

**Understanding Perceptions of Victimisation: A Critical Analysis of Gay and Bisexual
Male Grindr Users Negotiations of Safety and Risk**

Dr Ben Colliver (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0375-9410>)

C366 Curzon Building

Birmingham City University

Birmingham

England

B4 &BD

0121 331 6234

Ben.colliver@bcu.ac.uk

Abstract

The victimisation of gay and bisexual men has gained significant academic and social attention, with that focus extending to the role of digital victimisation. Grindr has dominated the market for online dating apps targeting gay, bisexual, trans and queer people. Drawing on qualitative data collected with men who use Grindr, this paper addresses a gap in criminological literature by exploring the way that men that have sex with men negotiate perceptions of safety when engaging in real-world meetings that have been facilitated by Grindr. It is argued throughout this paper that risk-reduction strategies adopted by interviewees only reduce the perception of risk, rather than the actual risk of experiencing violent victimisation. As such, it is claimed exploring digital integration offers a more nuanced reading of the intertwined and fraught relations of risk and safety within digital and physical spaces.

Keywords: Risk, Safety, Grindr, Violence, Online Dating, Homosexuality

Understanding Perceptions of Victimisation: A Critical Analysis of Gay and Bisexual Male Grindr Users Negotiations of Safety and Risk

Introduction

The rise in popularity of dating, and hook-up apps has been transformative in the ways gay, and bisexual men, and men who have sex with men (MSM) connect (Chan, 2018). Of dating and hook-up apps available for MSM, Grindr has dominated the market, with over 3,000,000 daily users, across 200 countries (Fitzsimons, 2019) and is described as ‘the world’s largest social networking app for gay, bi, trans and queer people’ (Grindr, N.D). However, the app has received national attention, most notably in 2016 when Stephen Port, commonly known as ‘The Grindr Killer’, was convicted for the murder of four men who he had initiated contact with on the app (Mackintosh, 2022). This case drew national attention in the United Kingdom to the potential risks associated with online dating and hook-up apps and demonstrated the most extreme manifestation of risk. This is not an issue confined to the UK, as news reports have documented violence and murders facilitated by connections made on Grindr globally, including in Australia (Proust, 2021), Spain (Wakefield, 2022) and the United States (Dickinson, 2021). There is a growing body of research exploring risk using different frameworks, and research has identified risks relating to experiencing racism within apps (Callender *et al.*, 2016; Conner, 2018), unwanted sexual contact (Albury and Byron, 2016), and being outed (Blackwell *et al.*, 2015). However, there is less research that addresses how gay and bisexual men negotiate their understanding of risk and safety relating to physical violence when engaging in real-life hook-ups that have been facilitated by a connection established on a hook-up app.

In this article, I draw upon qualitative data collected through 12 in-depth, semi-structured interviews to address some ways in which gay and bisexual men who use Grindr understand, conceptualise and respond to notions of risk and safety whilst using the app. Made up of 3 parts, I begin this article with an overview of existing literature that has explored notions of safety and risk in the context of online dating and hook-up apps. I then outline some of the key frameworks that have been utilised to understand the victimisation of, and violence against gay and bisexual men. The second part of this article addresses some of the methodological, and ethical considerations that were made throughout this research project.

The third and final part of this article reports the key findings of this research project in relation to how users of Grindr negotiate their perceived sense of safety and risk when engaging with others on the app. Through exploring three key themes, I argue that Grindr users' negotiations of safety increased levels of confidence that a digital trail between the victim and perpetrator would exist, rather than prevent victimisation. I begin by exploring the home as a 'safe' space and present the ways in which participants understand the 'familiar' to be safe. In doing so, the risks associated with the 'unknown', the 'other', are perceived to be minimised by engaging with them in a place of familiarity. This is understood both symbolically, and practically. Secondly, I outline the ways in which technology, specifically video-calling and cross-platform verification, are used by participants to confirm the identity of a potential sexual, romantic or platonic partner. The last section of empirical data presented relates to that of a nominated guardian. That is, an individual who is sent details of where participants were going, who they were meeting, and what action the guardian should take if they are unable to contact the participant after a pre-specified time period. Whilst this does demonstrate that issues of safety and risk are certainly considered by participants and they engage in perceived risk-reduction strategies, it is argued that these strategies do not prevent or minimise the risk of victimisation occurring. Rather, the strategies used by participants purely alleviate their feelings of safety in real-life situations that they deem risky in relation to experiencing interpersonal incidents of violent victimisation. Therefore, the safety mechanisms that participants rely on to minimise their risk of victimisation purely address *feelings* of safety, rather than offering the prevention of violent victimisation.

Risk, Safety and Online Dating

Risk refers to the anticipation of 'catastrophe' (Beck, 2006:332). In this sense, risk is not real, yet remains omnipresent. Risk is therefore becoming real (Van Loon, 2002). When a risk becomes 'real', it no longer represents a risk and instead becomes a 'catastrophe' (Beck, 2006). Risks are anticipated events that threaten the individual's or societal safety, freedom and livelihood among other things. In this study, risk is concerned with the anticipation of experiencing interpersonal violence in the 'offline' world as a result of establishing an initial connection with someone online. In this sense, the risk referred to throughout this article refers to the perception of victimisation occurring. Joffe (1999:132) suggests a 'not me – other' model for understanding how people perceive and navigate risks, arguing that responses to risk are commonly understood as 'others are to blame'. As such, danger becomes an essential characteristic of the 'other' (Couch *et al.*, 2012). This is particularly

pertinent to this study, as the crux of engaging with hook-up apps is to encounter the ‘other’, either virtually, physically, or both.

Möller *et al* (2006) have argued that although safety is routinely discussed, the concept itself has not been theoretically engaged with adequately. They argue that conceptualising safety as purely the antonym of risk ‘does not give an exhaustive understanding of the concept’ (Möller *et al.*, 2006:419). They further argue that safety cannot be fully understood in purely objective, or subjective terms, and rather suggest that the concept of safety is best understood from an ‘intersubjective’ perspective (Möller *et al.*, 2006:427). Intersubjective safety therefore describes the position in which ‘varying scenarios or states of being are evaluated in relation to one another. That is, rather than defining one scenario as safe and another as risky, it is more appropriate to consider whether one scenario is ‘at least as safe as’ another, given the relative probabilities of dangerous outcomes’ (Stardust *et al.*, 2022:7). Intersubjective safety is useful in this context, in which app users may compare the relative safety of an online hook-up to the safety of a hook-up resulting from establishing a connection in a physical space, for example, a pub or nightclub. Establishing virtual connections may offer more opportunities to engage in perceived risk-reduction strategies, and therefore, as will be explored in this article, online hook-ups may be seen as safer. However, as demonstrated throughout this paper, connecting with strangers online may only appear superficially to be safer than more traditional means of hooking-up including bathhouses, public toilets and public sex environments.

