 1.138] 0.054
Religion (Christian)		1.107 [0.923, 1.328] 0.103	1.090 [0.903, 1.315] 0.104
<i>Explanatory Variables:</i>			
Police legitimacy			0.838*[0.719, 0.976] 0.065
Cooperation with police			0.863 [0.742, 1.002] 0.066
Identifying with Australia and its community			1.076 [0.940, 1.233] 0.075
Law legitimacy			0.990 [0.865, 1.134] 0.068
Federal government legitimacy			0.673***[0.552, 0.820] 0.068
State government legitimacy			0.983 [0.822, 1.174] 0.089

Note: *p-value < 0.05; **p-value < 0.01; ***p-value < 0.001; statistical significance of difference from the reference category.

Table 4 Comparing non-victims vs. PMC victims (base).

Control & explanatory variables	Model 1 RRR [95% CI] SE	Model 2 RRR [95% CI] SE	Model 3 RRR [95% CI] SE
<i>Control Variables: Demographics</i>			
Age (18-95 years)	1.024*[1.002, 1.046] 0.011	1.026*[1.003, 1.049] 0.012	1.025*[1.001, 1.049] 0.012
Gender (female)	1.095 [0.597, 2.009] 0.339	1.074 [0.583, 1.981] 0.335	1.057 [0.562, 1.988] 0.341
Dependent children	1.126 [0.520, 2.436] 0.443	1.111 [0.513, 2.403] 0.437	1.082 [0.499, 2.346] 0.427
Income	1.166 [0.973, 1.397] 0.108	1.159 [0.967, 1.391] 0.108	1.164 [0.969, 1.397] 0.109
Education	1.017 [0.799, 1.294] 0.125	1.038 [0.810, 1.330] 0.131	1.026 [0.796, 1.322] 0.133
Home ownership	1.939 [0.983, 3.826] 0.672	1.953 [0.986, 3.869] 0.681	1.702 [0.844, 3.430] 0.609
Married	1.803 [0.931, 3.493] 0.608	1.846 [0.950, 3.585] 0.625	1.790 [0.918, 3.491] 0.610
Unemployed	0.300*[0.098, 0.919] 0.171	0.283*[0.091, 0.876] 0.163	0.292*[0.092, 0.929] 0.172
<i>Control Variables: Risk/Protective Factors for Victimization</i>			
LOTE		1.903 [0.237, 15.265] 2.021	1.892 [0.231, 15.468] 2.028
ATSI		0.633 [0.080, 5.010] 0.668	0.653 [0.082, 5.175] 0.690
Australian citizen		0.223 [0.029, 1.728] 0.233	0.243 [0.031, 1.911] 0.256
Foreign born		0.466*[0.232, 0.936] 0.166	0.491*[0.242, 0.998] 0.178
Preference for Anglo-Saxons as neighbours		0.755 [0.534, 1.065] 0.133	0.834 [0.589, 1.181] 0.148
Religion (Christian)		1.112 [0.600, 2.059] 0.350	1.133 [0.604, 2.127] 0.364
<i>Explanatory Variables</i>			
Police legitimacy			2.269***[1.446, 3.560] 0.521
Cooperation with police			1.043 [0.502, 1.282] 0.192
Identifying with Australia and its community			0.802 [0.452, 1.101] 0.160
Law legitimacy			0.705 [0.463, 1.118] 0.162
Federal government legitimacy			1.325 [0.660, 2.663] 0.472
State government legitimacy			1.167 [0.615, 2.216] 0.382

Note: *p-value < 0.05; **p-value < 0.01; ***p-value < 0.001; statistical significance of difference from the reference category.

Table 5 Comparing non-PMC victims vs. PMC victims (base).

Control & explanatory variables	Model 1 RRR [95% CI] SE	Model 2 RRR [95% CI] SE	Model 3 RRR [95% CI] SE
<i>Control Variables: Demographics</i>			
Age (18-95 years)	1.002 [0.981, 1.025] 0.011	1.004 [0.982, 1.027] 0.012	1.005 [0.981, 1.030] 0.012
Gender (female)	0.964 [0.518, 1.793] 0.305	0.947 [0.506, 1.772] 0.303	0.981 [0.514, 1.870] 0.323
Dependent children	1.268 [0.577, 2.783] 0.508	1.248 [0.568, 2.741] 0.501	1.218 [0.554, 2.677] 0.489
Income	1.194 [0.994, 1.436] 0.112	1.184 [0.984, 1.425] 0.112	1.193 [0.991, 1.437] 0.113
Education	1.117 [0.872, 1.430] 0.141	1.155 [0.896, 1.489] 0.150	1.168 [0.901, 1.514] 0.155
Home ownership	1.737 [0.860, 3.507] 0.623	1.698 [0.837, 3.445] 0.613	1.524 [0.740, 3.140] 0.562
Married	1.186 [0.602, 2.334] 0.410	1.203 [0.609, 2.375] 0.418	1.210 [0.611, 2.399] 0.422
Unemployed	0.411 [0.127, 1.330] 0.246	0.362 [0.110, 1.190] 0.220	0.398 [0.119, 1.339] 0.246
<i>Control Variables: Risk/Protective Factors for Victimization</i>			
LOTE		1.486 [0.178, 12.425] 1.610	1.572 [0.185, 13.343] 1.715
ATSI		0.491 [0.055, 4.354] 0.547	0.482 [0.054, 4.281] 0.537
Australian citizen		0.177 [0.022, 1.394] 0.186	0.198 [0.025, 1.594] 0.211
Foreign born		0.433*[0.210, 0.890] 0.159	0.448*[0.215, 0.932] 0.167
Preference for Anglo-Saxons as neighbours		0.793 [0.557, 1.130] 0.143	0.856 [0.600, 1.222] 0.155
Religion (Christian)		1.231 [0.654, 2.314] 0.397	1.235 [0.648, 2.353] 0.406
<i>Explanatory Variables</i>			
Police legitimacy			1.901**[1.197, 3.018] 0.449
Cooperation with police			0.900 [0.563, 1.439] 0.216
Identifying with Australia and its community			0.863 [0.535, 1.393] 0.211
Law legitimacy			0.698 [0.443, 1.101] 0.162
Federal government legitimacy			0.892 [0.437, 1.821] 0.325
State government legitimacy			1.147 [0.595, 2.209] 0.384

Note: *p-value < 0.05; **p-value < 0.01; ***p-value < 0.001; statistical significance of difference from the reference category.