There are a number of online risks that have been identified in relation to hook-up and dating apps, with Albury *et al.* (2021) highlighting that catfishing or encountering deceptive profiles is a key concern for app-users. To address this, users may engage in ‘cross-platform practices’ (Race, 2017:179-180). This involves using multiple social media platforms to verify someone’s identity. As Albury and Byron (2016:5) argue, photo-sharing is seen ‘as a crucial means of establishing trust with a potential partner’. However, this may be more difficult for app users’ who are not out¹ and being outed has been identified as another perceived risk of using online dating apps (Albury and Byron, 2016; Jaspal, 2016). A further concern identified with using online dating and hook-up apps was experiencing image-based sexual abuse (Powell, 2021). Dietzel (2022) found that MSM who use online dating and hook-up apps are more than twice as likely to experience this type of victimisation than the

¹ ‘Out’ refers to an individual who does not conceal their sexual orientation.

general population. Henry and Powell (2018) argue that dating apps may facilitate offline violent and sexual offending, in which dating apps may be used to organise an offline meeting with someone in order to sexually or physically victimise them, or to arrange a third party to sexually or physically victimise them. Despite this, there is relatively little research that explores offline offending that is specifically facilitated by dating apps (Pooley and Boxall, 2020). Instead, research exploring risk and dating-app use among gay and bisexual men has been dominated by public health research with a focus on sexual health (Albury and Byron, 2016).

One of the key features of Grindr is its use of global positioning systems (GPS) to connect its users to others who are geographically close to them. This feature, however, has raised concerns regarding privacy and safety (Albury and Byron, 2016; Murphy, 2018). However, given that this is a key feature, it can be argued that location disclosure is actually a motivating factor for using the app, rather than a concern around privacy and safety (Birnholtz *et al.*, 2014). Given that geo-location is a key feature, it creates a ‘complex layering of virtual and physical places and conflation of their boundaries’ (Blackwell *et al.*, 2015: 1131). Grindr therefore creates a liminal space in which sexuality is at the fore and it seemingly transcends usual boundaries, with sexual desire at the forefront. It is therefore key to consider harms and victimisation that may transcend these boundaries that separate the online from the offline and explore the relationship between offline victimisation that is facilitated through an online connection. Despite the risks identified, Byron *et al.* (2021:509) found that ‘safety arrangements were less common’ for cisgender gay and bisexual men than for trans and non-binary people. It is this area that this paper seeks to build on, by outlining a number of measures that gay and bisexual men use in order to enhance their perceived sense of safety from experiencing physical or sexual victimisation offline as a result of initiating contact via a dating app. In doing so, this paper advances criminological understanding of violence against gay and bisexual men by its focus on perceptions of safety, risk and victimisation in the newly expanded phenomenon of sexual relations structured in the digital sphere. In focusing on the digital sphere, this paper also reinterprets notions of digital dualism which wrongly reinforces the online and offline worlds as separate, distinct spaces. It emphasises instead a digital integration, which emphasises the overlapping, reciprocal and increasingly intertwined relationship of physical and virtual spaces.

Understanding the Victimisation of Gay and Bisexual Men

Violence against gay and bisexual men has most commonly been investigated in relation to hate crime and homophobic violence (Martin and Alessi, 2012) and intimate-partner violence (Callan *et al.*, 2021). Tomsen (2002) found two scenarios of violence perpetrated against gay and bisexual men. Firstly, violence against gay men in public was predominantly perpetrated by groups of heterosexual men. Secondly, violence that occurred in more private spaces, such as the home, which typically involved one perpetrator and more allegations of unwanted sexual advances made against the victim. In an analysis of murders of gay men in England and Wales, Bartlett (2007) found that murders in which sexual activity was also relevant, occurred primarily in the victim or perpetrators home (78%). Approximately 4% of murders occurred in public sex environments, and 12% occurred in other public spaces. A consistent finding across this research is the relatively high figure of gay men murdered by strangers, or individuals barely known to the victim, which accounted for 45% of victims in Bartlett's (2007) study and 61% in Tomsen's (2002) study. Many of these cases were understood by the police as attempted robberies, in which the perpetrator uses a gay identity to establish a connection with the victim and gain entry to the victim's residence (Bartlett, 2007). These scenarios suggest the potential risks of casual hook-ups with someone unknown to the victim.

It is important to note that 'risky' sex with strangers well predates the advent of geo-location technology. Public spaces, which may be considered 'risky' in relation to being caught by the public or police have been identified as popular public sex environments including public toilets (Tomsen, 2006), designated sex venues (Douglas and Tewksbury, 2008) and public parks (Polley and Tewksbury, 2007). Public sex environments may offer the 'allure of the spontaneous' (Mowlabocus, 2008: 422), but also offer differing risks. For example, whilst all public sex environments may be associated with some level of homophobic violence, public sex in toilets also has the risk of criminalisation, in that despite changes to legislation regarding sex in public, sex in public toilets generally remains illegal (Mowlabocus, 2008). In the United Kingdom, risk of homophobic violence can be seen in various incidents that have occurred on London's Clapham Common, a well-established public sex environment for gay and bisexual men, including the murder of Jody Dobrowski (Iganski, 2008) and the physical attack of an unnamed man who was garrotted with wire, and further attacks resulting in facial injuries (Chakraborti and Garland, 2009). These incidents have also impacted police-community relations, resulting in a breakdown of trust between gay and bisexual men and the police, who have not traditionally been sympathetic to gay men who engage in spontaneous sex (Bartlett, 2007). Burke (1993) documented how police

officers would often target public sex environments frequented by gay and bisexual men to engage in harassment of the users of such spaces.

Despite the widespread sense of greater safety within domestic space or with wholly familiar partners, gay and bisexual men are at risk from violence and abuse across public and private locations and from partners who are strangers, acquaintances, or familiar and well known to victims. Furthermore, the aggressive masculinity of different perpetrators can be a significant threat from strangers, and from casual and ongoing sexual partners who may become violent, controlling or abusive. Research has concluded that gay and bisexual men may even be at a heightened risk of experiencing intimate-partner violence (Messinger, 2017). Whilst masculinity may be understood as central in understanding intimate-partner violence in heterosexual relationships, it can be understood as trivialising or masking violence between same-sex male couples (Oliffe *et al.*, 2014; Stults *et al.*, 2016). For gay and bisexual men, achieving and maintaining a masculine identity may be problematic given the centrality of heterosexuality within hegemonic masculine ideals (Connell, 2005). Masculinities may also be problematic for gay and bisexual men in acknowledging a victim identity, often associated with weakness and passivity (Dunn, 2012).

Gay and bisexual men's experiences of sexual violence in general have received growing research attention (Ford and Becker, 2020; Peretz and Vidmar, 2021). Some gay and bisexual men may refer to heteronormative sex scripts (see Gagnon and Simon, 1973) when negotiating sexual activity, which when transferred to sex between two or more men, place priority on the dominance and pleasure of the 'top'². Ford and Becker (2020) found that this can place undue pressure on the 'bottom'³ to ensure the top has an orgasm and creates pressure to agree to the top's sexual desires. Fear of escalation to violent behaviour may also be present when a potential sexual partner demonstrates or enacts dangerous or toxic masculinity (Ford and Becker, 2020). However, the risks from this are not inevitable. Online hook-up and dating apps therefore offer opportunities to negotiate their goals before engaging in a face-to-face meet (Wu and Ward, 2018). These goals may include sexual desires and boundaries. As Fitzpatrick and Birnholtz (2018: 2478) argue 'Grindr's chat environment both enables and complicates this tension... mediated communication is often characterized by

² In the context of sexual activity, a 'top' commonly describes an individual who adopts the insertive role in anal and/or oral penetration.

³ In the context of sexual activity, A 'bottom' commonly describes an individual who adopts the receptive role in anal and/or oral penetration.

disinhibition in discussing potentially uncomfortable topics such as sex. This can help lead to rapid openness about sexual desires or other practices in the chat'. This is not to say that pre-agreed boundaries are necessarily fixed, or necessarily respected when a face-to-face meeting occurs. However, this communication does provide some opportunity to negotiate expected behaviour.

Methodology

The data presented in this paper is drawn from a broader research project which consisted of semi-structured interviews and an online questionnaire of Grindr users. Empirical data is reported from 12 in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted with gay and bisexual men who used Grindr at the time of interview. As Grindr is used by cisgender and transgender people, it is important to note that the data presented in this article describes the experiences of cisgender men. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to develop a detailed and contextualised account of gay and bisexual men's understanding of, and negotiations of safety and risk when using Grindr. The interviews were conducted between February 2020 and September 2020. All interviews were conducted online due to the national lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Interviews lasted between 45-90 minutes. The focus of the interviews was on participants' understanding of any risks associated with using Grindr, in relationship to the perceived boundaries that may be seen to exist between online and offline contexts. Participants were therefore asked what risks they perceived they may encounter within the app (i.e. catfishing, hate speech) and what risks they perceived they may encounter outside of the app (i.e. physical and sexual violence, risks to sexual health), and also how these risks overlapped and intertwined. Specific attention was then paid to the measures and risk-reduction strategies that participants engaged in that they perceived would reduce the risk of experiencing various forms of victimisation. Whilst a number of risks were identified that related predominantly to online interactions, such as catfishing and fraud, this paper focuses specifically on how participants navigated the risk of experiencing interpersonal violence.

Participants were recruited using 'typical-case' purposive sampling in order to collect information-rich data specific to the aims of the project, rather than to make generalisable statements about the target population (Patton, 2022). For an individual to participate, they were required to be aged 18 or over, live in the United Kingdom at the time of interview, and currently use Grindr. Facebook and Twitter were used to advertise the research project and

included contact details for the researcher should an individual wish to participate. As the online questionnaire was conducted before the interviews, 2 of the participants were also recruited for interview through the ‘interest in further research’ section of the questionnaire.

TABLE 1 – PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Participants recruited for this study reflected a range of different identities in relation to age, ethnicity and disability status. Whilst 6 of the 12 participants were white, only 4 were white British, and 2 were white European. 2 participants were Black British, 1 participant was Asian British, and 1 participant was of dual heritage (white British and Black Caribbean). 5 of the 12 participants also reported having a disability, and participant ages ranged from 18-67 years old.

The semi-structured interviews were fully transcribed. The data was analysed thematically, guided by the six steps outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). An inductive approach was adopted for analysis, as the lack of contemporary research into gay and bisexual men’s experiences of victimisation, risk and safety when using dating and hook-up apps created difficulty in trying to locate pre-existing themes. To engage participants throughout the research process, and in order to ensure participants accounts were reflected authentically, participants were approached and invited to review codes and themes that were developed throughout the analysis of the data.

Ethical approval was granted by [XXXX]. The researcher also utilised a national network of free support services that participants could access should they need additional support. In what follows, I focus on this qualitative data from the interviews to outline three key themes developed from participants’ narratives: ‘home as a safe space’, ‘identity verification’ and ‘nominated guardian’. To ensure the anonymity of all participants, pseudonyms have been assigned in the reporting of findings.

The Home, Familiarity and Safety

The most common theme developed from the data centred around notions of familiarity and safety that the home offered. It is only through excluding outside elements, such as crime, dirt and undesired ‘others’ that the physical space of the ‘house’ becomes a ‘home’ (Ruskin, 1891, Cited in Sennett, 1990). It is in the exclusion of these characteristics that the home becomes ‘familiar’ (Kaika, 2004). Kaika (2004: 272) argues that “the inside becomes safe, familiar and independent not only by excluding rain, cold and pollution, but also through

keeping fear, anxiety, social upheaval and inequality outside”. Notions of the home being familiar, and therefore a place of safety were certainly present within participant narratives.

I just prefer to be at mine, I feel much safer at mine because I know it. An outsider coming in doesn't know my place. They don't know the layout; they don't know where things are. Like, I have the upper hand because it's my place and I know it.
(Rob)

For Rob, the familiarity of the home increases his perception of his own safety, or certainly his ability to avoid victimisation. However, this familiarity has dual purpose. On the one hand, it provides Rob with the ‘upper hand’, because the space is familiar, the layout is familiar, and the belongings are familiar. Therefore, it provides Rob with a perception of safety in which he is able to better navigate the space than a potential ‘outsider’ that he invites in. However, it is also that this space is ‘unknown’ and unfamiliar to the ‘outsider’ who enters. Rob therefore perceives this as increasing his ability to avoid victimisation. It is clear that Rob’s perception of risk and safety play into his preference for facilitating sexual encounters at his own home, rather than entering someone else’s. This is consistent with other research, in which Fitzpatrick and Birnholtz (2018) found that participants would accommodate in-person meets at their own home to ensure greater predictability, which may be closely associated with greater safety. It is here that we see digital integration in practice, in which digital technology, particularly geo-location technology, is embedded within the physical world, creating a space which is an amalgamation of physical and virtual. The use of geo-location creates a unique space in which digital technology is firmly embedded within the physical space. Therefore, whilst people may navigate a virtual space equally, dependent upon their digital literacy, navigating physical spaces is supposedly unbalanced, with one individual supposedly having greater knowledge and accessibility to that space.

Notions of familiarity transcend the physical space, and participants also discussed how familiar they were with potential partners, and how this impacted whether they would travel to someone else’s home to facilitate a meeting.

Like, I would only ever meet someone at mine, I would only go to someone else’s place after we have met at mine a few times. Like, if something is going to go wrong, or something bad is going to happen, there is much more chance that someone will help at my place, because there’s a likelihood that someone will stop by if they don’t

hear from me. It does make me anxious having someone come over, but I do it anyway. (John)

For John, the familiarity of his home provides an opportunity for him to familiarise himself with a potential partner, potentially easing any anxiety felt about physically occupying an unfamiliar space. However, it also raises an interesting point regarding perceptions of ‘trustworthiness’. John would consider travelling to someone else’s home once he had met them previously at his own home and had developed a sense of trust, and therefore a perception of being safe around this person. This frames trust and safety as ‘achieved’ concepts, in which one demonstrates their trustworthiness and are therefore considered safe, which appears to be directly associated with avoiding victimisation. However, this does not account for victimisation that occurs once trust has been established and doesn’t recognise the situational and contextual aspects of behaviour and victimisation.

Whilst participants in this study understood the home to offer a space of safety, research has shown that the home can be a site of various forms of risk and victimisation for those who occupy the home, including domestic abuse (Saewyc *et al.*, 2006), murder (Campbell, 2022) and other forms of violence (Bhandal and Horwood, 2021). However, in John’s narrative, the conceptualisation of the home is more complex, and there is a tension between the desire for casual sexual activity alongside the anxiety and concern about the potential for harm facilitated by such activity. These concerns are mirrored across various physical spaces (both public and private) which facilitate spontaneous and/or anonymous sex with a relative stranger (Tomsen, 2006).

However, participant understanding of the home as a safe space is in keeping with broadly held but fictitious understandings of the ‘home’. As Wigley (1996: 104) claims, the home is “the most primitive drawing of a line that produces an inside opposed to an outside”. This dichotomy of the inside and outside is often representation with the home offering a space of sanctuary, cleanliness and safety, whereas the outside is characterised by risk and danger (Caplan, 2000). Therefore, risk-reduction is essential in maintaining these characteristics of the inside as safe, as “a bad guest [may] result in the displacement, undermining or destruction of everything – and everyone – in the house” (Geyh, 2011: 108). In order to manage the risk of potential visitors, participants often discussed their own measures to ensure they could defend themselves, and their homes.

When I invite someone to come to my yard, I always keep a bat in the wardrobe and I keep a BB gun under the bed, but right by the edge so it's easy to reach. (Tyrhys)

Here, we can see that Tyrhys adopts strategies that he perceives will reduce the risk of experiencing serious violence, and this is reduced by increasing the perceived level of protection he has for himself. Whilst this does not reduce the risk of someone attempting to enact violence upon him, he perceives it as reducing the risk of this being successful. This also speaks to the tension alluded to by John, in which participants understand there to be an inherent risk associated in creating a unique space in which the digital world, and the connections established there, safely manifest in the physical space. This was reiterated by Danny, who explained that:

I always have a knife in my bedroom, and I only ever really relax a bit when the other guy is completely naked. I always have this moment of fear when they first come in, and they have got clothes on. I always feel like they might have a weapon in their pocket. It's even worse when they walk in with a bag. When someone is completely naked, you know they don't have easy access to a weapon anymore, but I always know where mine is in case it's needed. And, who wants to be rolling around trying to kill someone when they are naked?

Danny also conceals a weapon within his bedroom when facilitating an in-person meet at his home. This demonstrates the tension discussed earlier between a desire for sexual encounters with the anxiety and concern around possible victimisation. Danny has a fear that the guest may also be carrying a weapon but does not consider this to be a potentially 'protective' measure for them, and rather considers that this would be used by the guest for aggression, rather than protection, whilst simultaneously not considering their own weapon concealment in the same way. This speaks to distorted perceptions of the self and reinforces the false concept of the home encompassing all that is good, and clean, whilst the 'outside' represents dirt and danger. It is here that the 'outsider' is judged unfavourably for potentially engaging in the same behaviour as the 'insider'. Fear of violence and victimisation has been associated with public sex environments, in which gay and bisexual men may fear experiencing mugging and violence (Hennelly, 2010). For both Danny and Tyrhys, it is clear that concealing a weapon function as a risk-reduction strategy, in which their anticipation for violent victimisation is addressed through concealing a weapon which may give them a supposed physical advantage in the event of conflict. This is not to say that having, or using a

weapon reduces risk, as research has shown that unpredictability of knives can actually increase risk of experiencing violence (Riggs and Palasinski, 2011), however, it reduces perceived risk.

Danny and Tyrhys made reference to being able to defend themselves within the home, whereas other participants prefer their home in order to increase their chances of being able to ‘escape’ situations of conflict. This was most commonly discussed in relation to participants having a greater awareness of ‘escape routes’ out of the home, than the outsider. This is most explicitly stated by Oliver, who describes how:

When someone comes over, I always leave the back door unlocked. It’s a really easy door to open that doesn’t take forever, so I could easily get out quickly. Upstairs, there is a big window that goes over the garage. So, I always leave that window wide open, so if I needed to, I could easily get out of the window and be on the roof of the garage. There are bins at the side of the garage, so it is easy to get down from as well. At least I know I can run and get help if I need it.

In this narrative, the outside has the potential to offer safety and security in the event that the familiar and safe becomes unfamiliar and risky. Even though the outside represents the unknown and the risky, for Oliver, it is clear that this may be preferable to the inside, the home, the known, when the known is violence and danger. For Oliver, escaping a violent situation is preferable to engaging in the situation in a defensive manner. Being able to escape the home offers opportunities to seek help. Help-seeking opportunities may be important for gay and bisexual men when determining where to engage in sexual encounters, and Choi *et al.*, (2022) highlight help-seeking opportunities as a key determinant for those who engage in sex in gay saunas.

Whilst communicating on Grindr may occur anywhere, when communication happens from an individual’s home, with the purpose of facilitating an in-person meet, there is a clear overlap between the digital and physical spaces. Geo-location technologies embed digital spheres within the physical realm, creating a unique, digitalised physical space in which a reciprocal relationship exists. Participants also engaged in risk-reduction strategies prior to agreeing to an in-person meet in order to reduce their perceived risk, and this was primarily in the form of trying to authenticate a potential partners identity.

“I know who they are”: Identity Verification and Risk Reduction

One of the central ways in which participants believed they negotiated a safer meeting was by engaging in various identity verification processes. The ways in which identities were verified differed between participants, with some taking more extensive steps to confirm the identity of a potential meet, and measures included voice and video calling and cross-referencing social media accounts. Identity verification served two primary purposes. Firstly, it served to reduce the risk of disappointment in terms of the physical appearance of a potential meet, and to avoid being catfished. Secondly, it served the purpose of alleviating feelings of anxiety around a person's potential for violence, as anonymity was understood to be a key factor in the perpetration of violence. Adrian describes how he verifies someone's identity, and the motivations for doing so:

You have to be able to send me multiple pictures. Ideally, given that most people have a camera phone, I prefer someone to send me a picture of them holding up a piece of paper with a word written on that I have given them. That way I know the picture has just been taken. There have been a few times when someone has sent a few pictures, they turn up at yours, and look nothing like the pictures that they have sent you, and just expect you not to say anything. I also like to check their other social media accounts as well.

For Adrian, verifying someone else's identity primarily serves to reduce the risk of being catfished, at least in relation to physical appearance. This is consistent with previous research, Albury and Byron (2016:5) discuss the 'personal codes of conduct' users may abide by. These 'rules' all function to establish how trustworthy a potential 'partner' may be. The rules they speak of may include reciprocal text and image exchange along with video-calling in order to get a sense of how authentic a potential partner may be in relation to facilitating an offline meet. In terms of effectiveness of risk-reduction, this does appear to serve the purpose of reducing the risk of being catfished and was common across participants' narratives. All participants in the study expressed concern around how accurate and reflective of reality people's photos were, and research has shown that catfishing is a significant concern for online dating app users (Albury *et al.*, 2019; Couch *et al.*, 2012). However, it is important to note that providing authentic pictures may increase an individual's perception of how trustworthy someone is, through the familiarisation of the body through digital means.

Adrian also discussed viewing potential partners other social media accounts as a way to verify their identity. Adrian specified particular expectations of someone's social media

accounts, including a large digital friendship group, and photo's that were not just selfies, but represented an individual in the 'real world'. Here, we see digital integration at play, in which Adrian expects to see the physical embodiment of the physical world, but particularly public physical spaces, within the digital realm, as an indication of authenticity. We therefore see how physical spaces are expected to be represented within digital spaces as a means of identity verification. Race (2017) found that app users may use mainstream social networks such as Facebook to 'cross-reference' people they have met on online dating apps. As social media may be considered an extension of an individual's identity (Belk, 2013), cross-referencing an individual's various social media profiles alleviates feelings of anxiety for participants that the person is being deceitful. However, it was not simply catfishing that identity verification processes sought to reduce the risk of. Participants also felt that by verifying someone's identity reduced the risk of experiencing victimisation in-person. As Carlos explains:

Like I just don't think someone is going to show me who they are and be genuinely honest about who they are if they plan on killing me or robbing me, like they know they would get caught.

It therefore becomes apparent that identity verification also serves the purpose of reducing an individual's anxiety about the risk of victimisation occurring in the offline world. This was apparent across a number of participants' narratives, as Matt reiterated that he "wouldn't meet someone anonymous, they are more likely to be a murderer". However, this does perpetuate the 'stranger danger' narrative that perpetuates the idea that victimisation is likely to be perpetrated by someone completely unknown to the victim, and existing research has already demonstrated that individuals generally have higher rates of fear of victimisation perpetrated by a stranger (Leverentz, 2012). Here, we see that digital verification is deemed to be an indication of an individual's trustworthiness. It wasn't just photo-sharing that participants used, and some felt that video-calling provided them with an opportunity to assess someone's character.

I like to video call and chat to someone first. Like, I think I am a pretty good judge of character, and I can tell pretty quickly whether I'm getting any red flags from someone when I talk to them, so it's easier for me to figure out if I'm meeting a good person or not. (Rob)

For Rob, pictures do not suffice in reducing his anxiety around the intentions and character of a potential sexual partner. Rather, by video-calling with a potential sexual partner, he relies on his own instincts to judge whether someone's character is 'good', and this is then perceived as 'safe'. This constructs 'goodness' as a static characteristic, in which when one is established as 'good', they are deemed as 'safe'. It also essentialises 'goodness' and indicates a belief that someone can be inherently good, and therefore non-risky, and does not recognise the fluidity of 'goodness', in which one might emphasise particular personality traits in particular situations. This is consistent with findings by Albury and Byron (2016) who found that trust is established through a range of activities including photo-sharing, video calling and cross-platform checking. It is also important to note that these risk-reduction strategies that individuals engage in do not necessarily offer any practical use in reducing actual risk. Rather, they serve to reduce perceived risk. This is important, as these strategies which reduce perceived risk, may result in individuals taking less risk-reduction strategies in-person, when victimisation might occur. This also represents the dualistic nature of technology, wherein participants perceive technology as a means of facilitating situations in which risk is perceived as high, whilst simultaneously being used to reduce the perception of risk. There were also other strategies that participants engaged in that reduced their perceived sense of risk but may not reduce their actual risk of victimisation, including creating a 'safety plan' with a 'nominated guardian'.

Nominated Guardian and Safety Plans

The concept of a 'nominated guardian' was recurrent within the data. A nominated guardian is an individual that participants' shared information with regarding a potential meet with a partner offline. Various levels of detail were shared, with some participants sending photos of the person they were meeting, the address of where they were going to meet a partner and others sharing contact details of their potential partner. Jordan explained the rationale behind sharing these details and explained:

If I am going to meet someone outside, or I'm going to their place, my friend has to know where I am going and who I am meeting. Like, they need to have some idea, like, a starting point of where to find me. Imagine I just tell them I'm meeting someone off Grindr, and then disappear. What are they going to tell the police?

It is clear that information sharing is seen as fundamental in relation to future-consideration of risk, rather than an immediate risk-reduction strategy. However, what became apparent is

that participants understood this method as reducing the anxiety they felt regarding the actual risk they faced.

I feel safer when my friends know where I am, like, having that knowledge that someone can help you if you need it and someone knows where you are and who you are with. Like, it just makes you safer. I always send my friend my live location so they can see where I am. (Harry)

Here, the integrated nature of technology is evident again. Whilst geo-based dating and hook-up apps have been shown as being perceived as risky (Blackwell *et al.*, 2015) it is evident that technology and geo-location features are also used in this way to further reduce the perception of risk. However, for Harry, having a ‘nominated guardian’ know where he is becomes directly associated with being ‘safer’. However, I argue that this relates to perception of safety, rather than to actual safety.

The ability to use social networking platforms to share geo-location with ‘nominated guardians’ plays an important role in the ways that participants negotiated their perceived sense of safety. However, there may therefore be an incongruence between perceptions of risk and the actual risk faced. Nominated guardians tended to be a close friend to participants, although some participants had a family member (although usually not a parent), or also a current partner (in cases where participants were in open relationships). The roles and responsibilities of the nominated guardian varied, with some participants’ expecting their nominated guardian to phone the police if they could not contact them at an agreed time and others expecting their nominated guardian to drive to their home to physically check up on them. Other studies have demonstrated that discussing potential meetings and sharing photos of potential partners is a common practice for some gay and bisexual men (Byron *et al.*, 2021). Ryan outlined his expectations of his ‘nominated guardian’:

They know that if I haven’t text them a certain message or phoned them by a particular time, they need to get themselves in the car and over to my place ASAP. If they don’t get an answer at the door, they need to ring the police and let themselves in.

The agreed actions of the nominated guardian were perceived by participants to reduce the likelihood of experiencing victimisation and also ensure that they receive support if required. These methods of risk-reduction demonstrate a sense of individual responsibility to avoiding victimisation, even though this responsibility becomes shared with the nominated guardian.

This sense of individual responsibility is perhaps unsurprising, given the regular victim-blaming narratives within mainstream media and on social media (Ullman *et al.*, 2007). This may also be a personal defence mechanism to avoid some of the negative emotions, such as shame, associated with self-blame (Weiss, 2010). In a society which often holds victims to account for their own victimisation, sharing responsibility with another may therefore alleviate some of the personal responsibility that potential victims feel.

Conclusion

This paper has addressed various ways that gay and bisexual men negotiate and reduce their perceived sense of risk of experiencing victimisation from violence in using a globally popular online dating app. As such, it has offered another way of understanding gay and bisexual men's experiences, and perceptions of violence, safety and risk, while they are seeking sexual partners. A common feature of these risk-reduction strategies was their use by interviewees in reducing perceptions of risk and increasing perceptions of safety, rather than preventing someone from attempting to, or actually victimising them. As such, these strategies are employed in the belief that they offer a prevention to experiencing violence or may even contribute evidence to proving a range of different crimes had occurred and help solve them. Meeting in a familiar space until trust is built, verifying someone's identity, and having a nominated guardian, may not prevent victimisation. Understanding the ways in which risk and safety are perceived by these men is key, as strategies that merely reduce perceptions of risk may result in more effective strategies being overlooked, and a false sense of safety being established. The ready adoption of doubtful or unproven risk-reduction behaviours are unsurprising given societal expectations around personal responsibility in relation to victimisation, in which victim-blaming narratives persist across various media formats. However, given that the risk-reduction techniques concern such after the fact issues as evidence and victim credibility rather than immediate situational risk-reduction, this demonstrates the need for a much greater awareness of the potential harms in such encounters as robbery, serious assault, extortion, and blackmail.

To understand the problematic views of these interviewees this paper has also highlighted digital integration, which pushes beyond common conceptualisations of digital dualism. Throughout both online and offline interactions, participant data demonstrated the intertwined, overlapping and reciprocal relationship between physical and virtual spaces. Moving beyond digital dualism in which the online and offline spheres are recognised as two

separate spaces, participants highlighted how digital technology shaped their experiences in the offline world, including offering a source of support and help when required. At the same time, views about the physical world influenced their online interactions, in the sense that the supposed safety of the home bolstered an individual's confidence to engage with people online and increase comfort levels to invite an online connection into their physical space. Whilst existing research has demonstrated how digital technology may exacerbate traditional forms of victimisation, or indeed provide opportunities for new forms of victimisation to be developed (Lumsden and Harmer, 2019), these spaces are still often conceptualised as two distinct spaces. The physical world can no longer be separated from the digital realm, with technology interwoven into everyday life. At the same time, the digital sphere, particularly digital technologies with geo-location features, are inherently grounded within the physical world. Therefore, technology may be seen as enabling 'risk' through the facilitation of 'in-person' meetings with unknown people, whilst simultaneously being perceived as a safety-enhancing tool facilitating communication with those who can provide help, and as a means of verifying the identity of a potential perpetrator of violence.

It is therefore recommended that campaigns, and educational initiatives that focus on digital literacy and digital safety centre this crossover. Whilst it may not be possible to completely reduce the risk of victimisation, campaigns could focus on strategies that make help-seeking behaviours easier, including live-location sharing with family and/or friends when meeting someone. Greater awareness also needs to be highlighted on common risk-reduction strategies that people engage in, and the potential ineffectiveness of these strategies at reducing the actual risk of violent victimisation. This will also require future research to evaluate the effectiveness of various risk reduction strategies to ensure that potential victims have access to the evidence-based safety strategies.

Reference List

Albury, K. and Byron, P. (2016) Safe on My Phone? Same-Sex Attracted Young People's

Negotiations of Intimacy, Visibility, and Risk on Digital Hook-Up Apps, *Social Media and Society*, 2(4), 1-10.

Albury, K., Byron, P., McCosker, A., Pym, T., Walshe, J., Race, K., Salon, D., Reeders, D.,

Wark, T., Botfield, J. and Dietzel, C. (2019) *Safety, Risk and Wellbeing on Dating*

Apps: Final Report, Melbourne: Swinburne University of Technology.

Albury, K., Dietzel, C., Pym, T., Vivienne, S. and Cook, T. (2021) Not your unicorn: Trans dating apps users' negotiations of personal safety and sexual health, *Health Sociology Review*, 30(1), 72-86.

Bartlett, P. (2007) Killing gay men, 1976-2001, *British Journal of Criminology*, 47(4), 573-595.

Beck, U. (2006) Living in the world risk society, *Economy and Society*, 35(3), 329-345.

Belk, R. (2013) Extended self in a digital world, *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(3), 477-500.

Bhandal, J. and Horwood, M. (2021) *The LGBTQ+ Youth Homelessness Report*, London: Albert Kennedy Trust.

Birnholtz, J., Fitzpatrick, C., Handel, M., and Brubaker, J. R. (2014) Identity, identification and identifiability: The language of self-presentation on a location-based mobile dating app, In: *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction With Mobile Devices & Services*, New York: Association for Computer Machinery.

Blackwell, C., Birnholtz, J. and Abbott, C. (2015) Seeing and being seen: Co-situation and impression formation using Grindr, a location-aware gay dating app, *New Media and Society*, 17, 1117-1136.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Byron, P., Albury, K. and Pym, T. (2021) Hooking up with friends: LGBTQ+ young people, dating apps, friendship and safety, *Media, Culture and Society*, 43(3), 497-514.

Callan, A., Corbally, M. and McElvaney, R. (2021) A scoping review of intimate partner

- violence as it relates to the experiences of gay and bisexual men, *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 22(2), 233–248.
- Callender, D., Holt, M. and Newman, C.E. (2016) “Not everyone’s gonna like me”: Accounting for race and racism in sex and dating web services for gay and bisexual men, *Ethnicities*, 16(1), 3-21.
- Campbell, E. (2022) Extreme dwelling: assembling *domus horribilis*, *Crime, Media, Culture*, 18(2), 163-182.
- Caplan, P. (2000) *Risk Revisited*, London: Pluto Press.
- Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (2009) *Hate Crime: Impact, Causes and Responses*, London: Sage Publications.
- Chan, L.S. (2018) Ambivalence in networked intimacy: Observations from gay men using mobile dating apps, *New Media and Society*, 20(7), 2566-2581.
- Choi, E. P. H., Kwok, J. Y. Y., Choi, K. W. Y., Lee, J. J., Lok, K. Y. W., Wong, J. Y. H., Fong, D. Y. T., Wan, E. Y. F., Wong, W. C. W., & Chow, E. P. F. (2022) Perceptions and experiences of sexual violence among Chinese men who have sex with men in Hong Kong, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 00, 1– 14.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15391>
- Connell, R.W. (2005) *Masculinities*, (2nd Edn), Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Conner, C.T. (2018) The gay gayze: Expressions of inequality on Grindr, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 60(3), 397-419.
- Couch, D., Liamputtong, P. and Pitts, M. (2012) What are the real and perceived risks and dangers of online dating? Perspectives from online daters, *Health, Risk and Society*, 14(7-8), 697-714.
- Dickinson, T. (2021) Oregon man charged with using Grindr to target gay man in alleged hate crime, Rolling Stone, 17th November, Available at:
<https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-news/grindr-assault-oregon-hate-crime-1259056/> (Accessed: 24th May 2022).
- Dietzel, C. (2022) The three dimensions of unsolicited dick pics: Men who have sex with

- Men's experiences of sending and receiving unsolicited dick pics on dating apps, *Sexuality & Culture*, 26(3), 834– 852.
- Douglas, B. & Tewksbury, R.. (2008). Theaters and sex: An examination of anonymous sexual encounters in an erotic oasis, *Deviant Behavior*, 29, 1-17.
- Dunn, P. (2012) Men as victims: ‘Victim’ identities, gay identities, and masculinities, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(17), 3442-3467.
- Fitzpatrick, C. and Birnholtz, J. (2018) ‘I Shut the Door’: Interactions, tensions, and negotiations from a location-based social app, *New Media & Society*, 20(7), 2469–2488.
- Fitzsimons, T. (2019) Grindr turns 10: How a decade with GPS ‘dating’ apps changed us all, NBC News, 24th March, Available at: <https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/grindr-turns-10-how-decade-gps-dating-apps-changed-us-n986666> (Accessed: 7th April 2022).
- Ford, J. and Becker, A. (2020) “A situation where there aren’t rules”: Unwanted sex for gay, bisexual, and questioning men, *Sociological Science*, 7, 57-74.
- Gagnon, J. and Simon, W. (1973) *Sexual Conduct: The Social Origins of Human Sexuality*, Chicago: Idine.
- Geyh, P.E. (2011) Cosmopolitan exteriors and cosmopolitan interiors: the city and hospitality in Haneke’s Code Unknown’, in McCann, B. and Sorfa, D. (eds.), *The Cinema of Michael Haneke*, New York: Columbia University Press, 105-114.
- Grindr. (ND) Available at: <https://www.grindr.com/> (Accessed: 1st March 2022).
- Hennelly, S. (2010) Public space, public morality: The media construction of sex in public places, *Liverpool Law Review*, 31(1), 69-91.
- Henry, N. and Powell, A. (2018) Technology-facilitated sexual violence: A literature review of empirical research, *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 19(2), 195-208.

- Iganski, P. (2008) Criminal Law and the Routine Activity of 'Hate Crime'. *The Liverpool Law Review*, 29(1), 1–17.
- Jaspal, R. (2016) Gay men's construction and management of identity on Grindr, *Sexuality and Culture*, 21(1), 187-204.
- Joffe, H. (1999) *Risk and 'the Other'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaika, M. (2004) Interrogating the geographies of the familiar: Domesticating nature and constructing the autonomy of the modern home, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(2), 265-286.
- Leverentz, A. (2012) Narratives of crime and criminals: How places socially construct the crime problem, *Sociological Forum*, 27(2), 348-371.
- Lumsden, K. and Harmer, E. (2019) Online othering: An introduction, In: Lumsden, K. and Harmer, E. (eds) *Online Othering: Exploring Digital Violence and Discrimination on the Web*, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-33.
- Mackintosh, T. (2022) Stephen Port: Met to be reinvestigated over serial killer, *BBC News*, 23rd June, Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-61909143> (Accessed: 2nd August 2022).
- Martin, J. and Edward, A. (2012) Victimization in a nationwide sample of gay and bisexual men, *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 24(3), 260-273.
- Messinger, A.M. (2017) *LGBTQ Intimate Partner Violence: Lessons for Policy, Practice and Research*, California: University of California Press.
- Möller, N., Hansson, S. and Peterson, M. (2006) Safety is more than the antonym of risk, *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 23(4), 419–432.
- Murphy, A. (2018) Dating dangerously: Risks lurking within mobile dating apps, *Catholic University Journal of Law and Technology*, 26(1), 100–126.
- Oliffe, J.L., Han, C., Maria, E.S., Lohan, M., Howard, T., Stewart, D.E. and MacMillan, H. (2014) Gay men and intimate partner violence: A gender analysis, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 36(4), 564-579.

- Patton, M.Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, 3rd Edn, California: Sage Publications.
- Peretz, T. and Vidmar, C.M. (2021) Men, masculinities, and gender-based violence: The broadening scope of recent research, *Sociology Compass*, 15(3),
- Polley, N. M.& Tewksbury, R. (2007) Conversation in the erotic oasis, *Journal of Men's Studies*, 15, 147-159.
- Pooley, K. and Boxall, H. (2020) Mobile dating applications and sexual and violent offending, *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 612, 1-16.
- Powell, A. (2021) 'Intimate intrusions': Technology facilitated dating and intimate partner violence, In: Powell, A., Flynn, A. and Sugiura, L. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Gendered Violence and Technology*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 157-179.
- Proust, K. (2021) Teen accused of Grindr murder of Peter Keeley has trial date set, *ABC News*, 2nd July, Available at: <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-07-02/teenager-pleads-not-guilty-to-death-of-canberra-man/100262702> (Accessed: 15th April 2022).
- Race, K. (2017) *The Gay Science: Intimate Experiments with the Problem of HIV*, New York: Routledge.
- Riggs, D. and Palasinski, M. (2011) Tackling knife violence, young men view things differently, *British Medical Journal*, 342, d2903.
- Saewyc, E., Skay, C., Pettingell, S., Reis, E., Bearinger, L., Resnick, M., Murphy, A. and Combs, L. (2006) Hazards of stigma: The sexual and physical abuse of gay, lesbian and bisexual adolescents in the United States and Canada, *Child Welfare*, 85(2), 195-213.
- Sennett, R. (1990) *The Conscience of the Eye: The Design and Social Life of Cities*, New York: Knopf.
- Stardust, Z., Gillett, R. and Albury, K. (2022) Surveillance does not equal safety: Police, data and consent on dating apps, *Crime, Media, Culture*, [Online First].
- Stults, C.B., Javdani, S., Greenbaum, C.A., Kapadia, F. and Halkitis, P.N. (2016) Intimate

- partner violence and sex among young men who have sex with men, *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 58(2), 215-222.
- Tomsen, S. (2002), *Hatred, Murder and Male Honour: Anti-Homosexual Homicides in New South Wales, 1980-2000*, Research and Public Policy Series no 43, Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Tomsen, S. (2006) 'Homophobic Violence, Cultural Essentialism and Shifting Sexual Identities', *Social and Legal Studies* 15(3): 389–407.
- Ullman, S. E., Townsend, S. M., Filipas, H. H., & Starzynski, L. L. (2007) Structural models of the relations of assault severity, social support, avoidance coping, self-blame, and PTSD among sexual assault survivors, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(1), 23–37.
- Van Loon, J. (2002) *Risk and Technological Culture: Towards a Sociology of Virulence*, Milton Park: Taylor and Francis.
- Wakefield, L. (2022) Grindr serial killer suspect arrested after police detect date rape drug in victim's remains, PinkNews, 9th May, Available at: <https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2022/05/09/bilbao-gay-serial-killer-murder-spain-basque-country/> (Accessed: 18th April 2022)
- Weiss, K. G. (2010) 'Too Ashamed to Report: Deconstructing the Shame of Sexual Victimization', *Feminist Criminology*, 5(3), 286–310.
- Wigley, M. (1996) *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*, London: MIT Press.
- Wilson, R., Gosling, S., and Graham, L. (2012) A review of Facebook research in the social sciences, *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 203-220.
- Wu, S. and Ward, J. (2018) The mediation of gay men's lives: A review on gay dating app studies, *Sociology Compass*, 12(2), 1-10.

Table 1 - Participant Demographic Information

Name	Age	Location	Ethnicity	Disability
Danny	30	London	White British	No
Adrian	24	Birmingham	White British	No

Carlos	21	Birmingham	White European	No
Matt	50	Birmingham	White British	Yes
Jordan	21	Liverpool	Black British	No
Ryan	43	Cardiff	Black British	Yes
Harry	33	Derby	Asian British	No
Oscar	28	London	White British	No
John	67	London	White British	Yes
Rob	29	Brighton	White British	No
Oliver	18	Sussex	White European	Yes
Tyrhys	18	London	Mixed: White British and Black Caribbean	Yes